

Committee Item No. 2
Board Item No. _____

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: Budget and Appropriations Committee **Date** June 23, 2022
Board of Supervisors Meeting **Date** _____

Cmte Board

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ordinance
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Budget and Legislative Analyst Report
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Correspondence

OTHER (Click on the BLUE hyperlink to be forwarded to the Legislative Research Center to view large files)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	ASO Administrative Provisions FY23 & FY24
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	MYR Interim Exceptions 060122
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	MYR Minimum Compensation Ordinance Letter – 6/1/2022
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	MYR Notice of Transfer of Function 6/1/2022
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	MYR Technical Adjustments to Proposed May Budget – 6/1/2022
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Presidential Action Memo – 30-Day Rule Waiver
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	OEWD Presentation 6/15/2022
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	ASR Presentation 6/15/2022
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	TTX Presentation 6/15/2022
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	CON Presentation 6/15/2022
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	GEN Presentation 6/15/2022
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	CAT Presentation 6/15/2022
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	HSS Presentation 6/15/2022
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	ADM Presentation 6/15/2022
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	TIS Presentation 6/15/2022
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	HRC Presentation 6/15/2022
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	HRC Organizational Chart 6/15/2022
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	DPW-SAS Presentation 6/15/2022
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	MYR-MOHCD Presentation 6/15/2022
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	ETH Presentation 6/15/2022
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	REG Presentation 6/15/2022
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	OCII Presentation 6/15/2022
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	BOS Presentation 6/15/2022
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	DPH Presentation 6/16/2022
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	DPH Organizational Chart 6/16/2022
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	HSA Presentation 6/16/2022
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	HSH Presentation 6/16/2022
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	CSC Presentation 6/16/2022
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	WOM Presentation 6/16/2022
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	AAM Presentation 6/16/2022
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	FAM Presentation 6/16/2022
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SCI Presentation 6/16/2022

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	ART Presentation 6/16/2022
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	WAR Presentation 6/16/2022
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	REC Presentation 6/16/2022
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	CHF Presentation 6/16/2022
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	DEC Presentation 6/16/2022
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	DEM Presentation 6/16/2022
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	DHR Presentation 6/16/2022
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	JUV Presentation 6/17/2022
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	ADP Presentation 6/17/2022
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	POL Presentation 6/17/2022
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	POL Staffing Analysis 6/17/2022
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	DPA Presentation 6/17/2022
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	PDR Presentation 6/17/2022
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	FIR Presentation 6/17/2022
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	DAT Presentation 6/17/2022
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SHF Presentation 6/17/2022
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	CRT Presentation 6/17/2022

Completed by: Brent Jalipa **Date** June 17, 2022
Completed by: Brent Jalipa **Date** _____

[Click on this page to be forwarded to the Legislative Research Center to view this large file](#)

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

MAYOR'S PROPOSED SALARY ORDINANCE

As of June 1, 2022



File No. _____

Ordinance No. _____

**FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 2023 and
FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 2024**

Note: Additions are single-underline italics Times New Roman;
deletions are ~~strikethrough italics Times New Roman~~.
Board amendment additions are double underlined.
Board amendment deletions are ~~strikethrough normal~~.

AN ORDINANCE ENUMERATING POSITIONS IN THE ANNUAL BUDGET AND
APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE FOR THE FISCAL YEARS ENDING JUNE 30, ~~2022~~2023,
AND JUNE 30, ~~2023~~2024 CONTINUING, CREATING, OR ESTABLISHING THESE
POSITIONS; ENUMERATING AND INCLUDING THEREIN ALL POSITIONS CREATED BY
CHARTER OR STATE LAW FOR WHICH COMPENSATIONS ARE PAID FROM CITY AND
COUNTY FUNDS AND APPROPRIATED IN THE ANNUAL APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE;
AUTHORIZING APPOINTMENTS OR CONTINUATION OF APPOINTMENTS THERETO;
SPECIFYING AND FIXING THE COMPENSATIONS AND WORK SCHEDULES THEREOF;
AND AUTHORIZING APPOINTMENTS TO TEMPORARY POSITIONS AND FIXING
COMPENSATIONS THEREFORE.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE PEOPLE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.

SECTION 1. ESTABLISHMENT, CREATION AND CONTINUATION OF POSITIONS.

In accordance with the provisions of the Administrative Code, the positions hereinafter
enumerated under the respective departments are hereby created, established, or continued
for the fiscal year ending June 30, ~~2022~~2023. Positions created or authorized by Charter or
State law, compensations for which are paid from City and County funds and appropriated in
the Annual Appropriation Ordinance, as that ordinance may be modified during the fiscal year
in supplemental appropriation or deappropriation ordinances (together "Annual Appropriation

Ordinance”), are enumerated and included herein.

The word “position” or “positions” as used in the ordinance shall be construed to include office or offices, and the word “employee” or “employees” shall be construed to include officer or officers. The terms “requisition” and “request to fill” are intended to be synonymous and shall be construed to mean a position authorization that is required by the Charter.

Section 1.1. APPOINTMENTS AND VACANCIES PERMANENT POSITIONS.

Section 1.1A. Appointing officers as specified in the Charter are hereby authorized, subject to the provisions of this ordinance, to make or continue appointments as needed during the fiscal year to permanent positions enumerated in their respective sections of this ordinance. Such appointments shall be made in accordance with the provisions of the Charter. Appointing officers shall not make an appointment to a vacancy in a permanent position until the request to fill for such position is approved by the Controller. Provided further, that if the Mayor declares an intent to approve requests to fill due to unanticipated financial reasons, appointing officers shall not make an appointment to a vacancy in a permanent position until the request to fill for such position is approved by the Mayor. Provided further, that if changes occur to the classification, compensation, or duties of a permanent position, appointing officers shall not make an appointment to a vacancy in such position until the request to fill for such position is approved by the Department of Human Resources. Provided further, that in order to prevent the stoppage of essential services, the Human Resources Director may authorize an emergency appointment pending approval or disapproval of a request to fill, if funds are available to pay the compensation of such emergency appointee.

1
2 Provided that if the proposed employment is for inter-departmental service, the Controller
3 shall approve as to conformity with the following inter-departmental procedure.

4 Appointing officers shall not authorize or permit employees to work in inter-departmental
5 service unless the following provisions are satisfied. The payment of compensation for
6 the employment of persons in inter-departmental service shall be within the limit of the
7 funds made available by certified inter-departmental work orders and such compensation
8 shall be distributed to the inter-departmental work orders against which they constitute
9 proper detailed charges.

10
11 A. If the appointing officer is unable to employ a qualified person to cover the work
12 schedule of a position herein established or authorized, the appointing officer, subject
13 to the provisions of this ordinance and the Annual Appropriation Ordinance and with
14 the approval of the Department of Human Resources, may in the appointing officer's
15 discretion employ more than one person on a lesser work schedule but the combined
16 salaries shall not exceed the compensation appropriated for the position, or may
17 appoint one person on a combined work schedule but subject to the limitation of the
18 appropriation and the compensation schedule for the position and without
19 amendment to this ordinance.

20
21 B. Where a vacancy exists in a position, the Human Resources Director may and is
22 hereby authorized to approve a temporary (diverted) request to fill in a different class,
23 provided that the Controller certifies that funds are available to fill that vacancy on this
24 basis, and provided that no action taken as a result of the application of this section
25 will affect the classification of the position concerned as established in the Annual

Appropriation Ordinance and this ordinance.

An appointing officer, subject to the provisions of this ordinance, the Annual Appropriation Ordinance, the Controller's certification of funds, and Civil Service certification procedures, may employ more than one person on a combined work schedule not to exceed the permanent full-time equivalent, or may combine the appropriations for more than one permanent part-time position in order to create a single full-time equivalent position limited to classifications of positions herein established or authorized and their respective compensation schedules. Such changes shall be reported to the Department of Human Resources and the Controller's office. No full-time equivalent position which is occupied by an employee shall be reduced in hours without the voluntary consent of the employee, if any, holding that position. However, the combined salaries for part-time positions created shall not exceed the compensation appropriated for the full-time position, nor will the salary of a single full-time position created exceed the compensation appropriated for part-time positions. Each permanent part-time employee shall receive the same benefits as existing permanent part-time employees. The funding of additional fringe benefit costs subject to availability of funds will be from any legally available funds.

Section 1.1B. The Human Resources Director is solely authorized to administratively adjust the terms of this ordinance as follows:

A. To change the classification of a position provided that the rate of pay is the same or less and the services are in the same functional area.

B. To adjust the compensation of a position pursuant to an approved Memorandum of Understanding or ordinance.

C. To reflect the initial rates of compensation for a newly established classification, excluding classes covered under Administrative Code Sections 2A.76 and 2A.90.

D. To add positions funded in accordance with section 10.22 of the Annual Appropriation Ordinance, regarding Professional Service Contracts, and section 26 of the Annual Appropriation Ordinance, regarding work order appropriations.

The Department of Human Resources shall promptly notify the Controller, the Clerk of the Board, the Mayor's Office and the affected department(s) if the Human Resources Director takes such actions as authorized above.

Section 1.1C. Provided further, that if requests to fill for vacant permanent positions issued by departments where the appointing officers are elected officials enumerated in Article II and Section 6.100 of the Charter (the Board of Supervisors, Assessor-Recorder, City Attorney, District Attorney, Public Defender, Sheriff and Treasurer) are approved by the Controller and are not approved or rejected by the Mayor and the Department of Human Resources within 15 working days of submission, the requests to fill shall be deemed approved. If such requests to fill are rejected by the Mayor and/or the Department of Human Resources, the appointing officers listed above may appeal that rejection in a hearing before the Budget and Finance and/or Budget and Appropriations Committee of the Board of Supervisors, and the Board of Supervisors in its discretion may then grant approval of said requests to fill.

1 Section 1.1D. The Human Resources Director is authorized to make permanent exempt
2 appointments for a period of up to 6 months to permit simultaneous employment of an existing
3 City employee who is expected to depart City employment and a person who is expected to
4 be appointed to the permanent position previously held by the departing employee when such
5 an appointment is necessary to ensure implementation of successful succession plans and to
6 facilitate the transfer of mission-critical knowledge within City departments.

7
8 Section 1.1E. The Human Resources Director, with concurrence of the Controller, is
9 authorized to adjust the terms of this ordinance to reflect the conversion of temporary
10 positions to a permanent position(s) when sufficient funding is available and conversion is
11 needed either (A) to maintain services when elimination of temporary positions is consistent
12 with the terms of Memoranda of Understanding or (B) to address City staffing needs created
13 by the San Francisco Housing Authority's changing scope of work-, or (C) when the Human
14 Resources Director determines the conversion is warranted and the Controller certifies that
15 the conversion will not require additional salary appropriations in that fiscal year.

16
17 Section 1.2. APPOINTMENTS TEMPORARY POSITIONS.

18
19 Section 1.2A. Temporary appointments to positions defined by Charter Section 10.104(16) as
20 seasonal or temporary positions may be made by the respective appointing officers in excess
21 of the number of permanent positions herein established or enumerated and such other
22 temporary services as required at rates not in excess of salary schedules if funds have been
23 appropriated and are available for such temporary service. Such appointments shall be
24 limited in duration to no more than 1040 hours in any fiscal year. No appointment to such
25 temporary or seasonal position shall be made until the Controller has certified the availability

of funds, and the request to fill for such service is approved by the Controller and the Department of Human Resources. Provided further that in order to prevent the stoppage of essential services, the Human Resources Director may authorize an emergency appointment pending approval or disapproval of the request to fill, if funds are available to pay the compensation of such emergency appointee. No such appointment shall continue beyond the period for which the Controller has certified the availability of funds. Provided that if the proposed employment is for inter-departmental service, the Controller shall approve as to conformity with the following inter-departmental procedure. Appointing officers shall not authorize or permit employees to work in inter-departmental service unless the following provisions are complied with. The payment of compensation for the employment of persons in inter-departmental service shall be within the limit of the funds made available by certified inter-departmental work orders and such compensation shall be distributed to the inter-departmental work orders against which they constitute proper detailed charges.

Section 1.2B. Temporary Assignment, Different Department. When the needs and the best interests of the City require, appointing officers are authorized to arrange among themselves the assignment of personnel from one department to another department on a temporary basis. Such temporary assignments shall not be treated as transfers, and may be used to alleviate temporary seasonal peak-load situations, complete specific projects, provide temporary transitional work programs to return injured employees to work, or other circumstances in which employees from one department can be effectively used on a temporary basis in another department. All such temporary assignments between departments shall be reviewed and approved by the Department of Human Resources.

Section 1.3. EXCEPTIONS TO NORMAL WORK SCHEDULES FOR WHICH NO EXTRA

COMPENSATION IS AUTHORIZED.

Employees appointed to salaried classifications (i.e., designated –Z symbol) shall work such hours as may be necessary for the full and proper performance of their duties and shall receive no additional compensation for work on holidays or in excess of eight hours per day for five days per week, but may be granted compensatory time off under the provisions of any applicable Memorandum of Understanding or ordinance. Provided that, subject to the fiscal provisions of the Charter and the availability of funds, the Human Resources Director may suspend the provisions of this section to allow overtime payment. Approval of overtime payments shall be limited to extraordinary circumstances in which employees are required to work a significant number of hours in excess of their regular work schedules for a prolonged period of time, with a limited ability to use compensatory time off. Further, such payment shall be consistently applied to all personnel in a class.

SECTION 2. COMPENSATION PROVISIONS.

Section 2.1. PUC EMPLOYEES ASSIGNED TO HETCH HETCHY AND RECREATION AND PARK EMPLOYEES PERMANENTLY ASSIGNED TO CAMP MATHER.

The Public Utilities Commission and Recreation and Park Department will pay a stipend of ~~\$443.43~~ \$447.19 per month to employees residing in designated zip code areas enrolled in the Health Services System with employee plus two or more dependents where HMOs are not available and such employees are limited to enrollment to the City Plan I. The Public Utilities Commission will pay a stipend of ~~\$129.10~~ \$130.19 per month to employees residing in designated zip code areas enrolled in the Health Services System with

employee plus one dependent where HMOs are not available and such employees are limited to enrollment to City Plan I. These rates may be adjusted by the Health Service System Board to reflect the increase in premiums effective January 1, ~~2022~~2023. The City reserves the right to either reimburse the affected employees or provide an equivalent amount directly to the Health Services System.

Section 2.2. MOVING EXPENSES.

Where needed to recruit employees to fill Department Head, Deputy Director or Manager Level IV or higher (Manager V or higher for SFMTA) positions, an appointing authority may authorize the expenditure of pre-offer recruitment expenses, such as interview travel expenses, and reimbursement of post-offer expenses, such as moving, lodging/temporary housing and other relocation costs, not to exceed ~~\$23,181~~ \$24,385. Reimbursement will be made for actual expenses documented by receipts. As an alternative, the Controller may authorize advance payment of approved expenses. Payments under this section are subject to approval by the Controller and the Human Resources Director (except for SFMTA, where the approval is the Controller and Director of Transportation). This amount shall be indexed to the growth rate in the Consumer Price Index – All Urban Consumers (CPI-U), as reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics for the San Francisco Metropolitan Statistical Area from February to February of the preceding fiscal year.

Section 2.3. SUPPLEMENTATION OF MILITARY PAY.

A. In accordance with Charter Section A8.400(h) and in addition to the benefits provided pursuant to Section 395.01 and 395.02 of the California Military and Veterans Code and

the Civil Service Rules, any City employee who is a member of the reserve corps of the United States Armed Forces, National Guard or other uniformed service organization of the United States and is called into active military service in response to the September 11th, 2001 terrorist attacks, international terrorism, conflict in Iraq or related extraordinary circumstances, or to provide medical or logistical support to federal, state, or local government responses to the COVID-19 pandemic shall have the benefits provided for in subdivision (B).

B. Any employee to whom subdivision (A) applies, while on military leave, shall receive from the City the following supplement to their military pay and benefits:

1. The difference between the amount of the individual's gross military pay and the amount of gross pay the individual would have received as a City employee, had the employee worked the employee's regular work schedule (excluding overtime unless regularly scheduled as part of the employee's regular work schedule).

2. Retirement service credit consistent with Section A8.520 of the Charter.

3. All other benefits to which the employee would have been entitled had the employee not been called to eligible active military service, except as limited under state law or the Charter.

C. As set forth in Charter Section A8.400(h), this section shall be subject to the following limitations and conditions:

1. The employee must have been called into active service for a period greater than 30 consecutive days.

2. The purpose for such call to active service shall have been to respond to the September 11th, 2001 terrorist attacks, international terrorism, conflict in Iraq or related extraordinary circumstances, or to the COVID-19 pandemic, and shall not include scheduled training, drills, unit training assemblies or similar events.

3. The amounts authorized under this section shall be offset by amounts required to be paid pursuant to any other law, so there are no double payments to the employee.

4. Any employee receiving compensation under this section shall execute an agreement providing that if the employee does not return to City service within 60 days of release from active duty (or if the employee is not fit for employment at that time, within 60 days of a determination that the employee is fit for employment), then the compensation described in Sections (B)(1) through (B)(3) shall be treated as a loan payable with interest at a rate equal to the greater of (i) the rate received for the concurrent period by the Treasurer's Pooled Cash Account or (ii) the minimum amount necessary to avoid imputed income under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended from time to time, and any successor statute. Interest shall begin to accrue 90 days after the employee's release from active service or return to fitness for employment. Such loan shall be payable in equal monthly installments over a period not to exceed 5 years, commencing 90 days after the individual's release from active service or return to fitness for employment.

5. This section shall not apply to any active duty served voluntarily after the time that the employee is called to active service.

Section 2.4 CITY EMPLOYEES SERVING ON CHARTER-MANDATED BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS, OR BOARDS, COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES CREATED BY INITIATIVE ORDINANCE.

A. City employees serving on Charter-mandated boards and commissions, or boards, commissions and committees created by initiative ordinance, shall not be compensated for the number of hours each pay period spent in service of these boards and commissions, based on a 40-hour per week compensation assumption.

B. City employees covered by this provision shall submit to the Controller each pay period a detailed description of the time spent in service, including attending meetings, preparing for meetings, meeting with interested stakeholders or industry, and writing or responding to correspondence. There is a rebuttable presumption that such employees spend 0.25 of their time in service of these duties. This information shall be made publicly available pursuant to the Sunshine Ordinance.

C. This provision shall not apply to City employees whose service is specified in the Charter or by initiative ordinance, nor shall it apply to City employees serving on interdepartmental or other working groups created by initiative of the Mayor or Board of Supervisors, nor shall it apply to City employees who serve on the Health Service Board, Retiree Health Care Trust Fund Board, or Retirement Board

Section 2.5 STIPEND FOR PLANNING COMMISSIONERS FOR ATTENDANCE AT
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETINGS.

Each commissioner serving on the Planning Commission may receive full stipend for that commissioner's attendance at each meeting of the Commission, as enumerated and included herein, if the commissioner is present at the beginning of the first action item on the agenda for such meeting for which a vote is taken until the end of the public hearing on the last calendared item. A commissioner of the Planning Commission who attends a portion of a meeting of the Planning Commission, but does not qualify for full stipend, may receive one-quarter of the stipend available for the commissioner's attendance at each meeting of the commission, as enumerated and included herein

EXPLANATION OF SYMBOLS.

The following symbols used in connection with the rates fixed herein have the significance and meaning indicated.

- B. Biweekly.
- C. Contract rate.
- D. Daily.
- E. Salary fixed by Charter.
- F. Salary fixed by State law.
- G. Salary adjusted pursuant to ratified Memorandum of Understanding.
- H. Hourly.
- I. Intermittent.
- J. Rate set forth in budget.
- K. Salary based on disability transfer.
- L. Salary paid by City and County and balance paid by State.
- M. Monthly.
- O. No funds provided.
- P. Premium rate.
- Q. At rate set under Charter Section A8.405 according to prior service.
- W. Weekly.
- Y. Yearly.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO



RECEIVED
OFFICE OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
JUN -1 PM 1:19

LONDON N. BREED
MAYOR

To: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
From: Ashley Groffenberger, Mayor's Budget Director
Date: June 1, 2022
Re: Interim Exceptions to the Annual Salary Ordinance and Annual Appropriations Ordinance

Dear Madam Clerk,

I herein present exceptions to the Annual Salary Ordinance (ASO) and Annual Appropriations Ordinance (AAO) for consideration by the Budget and Appropriations Committee of the Board of Supervisors. The City's standard practice is to budget new positions beginning in pay period 7, at 0.79 FTE, and to hold funding for new initiatives until the budget is signed on August 1. Where there is justification for expedited hiring and spending, however, the Board may authorize exceptions to the Interim ASO and AAO, which allow new positions to be filled and expenditures related to new initiatives to begin in the first quarter of the fiscal year, prior to final adoption of the budget.

Exceptions are being requested for the following positions and non-personnel expenditures:

General Fund Positions (46.5 FTE)

- **City Attorney's Office (3.0 FTE)**
8177 Attorney (2.0 FTE); 8151 Claims Investigator (1.0 FTE). These 8177 positions are extensions of three-year limited duration positions that expire at the end of FY 2021-22, and are critical for specific programs that extend into FY 2022-23. The 8151 is an off-budget position that was mistakenly not included in the FY 2022-23 base budget.
- **Department of Children, Youth, and their Families (2.5 FTE)**
9774 Senior Community Development Specialist I (1.0 FTE); 9775 Senior Community Development Specialist II (1.0 FTE); 1823 Senior Administrative Analyst (0.5 FTE). These positions support a new effort with the Juvenile Probation Department to support justice-involved youth. The department has begun recruitment in order to meet critical youth and family needs as soon as possible.
- **Controller's Office (2.0 FTE)**
0923 Manager II (1.0 FTE); 1824 Principal Administrative Analyst (1.0 FTE). These positions will support the new refuse rate setting and monitoring process which would be assigned to the Controller's Office, assuming passage of Proposition F on the June 7, 2022 ballot.
- **Department of Public Works (6.0 FTE)**
0112 Commission Member (5.0 FTE); 1842 Management Assistant (1.0 FTE). These positions support the requirements of Proposition B and the creation of the new Public Works Commission.

- **Office of Economic and Workforce Development (2.0 FTE)**
5502 Project Manager I (2.0 FTE). These positions are extensions of three-year limited duration positions that expire at the end of FY 2021-22, and are critical for programs that extend into FY 2022-23.
- **Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (19.0 FTE)**
0923 Manager II (3.0 FTE); 1244 Senior Human Resources Analyst (2.0 FTE); 1823 Senior Administrative Analyst (6.0 FTE); 1824 Principal Administrative Analyst (3.0 FTE); 1820 Junior Administrative Analyst (1.0 FTE); 2593 Health Program Coordinator III (1.0 FTE); 2917 Program Support Analyst (1.0 FTE); 2918 Human Services Agency Social Worker (2.0 FTE). These positions are critical to implement existing Our City, Our Home-funded programs that are already in progress, to respond rapidly and effectively to drug use and overdoses, to manage shelter and housing coordination, to complete the Continuum of Care grants for HUD funding compliance, to implement state-funded programs to place clients from temporary shelter into permanent housing, and to meet required timelines for grant-funded projects.
- **Mayor's Office (1.0 FTE)**
0981 Mayoral Staff XI (1.0 FTE). This is off-budget and is an extension of a three-year limited duration position that expires at the end of FY 2021-22, and is critical for a HOPE SF program that extends into FY 2022-23.
- **Department of Sanitation and Streets (7.0 FTE)**
0112 Commission Member (5.0 FTE); 0922 Manager I (1.0 FTE); 1842 Management Assistant (1.0 FTE). These positions support the requirements of Proposition B and the creation of the new Sanitation and Streets Commission.
- **Department on the Status of Women (4.0 FTE)**
2998 Representative, Commission on The Status of Women (2.0 FTE); 1820 Junior Administrative Analyst (1.0 FTE); 1823 Senior Administrative Analyst (1.0 FTE). These positions are critical to the fiscal management and programmatic expansion of the Department and the services it provides to the community.

Non-General Fund Positions (13.5 FTE)

- **Department of Children, Youth, and their Families (0.5 FTE)**
1823 Senior Administrative Analyst (0.5 FTE). This position supports a new effort with the Juvenile Probation Department to support justice-involved youth. The department has begun recruitment in order to meet critical youth and family needs as soon as possible.
- **Department of Public Health (2.0 FTE)**
0931 Manager III (2.0 FTE). These positions are needed to perform work on a grant the Department received in FY 2021-22.
- **Department of Public Works (1.0 FTE)**
0941 Manager VI (1.0 FTE). This position will meet the requirements of Proposition B and will support rapid hiring for the Department of Sanitation and Streets.

- **San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (1.0 FTE)**
5408 Coordinator of Citizen Involvement (1.0 FTE). This position will support critical community outreach regarding ongoing and new capital projects.
- **San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (1.0 FTE)**
0933 Manager V (1.0 FTE). This position will manage the negotiation, coordination and facilitation of low-cost project financing loan funding agreements with federal, state, and local agencies. Prior to this position, the duties were being handled by an outside contractor.
- **Department of Technology (7.0 FTE)**
7432 Electrical Line Helper (4.0 FTE); 1844 Senior Management Assistant (2.0 FTE); 7308 Cable Splicer (1.0 FTE). These off-budget positions will support the Fiber to Housing project approved in the FY 2021-22 budget cycle.
- **Department on the Status of Women (1.0 FTE)**
2998 Representative, Commission on The Status of Women (1.0 FTE). This position will support the Commercially Sexually Exploited Children (CSEC) grant from the California Department of Social Services that the Department received in FY 2019-20.

General Fund Non-personnel Expenditures

- **Department of Children, Youth, and their Families (\$4,000,000)**
To immediately continue existing programs for roughly 800 students at the San Francisco Unified School District to pre-enroll in the City College of San Francisco and receive enhanced academic support for college success.

There are additional positions that indicate they are starting at pay-period one in the Mayor's proposed budget, however the Mayor's Office intends to submit technical adjustments to move these positions to starting at pay period 7. Those changes will be noted in the technical adjustments letter to the Board of Supervisors, at a later date, rather than included in this letter noting interim exceptions.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions regarding the requested interim exceptions to the Annual Salary Ordinance and Annual Appropriations Ordinance.

Sincerely,



Ashley Groffenberger
Mayor's Budget Director

cc: Members of the Budget and Appropriations Committee
Budget & Legislative Analyst's Office
Controller

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO



RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
LONDON N. BREED
2022 JUN -1 PM 1:19 MAYOR

BY 

To: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
From: Ashley Groffenberger, Mayor's Budget Director
Date: June 1, 2022
Re: Minimum Compensation Ordinance and the Mayor's FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24
Proposed Budget

Madam Clerk,

Pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code, SEC 12P.3, the minimum compensation for nonprofit corporations will be \$17.90 and will be \$18.75 for public entities as of July 1, 2022. This letter provides notice to the Board of Supervisors that the Mayor's proposed budget for Fiscal Years (FY) FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24 contains funding to support the full increase in the minimum compensation wage levels for nonprofit corporations and public entities in FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24.

If you have any questions, please contact my office.

Sincerely,



Ashley Groffenberger
Mayor's Budget Director

cc: Members of the Board of Supervisors
Budget & Legislative Analyst's Office
Controller

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO



RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
JUN -1 PM 1:19

LONDON N. BREED
MAYOR

To: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
From: Ashley Groffenberger, Mayor's Budget Director
Date: June 1, 2022
Re: Notice of Transfer of Functions under Charter Section 4.132

Dear Madam Clerk,

This memorandum constitutes notice to the Board of Supervisors under Charter Section 4.132 of transfers of functions between departments within the Executive Branch. All positions are regular positions unless otherwise specified. The positions include the following:

- 11 positions (0.81 FTE 0931 Manager III, 0.81 FTE 1241 Human Resources Analyst, 0.75 FTE 5177 Safety Officer, 0.75 FTE 1244 Senior Human Resources Analyst, 0.75 FTE 1224 Principal Payroll and Personnel Clerk, 0.75 1222 Senior Payroll and Personnel Clerk, 0.75 1222 Senior Payroll and Personnel Clerk, 0.75 1220 Payroll and Personnel Clerk, 0.5 1244 Senior Human Resources Analyst, 0.5 1244 Senior Human Resources Analyst, 1.0 FTE 0922 Manager I) to be transferred from the City Administrator's Office to the Department of Public Works in order to meet the requirements of Proposition B and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.
- One position (0.79 FTE 1824 Principal Administrative Analyst) to be transferred from Controller's Office to the Office of Economic and Workforce Development in order to better align the programmatic support for the San Francisco Community Investment Fund with other citywide economic development functions.
- One position (1.0 FTE 2931 Marriage, Family, and Child Counselor) from the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing to the San Francisco Public Library to support clients at the Main Library site.
- 11 positions (2.0 7428 Hodcarrier, 1.0 7248 Sewer Repair Supervisor, 1.0 7246 Sewer Repair Supervisor, 6.0 7421 Sewer Maintenance Worker, and 1.0 7307 Bricklayer) from the Department of Public Works to the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission for the transfer of the Sewer Division.
- One position (1.0 FTE 0931 Manager II) from the City Administrator's Office to the Department of Emergency Management as part of a transition to move all citywide community and neighborhood preparedness and response efforts to the Department of Emergency Management.

If you have any questions, please contact my office.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'A. Groffenberger', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Ashley Groffenberger
Mayor's Budget Director

cc: Members of the Budget and Finance Committee
Budget & Legislative Analyst's Office
Controller

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO



RECEIVED
OFFICE OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
JUN -1 PM 1:19

LONDON N. BREED
MAYOR

To: Supervisor Hilary Ronen, Chair, Budget and Appropriation Committee
From: Ashley Groffenberger, Mayor's Budget Director
Date: June 1, 2022
Re: Technical Adjustments to the Mayor's Proposed May 1 Budget

Dear Chair Ronen,

Per Charter Section 9.101, the Mayor's Office hereby submits the following technical adjustments to the Mayor's Proposed May 1 Budget for FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24. The May 1 budget is now part of the June 1 Mayor's proposed budget, however, since the Board of Supervisors has already reviewed these budgets, attached is a summary of the changes to these departments since the May 1 submission.

These adjustments include:

- Changes to salary and fringe benefits due to final agreed-upon adjustments in recently negotiated MOUs;
- Changes to Airport revenues and associated expenditures based on updated rates and charges adopted by the Airport Commission on May 17, 2022;
- Other miscellaneous technical changes including: changes to work orders to reflect accurate service level needs and costs; fund balancing entries and transfers; modest changes to the MTA baseline to reflect final revenue projections; and other small miscellaneous expenditure changes.

If you have any questions, please contact my office.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Ashley Groffenberger".

Ashley Groffenberger
Mayor's Budget Director

cc: Members of the Board of Supervisors
Budget & Legislative Analyst's Office
Controller

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

**Technical Adjustments for May 1 Departments
FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24**

GFS Type	Dept Grp	Dept ID	Fund	Project-Activity	Authority	Account - Title	FY 2022-23 May 1 Proposed	FY 2022-23 Updated	Variance FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24 May 1 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Updated	Variance FY 2023-24
GFS	BOA	232076	10000	10026677-0001	10000	501000 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Budget	(3)	-	3	(3)	-	3
GFS	BOA	232076	10000	10026677-0001	10000	513000 - Retirement - Budget	(379)	-	379	(379)	-	379
GFS	BOA	232076	10000	10026677-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	21,156	21,190	34	22,427	22,462	35
GFS	BOA	232076	10000	10026677-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	44,398	44,534	136	47,061	47,204	143
GFS	BOA	232076	10000	10026677-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	4,217	4,229	12	4,344	4,356	12
GFS	BOA	232076	10000	10026677-0001	10000	581210 - DT Technology Infrastructure	524	200	(324)	538	201	(337)
GFS	BOA	232076	10000	10026677-0001	10000	581360 - DT Telecommunications Serv	654	654	-	654	669	15
GFS	LLB	232051	10000	10026756-0001	10000	501000 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Budget	4	-	(4)	4	-	(4)
GFS	LLB	232051	10000	10026756-0001	10000	513000 - Retirement - Budget	(2,258)	-	2,258	(2,258)	-	2,258
GFS	LLB	232051	10000	10026756-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	6,591	6,631	40	6,986	7,028	42
GFS	LLB	232051	10000	10026756-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	32,233	32,393	160	34,166	34,337	171
GFS	LLB	232051	10000	10026756-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	2,691	2,705	14	2,773	2,787	14
GFS	LLB	232051	10000	10026756-0001	10000	581210 - DT Technology Infrastructure	6,572	5,767	(805)	7,082	6,311	(771)
GFS	LLB	232051	10000	10026756-0001	10000	581325 - DT Enterprise Tech Contracts	2,561	2,561	0	3,394	3,394	0
GFS	LLB	232051	10000	10026756-0001	10000	581360 - DT Telecommunications Serv	1,129	1,129	-	1,129	1,137	8
GFS	RET	207980	10020	10024407-0001	17410	460199 - Other General Government Ch	1,697,630	1,597,226	(100,404)	1,781,849	1,674,387	(107,462)
GFS	RET	207980	10020	10024407-0001	17410	501000 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Budget	(382)	-	382	(382)	-	382
GFS	RET	207980	10020	10024407-0001	17410	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	739,894	656,115	(83,779)	817,221	724,559	(92,662)
GFS	RET	207980	10020	10024407-0001	17410	513000 - Retirement - Budget	1,911	-	(1,911)	1,911	-	(1,911)
GFS	RET	207980	10020	10024407-0001	17410	513010 - Retire City Misc	131,940	116,867	(15,073)	114,834	101,683	(13,151)
GFS	RET	207980	10020	10024407-0001	17410	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	46,790	43,623	(3,167)	51,314	47,687	(3,627)
GFS	RET	207980	10020	10024407-0001	17410	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	12,185	10,969	(1,216)	13,299	11,955	(1,344)
GFS	RET	207980	10020	10024407-0001	17410	515010 - Health Service-City Match	26,422	27,326	904	30,335	31,382	1,047
GFS	RET	207980	10020	10024407-0001	17410	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	5,205	4,687	(518)	5,684	5,108	(576)
GFS	RET	207980	10020	10024407-0001	17410	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	3,197	2,878	(319)	3,489	3,136	(353)
GFS	RET	207980	10020	10024407-0001	17410	515710 - Dependent Coverage	51,101	54,097	2,996	58,627	62,086	3,459
GFS	RET	207980	10020	10024407-0001	17410	516010 - Dental Coverage	5,047	5,226	179	5,624	5,824	200
GFS	RET	207980	10020	10024407-0001	17410	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	841	756	(85)	918	825	(93)
GFS	RET	207980	10020	10024407-0001	17410	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	1,514	1,188	(326)	1,772	1,410	(362)
GFS	RNT	232325	10020	10026789-0001	22256	493014 - OTI Fr 2S/NDF-NeghborhoodC	0	1,000,000	1,000,000	-	-	-
GFS	RNT	232325	10020	10026789-0001	22256	527000 - Prof & Specialized Svcs-Bdgt	0	1,000,000	1,000,000	-	-	-
NGFS	AIR	228994	17960	10001629-0001	10000	591060 - OTO To 1G-General Fund	35,000,000	37,080,000	2,080,000	40,000,000	45,774,000	5,774,000
NGFS	AIR	228994	17960	10001756-0003	10000	467111 - Airline Landing Fees	252,526,000	212,688,000	(39,838,000)	290,416,000	298,892,000	8,476,000
NGFS	AIR	228994	17960	10001756-0006	10000	467161 - Non-Signatry AirlineSurchrgFe	1,615,000	1,377,000	(238,000)	1,516,000	1,510,000	(6,000)
NGFS	AIR	228994	17960	10001757-0003	10000	467321 - Rental-Airline Ground Leases	19,469,000	19,552,000	83,000	19,954,000	20,041,000	87,000
NGFS	AIR	228994	17960	10001757-0006	10000	467411 - Rental-Aircraft Parking	8,332,000	8,332,000	-	8,999,000	10,289,000	1,290,000
NGFS	AIR	228994	17960	10001757-0006	10000	467511 - Airline Support Services	16,531,000	17,043,000	512,000	17,362,000	17,991,000	629,000
NGFS	AIR	228994	17960	10001757-0006	10000	467711 - Parking - Employees	9,645,000	9,969,000	324,000	10,122,000	10,525,000	403,000
NGFS	AIR	228994	17960	10001757-0006	10000	477911 - Licenses & Permits	2,455,000	2,172,000	(283,000)	2,649,000	2,484,000	(165,000)
NGFS	AIR	228994	17960	10001757-0009	10000	467311 - Rental-Airline Cargo Space	4,551,000	4,576,000	25,000	4,664,000	4,689,000	25,000
NGFS	AIR	228994	17960	10001757-0012	10000	467421 - Rental-Airline Superbay Hanga	11,865,000	12,114,000	249,000	6,707,000	12,417,000	5,710,000

**Technical Adjustments for May 1 Departments
FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24**

GFS Type	Dept Grp	Dept ID	Fund	Project-Activity	Authority	Account - Title	FY 2022-23 May 1 Proposed	FY 2022-23 Updated	Variance FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24 May 1 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Updated	Variance FY 2023-24
NGFS	AIR	228994	17960	10001757-0015	10000	467611 - Rental Tank Farm Area	1,798,000	1,804,000	6,000	1,839,000	1,848,000	9,000
NGFS	AIR	228994	17960	10001757-0018	10000	477951 - Rent-Governmental Agency	6,260,000	4,814,000	(1,446,000)	6,313,000	4,535,000	(1,778,000)
NGFS	AIR	228994	17960	10001757-0024	10000	467651 - FBO-Other Services	16,066,000	16,126,000	60,000	16,448,000	16,529,000	81,000
NGFS	AIR	228994	17960	10001757-0027	10000	467215 - Customs Cargo Facility Fee	936,000	937,000	1,000	957,000	958,000	1,000
NGFS	AIR	228994	17960	10001757-0030	10000	477921 - Collection Charges	562,000	472,000	(90,000)	562,000	519,000	(43,000)
NGFS	AIR	228994	17960	10001758-0003	10000	467141 - Jet Bridge Fees	117,000	10,000	(107,000)	120,000	10,000	(110,000)
NGFS	AIR	228994	17960	10001758-0003	10000	467213 - Rental-Airline NorthTerminalT3	89,712,000	94,165,000	4,453,000	101,884,000	107,306,000	5,422,000
NGFS	AIR	228994	17960	10001758-0003	10000	467214 - Rental-Airline SouthTerminalT1	43,916,000	45,733,000	1,817,000	54,036,000	56,463,000	2,427,000
NGFS	AIR	228994	17960	10001758-0003	10000	467216 - Rental-Airline-ITB	100,241,000	101,170,000	929,000	113,843,000	115,289,000	1,446,000
NGFS	AIR	228994	17960	10001758-0003	10000	467217 - Rentl-Airline-CustmsFacilts-ITB	48,521,000	50,528,000	2,007,000	55,105,000	57,580,000	2,475,000
NGFS	AIR	228994	17960	10001758-0003	10000	467218 - Rental-Airline-T2	25,423,000	30,590,000	5,167,000	28,873,000	34,859,000	5,986,000
NGFS	AIR	228994	17960	10001758-0005	10000	437421 - Concession-Telephone	2,875,000	2,400,000	(475,000)	2,975,000	2,472,000	(503,000)
NGFS	AIR	228994	17960	10001758-0005	10000	437441 - Concession-Advertising	13,051,000	13,328,000	277,000	13,370,000	13,649,000	279,000
NGFS	AIR	228994	17960	10001758-0005	10000	437499 - Concession-Others	5,756,000	6,047,000	291,000	7,616,000	8,727,000	1,111,000
NGFS	AIR	228994	17960	10001758-0005	10000	437501 - Concession-Others-ITB	93,000	331,000	238,000	552,000	451,000	(101,000)
NGFS	AIR	228994	17960	10001758-0005	10000	437512 - Concess Rev-DutyFreeInBond	20,017,000	20,025,000	8,000	29,711,000	29,086,000	(625,000)
NGFS	AIR	228994	17960	10001758-0005	10000	437521 - Concession-Gifts & Merchandi	8,371,000	8,187,000	(184,000)	12,219,000	14,950,000	2,731,000
NGFS	AIR	228994	17960	10001758-0005	10000	437522 - Concess Rev-Gift&Merchndse	2,319,000	2,114,000	(205,000)	4,617,000	3,200,000	(1,417,000)
NGFS	AIR	228994	17960	10001758-0005	10000	437711 - Concession-Food & Beverage	16,049,000	15,418,000	(631,000)	20,008,000	20,630,000	622,000
NGFS	AIR	228994	17960	10001758-0005	10000	437712 - Concession-Food & Beverage-	2,900,000	2,346,000	(554,000)	4,312,000	4,957,000	645,000
NGFS	AIR	228994	17960	10001758-0009	10000	477931 - Refuse Disposal	1,382,000	1,414,000	32,000	1,416,000	1,449,000	33,000
NGFS	AIR	228994	17960	10001758-0009	10000	477933 - Miscellaneous Terminal Fees	10,671,000	9,612,000	(1,059,000)	10,884,000	10,619,000	(265,000)
NGFS	AIR	228994	17960	10001758-0009	10000	477942 - Reimbursement From SFOTE(139,000	2,668,000	2,529,000	142,000	143,000	1,000
NGFS	AIR	228994	17960	10001758-0011	10000	437213 - Rentl-North Term T3 (Non-Air)	1,015,000	1,059,000	44,000	1,161,000	1,217,000	56,000
NGFS	AIR	228994	17960	10001758-0011	10000	437214 - Rentl-South Term T1 (Non-Air)	682,000	736,000	54,000	732,000	795,000	63,000
NGFS	AIR	228994	17960	10001758-0011	10000	437215 - Rental - T2 (Non Airline)	592,000	631,000	39,000	237,000	733,000	496,000
NGFS	AIR	228994	17960	10001758-0011	10000	437216 - Rental-ITB (Non-Airline)	1,088,000	1,324,000	236,000	1,356,000	1,509,000	153,000
NGFS	AIR	228994	17960	10001758-0015	10000	467142 - Common Use Gate Fees	1,224,000	4,881,000	3,657,000	2,509,000	5,562,000	3,053,000
NGFS	AIR	228994	17960	10001759-0002	10000	435271 - SFO-PrkingGarge,Lots&Permit	85,987,000	87,953,000	1,966,000	92,227,000	97,834,000	5,607,000
NGFS	AIR	228994	17960	10001759-0002	10000	437411 - Concession-Groundside	12,000	12,000	-	14,000	15,000	1,000
NGFS	AIR	228994	17960	10001759-0002	10000	437611 - Concession-Car Rental	38,955,000	38,955,000	-	43,826,000	44,826,000	1,000,000
NGFS	AIR	228994	17960	10001759-0002	10000	437621 - Off Airport Privilege Fee	2,220,000	2,220,000	-	2,705,000	2,242,000	(463,000)
NGFS	AIR	228994	17960	10001759-0002	10000	437911 - Taxicabs	3,364,000	3,364,000	-	4,223,000	4,555,000	332,000
NGFS	AIR	228994	17960	10001759-0002	10000	437921 - Ground Trans Trip Fees	35,105,000	35,106,000	1,000	44,586,000	47,548,000	2,962,000
NGFS	AIR	228994	17960	10001759-0002	10000	438111 - CNG Services	90,000	95,000	5,000	91,000	97,000	6,000
NGFS	AIR	228994	17960	10001759-0005	10000	437219 - Rental-Other BdlgsNon-Airline	51,000	36,000	(15,000)	15,000	15,000	-
NGFS	AIR	228994	17960	10001759-0005	10000	437311 - Rental-UnimprvdAreaNon-Airlii	5,390,000	5,404,000	14,000	5,512,000	5,539,000	27,000
NGFS	AIR	228994	17960	10001759-0006	10000	437217 - Rental-BART	3,402,000	3,406,000	4,000	3,424,000	3,429,000	5,000
NGFS	AIR	228994	17960	10001759-0006	10000	437321 - Rental Car Facility Fee	17,319,000	17,361,000	42,000	17,709,000	17,795,000	86,000
NGFS	AIR	228994	17960	10001759-0006	10000	467521 - Transportation & Facilitis Fee	17,609,000	15,975,000	(1,634,000)	21,463,000	20,476,000	(987,000)
NGFS	AIR	228994	17960	10001760-0003	10000	477211 - Sale Of Electricity	23,630,000	28,070,000	4,440,000	24,221,000	29,347,000	5,126,000

**Technical Adjustments for May 1 Departments
FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24**

GFS Type	Dept Grp	Dept ID	Fund	Project-Activity	Authority	Account - Title	FY 2022-23 May 1 Proposed	FY 2022-23 Updated	Variance FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24 May 1 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Updated	Variance FY 2023-24
NGFS	AIR	228994	17960	10001760-0009	10000	477611 - Sale Of Natural Gas	390,000	447,000	57,000	468,000	483,000	15,000
NGFS	AIR	228994	17960	10001760-0012	10000	437425 - Telecommunication Fees	5,251,000	5,148,000	(103,000)	5,408,000	5,251,000	(157,000)
NGFS	AIR	228994	17960	10001761-0003	10000	430120 - Interest Earned-FiscAgentAcct	9,682,000	13,234,000	3,552,000	14,712,000	18,140,000	3,428,000
NGFS	AIR	228994	17960	10001761-0003	10000	430150 - Interest Earned - Pooled Cash	1,416,000	5,610,000	4,194,000	2,102,000	8,354,000	6,252,000
NGFS	AIR	228994	17960	10005719-0001	10000	495021 - ITI Fr 5A-Airport Funds	65,757,504	137,242,096	71,484,592	204,695,084	91,225,599	(113,469,485)
NGFS	AIR	228994	19610	10005719-0001	10718	467151 - Passenger Facility Fees	-	137,000,000	137,000,000	197,029,000	44,539,000	(152,490,000)
NGFS	AIR	228994	19610	10005719-0001	10718	499999 - Beg Fund Balance - Budget Or	65,757,504	242,096	(65,515,408)	7,666,084	46,686,599	39,020,515
NGFS	AIR	228994	19610	10005719-0001	10718	595210 - ITO To 5A-Airport Funds	65,757,504	137,242,096	71,484,592	204,695,084	91,225,599	(113,469,485)
NGFS	AIR	109653	17960	10026671-0001	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	4,242,303	4,274,631	32,328	4,381,963	4,473,273	91,310
NGFS	AIR	109653	17960	10026671-0001	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	765,195	771,013	5,818	622,759	635,719	12,960
NGFS	AIR	109653	17960	10026671-0001	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	304,655	305,805	1,150	313,925	317,165	3,240
NGFS	AIR	109653	17960	10026671-0001	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	74,255	74,713	458	76,574	77,898	1,324
NGFS	AIR	109653	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	148,838	148,898	60	157,770	157,834	64
NGFS	AIR	109653	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	31,729	31,929	200	32,727	33,287	560
NGFS	AIR	109653	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	19,478	19,602	124	20,093	20,437	344
NGFS	AIR	109653	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	358,086	358,329	243	379,569	379,826	257
NGFS	AIR	109653	17960	10026671-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	32,988	33,009	21	33,984	34,005	21
NGFS	AIR	109653	17960	10026671-0001	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	5,124	5,156	32	5,284	5,370	86
NGFS	AIR	109653	17960	10026671-0001	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	12,855	12,963	108	13,270	13,598	328
NGFS	AIR	109653	17960	10026671-0001	10000	581120 - GF-Con-Financial Systems	1,041,279	1,074,384	33,105	1,062,178	1,119,798	57,620
NGFS	AIR	109653	17960	10026671-0001	10000	581130 - GF-Con-Internal Audits	1,357,316	1,358,928	1,612	1,327,674	1,329,947	2,273
NGFS	AIR	109653	17960	10026671-0001	10000	581245 - GF-CON-Information System C	3,133,116	3,084,246	(48,870)	3,153,455	3,100,043	(53,412)
NGFS	AIR	109654	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	103,989	104,212	223	110,229	110,465	236
NGFS	AIR	109654	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	258,338	259,234	896	273,837	274,787	950
NGFS	AIR	109654	17960	10026671-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	23,836	23,912	76	24,558	24,636	78
NGFS	AIR	109664	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	28,331	28,374	43	30,031	30,076	45
NGFS	AIR	109664	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	66,974	67,146	172	70,990	71,173	183
NGFS	AIR	109664	17960	10026671-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	6,303	6,317	14	6,493	6,508	15
NGFS	AIR	109665	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	162,634	162,711	77	172,398	172,480	82
NGFS	AIR	109665	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	349,324	349,635	311	370,267	370,596	329
NGFS	AIR	109665	17960	10026671-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	33,088	33,115	27	34,085	34,112	27
NGFS	AIR	109668	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	37,961	38,023	62	40,238	40,303	65
NGFS	AIR	109668	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	78,185	78,432	247	82,873	83,135	262
NGFS	AIR	109668	17960	10026671-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	7,545	7,566	21	7,773	7,795	22
NGFS	AIR	109677	17960	10026671-0001	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	1,959,116	1,965,703	6,587	2,189,124	2,202,969	13,845
NGFS	AIR	109677	17960	10026671-0001	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	353,692	352,917	(775)	311,923	311,849	(74)
NGFS	AIR	109677	17960	10026671-0001	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	122,164	122,480	316	136,264	136,930	666
NGFS	AIR	109677	17960	10026671-0001	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	29,201	29,299	98	32,542	32,743	201
NGFS	AIR	109677	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	54,850	54,976	126	62,772	62,841	69
NGFS	AIR	109677	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	12,478	12,519	41	13,904	13,991	87
NGFS	AIR	109677	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	7,660	7,686	26	8,536	8,588	52

**Technical Adjustments for May 1 Departments
FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24**

GFS Type	Dept Grp	Dept ID	Fund	Project-Activity	Authority	Account - Title	FY 2022-23 May 1 Proposed	FY 2022-23 Updated	Variance FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24 May 1 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Updated	Variance FY 2023-24
NGFS	AIR	109677	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	198,406	198,913	507	228,920	229,198	278
NGFS	AIR	109677	17960	10026671-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	16,571	16,614	43	18,603	18,626	23
NGFS	AIR	109677	17960	10026671-0001	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	2,013	2,019	6	2,245	2,259	14
NGFS	AIR	109677	17960	10026671-0001	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	6,593	6,619	26	7,453	7,505	52
NGFS	AIR	109678	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	113,116	113,152	36	121,228	121,248	20
NGFS	AIR	109678	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	471,575	471,719	144	505,169	505,248	79
NGFS	AIR	109678	17960	10026671-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	39,195	39,208	13	40,822	40,828	6
NGFS	AIR	109679	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	147,012	147,247	235	164,468	164,597	129
NGFS	AIR	109679	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	755,191	756,135	944	835,156	835,674	518
NGFS	AIR	109679	17960	10026671-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	60,955	61,035	80	65,666	65,708	42
NGFS	AIR	109681	17960	10026671-0001	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	5,194,503	5,304,533	110,030	5,535,861	5,649,417	113,556
NGFS	AIR	109681	17960	10026671-0001	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	930,702	940,242	9,540	781,184	786,702	5,518
NGFS	AIR	109681	17960	10026671-0001	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	355,006	361,498	6,492	376,018	382,666	6,648
NGFS	AIR	109681	17960	10026671-0001	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	83,634	85,218	1,584	88,580	90,216	1,636
NGFS	AIR	109681	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	79,046	79,177	131	88,600	88,672	72
NGFS	AIR	109681	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	35,727	36,409	682	37,854	38,556	702
NGFS	AIR	109681	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	21,940	22,354	414	23,246	23,678	432
NGFS	AIR	109681	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	650,173	650,703	530	708,602	708,892	290
NGFS	AIR	109681	17960	10026671-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	49,696	49,741	45	52,796	52,821	25
NGFS	AIR	109681	17960	10026671-0001	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	5,773	5,881	108	6,101	6,211	110
NGFS	AIR	109681	17960	10026671-0001	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	20,257	20,689	432	21,582	22,032	450
NGFS	AIR	109683	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	35,926	35,987	61	40,331	40,365	34
NGFS	AIR	109683	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	203,986	204,231	245	225,220	225,355	135
NGFS	AIR	109683	17960	10026671-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	16,281	16,302	21	17,518	17,529	11
NGFS	AIR	109684	17960	10026671-0001	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	2,668,248	2,668,248	-	3,297,771	3,304,050	6,279
NGFS	AIR	109684	17960	10026671-0001	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	478,553	478,553	-	464,813	465,686	873
NGFS	AIR	109684	17960	10026671-0001	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	146,067	146,067	-	184,227	184,616	389
NGFS	AIR	109684	17960	10026671-0001	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	39,041	39,041	-	48,167	48,258	91
NGFS	AIR	109684	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	95,572	95,679	107	115,359	115,418	59
NGFS	AIR	109684	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	16,686	16,686	-	20,579	20,618	39
NGFS	AIR	109684	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	10,242	10,242	-	12,640	12,664	24
NGFS	AIR	109684	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	208,645	209,072	427	265,957	266,191	234
NGFS	AIR	109684	17960	10026671-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	19,714	19,750	36	24,144	24,163	19
NGFS	AIR	109684	17960	10026671-0001	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	2,694	2,694	-	3,322	3,328	6
NGFS	AIR	109684	17960	10026671-0001	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	5,481	5,481	-	7,100	7,122	22
NGFS	AIR	109685	17960	10026671-0001	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	3,685,896	3,706,856	20,960	3,913,390	3,935,020	21,630
NGFS	AIR	109685	17960	10026671-0001	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	669,451	673,261	3,810	561,568	564,678	3,110
NGFS	AIR	109685	17960	10026671-0001	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	243,037	244,337	1,300	257,081	258,421	1,340
NGFS	AIR	109685	17960	10026671-0001	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	57,116	57,426	310	60,418	60,728	310
NGFS	AIR	109685	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	97,242	97,324	82	106,077	106,123	46
NGFS	AIR	109685	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	24,397	24,527	130	25,815	25,955	140

**Technical Adjustments for May 1 Departments
FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24**

GFS Type	Dept Grp	Dept ID	Fund	Project-Activity	Authority	Account - Title	FY 2022-23 May 1 Proposed	FY 2022-23 Updated	Variance FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24 May 1 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Updated	Variance FY 2023-24
NGFS	AIR	109685	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	14,991	15,071	80	15,852	15,932	80
NGFS	AIR	109685	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	465,156	465,487	331	505,190	505,372	182
NGFS	AIR	109685	17960	10026671-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	38,182	38,211	29	40,343	40,358	15
NGFS	AIR	109685	17960	10026671-0001	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	3,934	3,954	20	4,173	4,193	20
NGFS	AIR	109686	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	2,635,508	2,636,513	1,005	2,830,641	2,831,194	553
NGFS	AIR	109686	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	5,294,798	5,298,842	4,044	5,760,527	5,762,746	2,219
NGFS	AIR	109686	17960	10026671-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	505,554	505,897	343	533,005	533,188	183
NGFS	AIR	109687	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	202,569	202,853	284	225,154	225,310	156
NGFS	AIR	109687	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	776,326	777,466	1,140	864,690	865,316	626
NGFS	AIR	109687	17960	10026671-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	65,163	65,259	96	70,574	70,625	51
NGFS	AIR	109689	17960	10026671-0001	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	3,224,851	3,258,594	33,743	3,495,729	3,566,630	70,901
NGFS	AIR	109689	17960	10026671-0001	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	584,147	590,266	6,119	499,991	510,150	10,159
NGFS	AIR	109689	17960	10026671-0001	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	223,014	224,752	1,738	239,678	243,308	3,630
NGFS	AIR	109689	17960	10026671-0001	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	52,427	52,931	504	56,351	57,389	1,038
NGFS	AIR	109689	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	53,262	53,388	126	61,094	61,163	69
NGFS	AIR	109689	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	22,391	22,603	212	24,080	24,531	451
NGFS	AIR	109689	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	13,747	13,878	131	14,792	15,058	266
NGFS	AIR	109689	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	395,011	395,519	508	437,318	437,597	279
NGFS	AIR	109689	17960	10026671-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	29,175	29,218	43	31,580	31,603	23
NGFS	AIR	109689	17960	10026671-0001	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	3,607	3,656	49	3,895	3,951	56
NGFS	AIR	109689	17960	10026671-0001	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	12,571	12,705	134	13,635	13,904	269
NGFS	AIR	109690	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	40,882	40,987	105	47,175	47,232	57
NGFS	AIR	109690	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	235,821	236,241	420	265,346	265,576	230
NGFS	AIR	109690	17960	10026671-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	18,776	18,812	36	20,617	20,635	18
NGFS	AIR	109691	17960	10026671-0001	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	733,566	743,867	10,301	937,259	958,903	21,644
NGFS	AIR	109691	17960	10026671-0001	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	132,829	134,699	1,870	134,129	137,234	3,105
NGFS	AIR	109691	17960	10026671-0001	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	49,318	49,871	553	61,922	63,077	1,155
NGFS	AIR	109691	17960	10026671-0001	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	11,544	11,698	154	14,497	14,814	317
NGFS	AIR	109691	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	9,421	9,557	136	14,974	15,048	74
NGFS	AIR	109691	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	4,930	4,995	65	6,195	6,333	138
NGFS	AIR	109691	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	3,026	3,066	40	3,806	3,887	81
NGFS	AIR	109691	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	93,523	94,070	547	119,181	119,481	300
NGFS	AIR	109691	17960	10026671-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	6,599	6,646	47	8,449	8,474	25
NGFS	AIR	109691	17960	10026671-0001	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	794	809	15	1,003	1,020	17
NGFS	AIR	109691	17960	10026671-0001	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	2,859	2,900	41	3,655	3,737	82
NGFS	AIR	109692	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	74,245	74,389	144	83,976	84,055	79
NGFS	AIR	109692	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	196,027	196,604	577	228,965	229,283	318
NGFS	AIR	109692	17960	10026671-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	17,607	17,656	49	19,882	19,908	26
NGFS	AIR	109693	17960	10026671-0001	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	1,527,772	1,535,194	7,422	1,616,696	1,632,307	15,611
NGFS	AIR	109693	17960	10026671-0001	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	272,252	272,931	679	226,499	228,021	1,522
NGFS	AIR	109693	17960	10026671-0001	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	100,767	100,968	201	105,968	106,381	413

**Technical Adjustments for May 1 Departments
FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24**

GFS Type	Dept Grp	Dept ID	Fund	Project-Activity	Authority	Account - Title	FY 2022-23 May 1 Proposed	FY 2022-23 Updated	Variance FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24 May 1 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Updated	Variance FY 2023-24
NGFS	AIR	109693	17960	10026671-0001	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	24,458	24,568	110	25,749	25,976	227
NGFS	AIR	109693	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	31,345	31,376	31	34,336	34,353	17
NGFS	AIR	109693	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	10,451	10,498	47	11,004	11,101	97
NGFS	AIR	109693	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	6,416	6,445	29	6,758	6,817	59
NGFS	AIR	109693	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	151,045	151,167	122	164,568	164,636	68
NGFS	AIR	109693	17960	10026671-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	12,165	12,175	10	12,897	12,903	6
NGFS	AIR	109693	17960	10026671-0001	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	1,686	1,695	9	1,778	1,793	15
NGFS	AIR	109693	17960	10026671-0001	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	5,147	5,174	27	5,466	5,526	60
NGFS	AIR	109696	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	41,764	41,870	106	48,125	48,183	58
NGFS	AIR	109696	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	73,212	73,634	422	93,095	93,326	231
NGFS	AIR	109696	17960	10026671-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	7,192	7,228	36	8,687	8,706	19
NGFS	AIR	210730	17960	10026671-0001	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	3,849,657	3,849,657	-	4,147,770	4,232,151	84,381
NGFS	AIR	210730	17960	10026671-0001	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	680,631	680,631	-	576,026	587,756	11,730
NGFS	AIR	210730	17960	10026671-0001	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	261,831	261,831	-	280,189	284,817	4,628
NGFS	AIR	210730	17960	10026671-0001	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	61,631	61,631	-	65,938	67,168	1,230
NGFS	AIR	210730	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	51,654	51,786	132	59,571	59,643	72
NGFS	AIR	210730	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	26,326	26,326	-	28,186	28,688	502
NGFS	AIR	210730	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	16,180	16,180	-	17,301	17,624	323
NGFS	AIR	210730	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	437,169	437,698	529	482,818	483,109	291
NGFS	AIR	210730	17960	10026671-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	33,316	33,361	45	35,923	35,947	24
NGFS	AIR	210730	17960	10026671-0001	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	4,253	4,253	-	4,536	4,623	87
NGFS	AIR	210730	17960	10026671-0001	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	15,008	15,008	-	16,175	16,498	323
NGFS	AIR	109701	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	34,578	34,596	18	36,654	36,672	18
NGFS	AIR	109701	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	85,485	85,553	68	90,612	90,685	73
NGFS	AIR	109701	17960	10026671-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	7,895	7,901	6	8,133	8,139	6
NGFS	AIR	109704	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	36,340	36,409	69	38,522	38,595	73
NGFS	AIR	109704	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	101,979	102,257	278	108,094	108,388	294
NGFS	AIR	109704	17960	10026671-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	9,286	9,309	23	9,567	9,591	24
NGFS	AIR	109706	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	251,342	251,425	83	266,435	266,522	87
NGFS	AIR	109706	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	499,419	499,751	332	529,359	529,711	352
NGFS	AIR	109706	17960	10026671-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	47,781	47,809	28	49,220	49,249	29
NGFS	AIR	109707	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	233,612	233,773	161	247,641	247,811	170
NGFS	AIR	109707	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	439,704	440,348	644	466,062	466,745	683
NGFS	AIR	109707	17960	10026671-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	42,507	42,562	55	43,787	43,843	56
NGFS	AIR	109709	17960	10026671-0001	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	1,812,591	1,823,841	11,250	1,874,645	1,898,468	23,823
NGFS	AIR	109709	17960	10026671-0001	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	320,165	322,157	1,992	260,031	263,343	3,312
NGFS	AIR	109709	17960	10026671-0001	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	26,881	27,043	162	27,777	28,122	345
NGFS	AIR	109709	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	48,176	48,207	31	51,066	51,099	33
NGFS	AIR	109709	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	11,485	11,557	72	11,869	12,016	147
NGFS	AIR	109709	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	7,050	7,092	42	7,287	7,377	90
NGFS	AIR	109709	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	128,954	129,081	127	136,693	136,828	135

**Technical Adjustments for May 1 Departments
FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24**

GFS Type	Dept Grp	Dept ID	Fund	Project-Activity	Authority	Account - Title	FY 2022-23 May 1 Proposed	FY 2022-23 Updated	Variance FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24 May 1 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Updated	Variance FY 2023-24
NGFS	AIR	109709	17960	10026671-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	11,671	11,682	11	12,024	12,035	11
NGFS	AIR	109709	17960	10026671-0001	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	1,855	1,867	12	1,918	1,942	24
NGFS	AIR	109709	17960	10026671-0001	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	5,011	5,050	39	5,185	5,269	84
NGFS	AIR	109710	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	122,753	122,814	61	130,124	130,189	65
NGFS	AIR	109710	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	236,559	236,806	247	250,741	251,002	261
NGFS	AIR	109710	17960	10026671-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	22,760	22,781	21	23,445	23,467	22
NGFS	AIR	207658	17960	10026671-0001	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	3,331,554	3,340,929	9,375	3,444,690	3,454,366	9,676
NGFS	AIR	207658	17960	10026671-0001	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	600,240	601,901	1,661	489,446	490,791	1,345
NGFS	AIR	207658	17960	10026671-0001	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	52,797	52,933	136	54,439	54,580	141
NGFS	AIR	207658	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	136,852	136,917	65	145,069	145,139	70
NGFS	AIR	207658	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	22,551	22,609	58	23,261	23,321	60
NGFS	AIR	207658	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	13,847	13,883	36	14,291	14,328	37
NGFS	AIR	207658	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	266,987	267,250	263	282,994	283,272	278
NGFS	AIR	207658	17960	10026671-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	25,614	25,636	22	26,385	26,408	23
NGFS	AIR	207658	17960	10026671-0001	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	3,649	3,659	10	3,745	3,755	10
NGFS	AIR	207658	17960	10026671-0001	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	12,221	12,254	33	12,622	12,656	34
NGFS	AIR	207660	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	67,706	67,753	47	71,769	71,819	50
NGFS	AIR	207660	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	187,081	187,269	188	198,306	198,505	199
NGFS	AIR	207660	17960	10026671-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	16,838	16,854	16	17,339	17,355	16
NGFS	AIR	232505	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	89,868	89,868	-	95,260	95,261	1
NGFS	AIR	109714	17960	10001631-0002	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	287,861	291,963	4,102	297,106	305,750	8,644
NGFS	AIR	109714	17960	10001631-0002	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	51,660	51,744	84	41,984	42,524	540
NGFS	AIR	109714	17960	10001631-0002	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	24,422	24,540	118	24,934	25,182	248
NGFS	AIR	109714	17960	10001631-0002	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	5,794	5,854	60	5,922	6,047	125
NGFS	AIR	109714	17960	10001631-0002	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	2,475	2,501	26	2,530	2,584	54
NGFS	AIR	109714	17960	10001631-0002	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	1,520	1,535	15	1,554	1,588	34
NGFS	AIR	109714	17960	10001631-0002	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	400	404	4	408	416	8
NGFS	AIR	109714	17960	10001631-0002	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	1,008	1,022	14	1,040	1,071	31
NGFS	AIR	207661	17960	10001631-0002	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	720,994	727,861	6,867	751,506	765,972	14,466
NGFS	AIR	207661	17960	10001631-0002	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	127,236	128,461	1,225	103,992	106,022	2,030
NGFS	AIR	207661	17960	10001631-0002	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	30,263	30,365	102	31,585	31,801	216
NGFS	AIR	207661	17960	10001631-0002	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	10,518	10,618	100	10,960	11,171	211
NGFS	AIR	207661	17960	10001631-0002	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	14,297	14,386	89	15,154	15,248	94
NGFS	AIR	207661	17960	10001631-0002	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	4,494	4,537	43	4,682	4,772	90
NGFS	AIR	207661	17960	10001631-0002	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	2,761	2,785	24	2,876	2,931	55
NGFS	AIR	207661	17960	10001631-0002	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	31,656	32,013	357	33,557	33,936	379
NGFS	AIR	207661	17960	10001631-0002	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	2,954	2,984	30	3,044	3,075	31
NGFS	AIR	207661	17960	10001631-0002	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	725	731	6	756	769	13
NGFS	AIR	207661	17960	10001631-0002	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	2,431	2,455	24	2,540	2,591	51
NGFS	AIR	207662	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	(3,115)	(3,071)	44	(3,302)	(3,256)	46
NGFS	AIR	207662	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	(12,525)	(12,351)	174	(13,277)	(13,092)	185

**Technical Adjustments for May 1 Departments
FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24**

GFS Type	Dept Grp	Dept ID	Fund	Project-Activity	Authority	Account - Title	FY 2022-23 May 1 Proposed	FY 2022-23 Updated	Variance FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24 May 1 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Updated	Variance FY 2023-24
NGFS	AIR	207662	17960	10026671-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	(1,063)	(1,048)	15	(1,095)	(1,079)	16
NGFS	AIR	207663	17960	10001631-0002	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	1,399,417	1,413,682	14,265	1,444,362	1,474,539	30,177
NGFS	AIR	207663	17960	10001631-0002	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	249,115	251,641	2,526	202,012	206,208	4,196
NGFS	AIR	207663	17960	10001631-0002	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	29,745	29,951	206	30,803	31,241	438
NGFS	AIR	207663	17960	10001631-0002	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	12,708	12,799	91	13,165	13,351	186
NGFS	AIR	207663	17960	10001631-0002	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	7,804	7,857	53	8,081	8,195	114
NGFS	AIR	207663	17960	10001631-0002	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	2,050	2,065	15	2,123	2,154	31
NGFS	AIR	207663	17960	10001631-0002	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	4,899	4,948	49	5,054	5,161	107
NGFS	AIR	207663	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	(4,717)	(4,651)	66	(5,000)	(4,930)	70
NGFS	AIR	207663	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	(18,967)	(18,703)	264	(20,105)	(19,825)	280
NGFS	AIR	207663	17960	10026671-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	(1,609)	(1,587)	22	(1,658)	(1,634)	24
NGFS	AIR	207664	17960	10001631-0002	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	1,579,622	1,601,756	22,134	1,630,357	1,655,806	25,449
NGFS	AIR	207664	17960	10001631-0002	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	282,376	286,299	3,923	229,247	232,786	3,539
NGFS	AIR	207664	17960	10001631-0002	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	22,938	23,259	321	23,675	24,045	370
NGFS	AIR	207664	17960	10001631-0002	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	9,802	9,939	137	10,116	10,274	158
NGFS	AIR	207664	17960	10001631-0002	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	6,018	6,102	84	6,212	6,308	96
NGFS	AIR	207664	17960	10001631-0002	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	1,581	1,603	22	1,632	1,657	25
NGFS	AIR	207664	17960	10001631-0002	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	4,848	4,926	78	5,003	5,092	89
NGFS	AIR	207664	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	(7,850)	(7,740)	110	(8,321)	(8,205)	116
NGFS	AIR	207664	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	(31,566)	(31,126)	440	(33,460)	(32,994)	466
NGFS	AIR	207664	17960	10026671-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	(2,678)	(2,641)	37	(2,759)	(2,720)	39
NGFS	AIR	207960	18000	10001631-0003	10002	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	3,323,412	3,337,719	14,307	3,450,289	3,480,439	30,150
NGFS	AIR	207960	18000	10001631-0003	10002	513010 - Retire City Misc	594,515	597,050	2,535	484,738	488,931	4,193
NGFS	AIR	207960	18000	10001631-0003	10002	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	52,791	52,997	206	54,614	55,052	438
NGFS	AIR	207960	18000	10001631-0003	10002	515010 - Health Service-City Match	94,879	95,161	282	100,575	100,872	297
NGFS	AIR	207960	18000	10001631-0003	10002	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	22,559	22,650	91	23,337	23,523	186
NGFS	AIR	207960	18000	10001631-0003	10002	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	13,852	13,905	53	14,331	14,445	114
NGFS	AIR	207960	18000	10001631-0003	10002	515710 - Dependent Coverage	191,684	192,814	1,130	203,181	204,379	1,198
NGFS	AIR	207960	18000	10001631-0003	10002	516010 - Dental Coverage	18,317	18,413	96	18,870	18,969	99
NGFS	AIR	207960	18000	10001631-0003	10002	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	3,639	3,654	15	3,768	3,799	31
NGFS	AIR	207960	18000	10001631-0003	10002	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	9,159	9,211	52	9,536	9,643	107
NGFS	AIR	207960	18000	10001631-0003	10002	520100 - Overhead Recovery	(4,828,709)	(4,847,476)	(18,767)	(4,872,749)	(4,909,562)	(36,813)
NGFS	AIR	109718	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	35,240	35,326	86	37,354	37,444	90
NGFS	AIR	109718	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	90,041	90,384	343	95,447	95,810	363
NGFS	AIR	109718	17960	10026671-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	8,175	8,205	30	8,423	8,453	30
NGFS	AIR	210814	17960	10026671-0001	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	731,464	731,464	-	927,517	932,541	5,024
NGFS	AIR	210814	17960	10026671-0001	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	129,946	129,946	-	129,283	129,982	699
NGFS	AIR	210814	17960	10026671-0001	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	11,057	11,057	-	13,897	13,970	73
NGFS	AIR	210814	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	4,723	4,723	-	5,938	5,969	31
NGFS	AIR	210814	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	2,899	2,899	-	3,648	3,667	19
NGFS	AIR	210814	17960	10026671-0001	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	762	762	-	958	963	5

**Technical Adjustments for May 1 Departments
FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24**

GFS Type	Dept Grp	Dept ID	Fund	Project-Activity	Authority	Account - Title	FY 2022-23 May 1 Proposed	FY 2022-23 Updated	Variance FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24 May 1 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Updated	Variance FY 2023-24
NGFS	AIR	210814	17960	10026671-0001	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	1,791	1,791	-	2,451	2,469	18
NGFS	AIR	183647	17960	10026671-0001	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	14,302,891	14,522,581	219,690	14,792,286	15,019,032	226,746
NGFS	AIR	183647	17960	10026671-0001	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	2,535,777	2,574,713	38,936	2,058,135	2,089,671	31,536
NGFS	AIR	183647	17960	10026671-0001	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	224,824	228,012	3,188	231,886	235,184	3,298
NGFS	AIR	183647	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	328,973	329,347	374	348,705	349,101	396
NGFS	AIR	183647	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	96,067	97,427	1,360	99,101	100,505	1,404
NGFS	AIR	183647	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	58,984	59,818	834	60,856	61,712	856
NGFS	AIR	183647	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	909,521	911,023	1,502	964,111	965,704	1,593
NGFS	AIR	183647	17960	10026671-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	81,601	81,728	127	84,068	84,200	132
NGFS	AIR	183647	17960	10026671-0001	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	15,498	15,718	220	15,995	16,215	220
NGFS	AIR	183647	17960	10026671-0001	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	42,282	43,050	768	43,766	44,556	790
NGFS	AIR	183647	17960	10026671-0001	10000	581325 - DT Enterprise Tech Contracts	943,570	943,570	-	1,110,371	1,110,370	(1)
NGFS	AIR	109650	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	81,681	81,705	24	86,582	86,607	25
NGFS	AIR	109650	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	205,989	206,083	94	218,349	218,449	100
NGFS	AIR	109650	17960	10026671-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	18,804	18,812	8	19,372	19,380	8
NGFS	AIR	109651	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	16,601	16,613	12	17,597	17,610	13
NGFS	AIR	109651	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	42,013	42,060	47	44,533	44,584	51
NGFS	AIR	109651	17960	10026671-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	3,850	3,854	4	3,966	3,970	4
NGFS	AIR	109652	17960	10026671-0001	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	2,168,549	2,173,000	4,451	2,239,290	2,248,670	9,380
NGFS	AIR	109652	17960	10026671-0001	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	384,898	385,044	146	312,382	313,024	642
NGFS	AIR	109652	17960	10026671-0001	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	125,263	125,381	118	129,212	129,460	248
NGFS	AIR	109652	17960	10026671-0001	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	31,559	31,624	65	32,585	32,721	136
NGFS	AIR	109652	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	13,486	13,514	28	13,922	13,980	58
NGFS	AIR	109652	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	8,280	8,297	17	8,552	8,588	36
NGFS	AIR	109652	17960	10026671-0001	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	2,176	2,181	5	2,248	2,257	9
NGFS	AIR	109652	17960	10026671-0001	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	6,861	6,875	14	7,090	7,123	33
NGFS	AIR	183644	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	50,696	50,816	120	53,739	53,866	127
NGFS	AIR	183644	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	110,097	110,579	482	116,701	117,212	511
NGFS	AIR	183644	17960	10026671-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	10,373	10,415	42	10,685	10,728	43
NGFS	AIR	228932	17960	10026671-0001	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	5,588,160	5,722,452	134,292	5,795,799	5,934,419	138,620
NGFS	AIR	228932	17960	10026671-0001	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	1,000,639	1,024,679	24,040	815,707	835,227	19,520
NGFS	AIR	228932	17960	10026671-0001	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	395,742	403,778	8,036	407,521	415,501	7,980
NGFS	AIR	228932	17960	10026671-0001	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	97,503	99,455	1,952	100,479	102,487	2,008
NGFS	AIR	228932	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	219,611	220,000	389	232,777	233,189	412
NGFS	AIR	228932	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	41,661	42,497	836	42,933	43,785	852
NGFS	AIR	228932	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	25,590	26,098	508	26,357	26,885	528
NGFS	AIR	228932	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	406,444	408,008	1,564	430,818	432,475	1,657
NGFS	AIR	228932	17960	10026671-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	39,995	40,128	133	41,201	41,338	137
NGFS	AIR	228932	17960	10026671-0001	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	6,720	6,864	144	6,930	7,062	132
NGFS	AIR	228932	17960	10026671-0001	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	17,294	17,822	528	17,966	18,506	540
NGFS	AIR	109659	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	26,682	26,718	36	28,283	28,320	37

**Technical Adjustments for May 1 Departments
FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24**

GFS Type	Dept Grp	Dept ID	Fund	Project-Activity	Authority	Account - Title	FY 2022-23 May 1 Proposed	FY 2022-23 Updated	Variance FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24 May 1 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Updated	Variance FY 2023-24
NGFS	AIR	109659	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	73,722	73,865	143	78,143	78,295	152
NGFS	AIR	109659	17960	10026671-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	6,795	6,807	12	7,001	7,013	12
NGFS	AIR	183645	17960	10026671-0001	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	970,083	974,207	4,124	1,002,878	1,007,135	4,257
NGFS	AIR	183645	17960	10026671-0001	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	175,540	176,291	751	143,328	143,941	613
NGFS	AIR	183645	17960	10026671-0001	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	58,998	59,253	255	60,968	61,232	264
NGFS	AIR	183645	17960	10026671-0001	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	14,074	14,134	60	14,549	14,611	62
NGFS	AIR	183645	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	47,094	47,110	16	49,921	49,938	17
NGFS	AIR	183645	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	6,013	6,039	26	6,218	6,244	26
NGFS	AIR	183645	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	3,693	3,708	15	3,817	3,833	16
NGFS	AIR	183645	17960	10026671-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	101,333	101,396	63	107,410	107,477	67
NGFS	AIR	183645	17960	10026671-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	9,538	9,544	6	9,826	9,831	5
NGFS	AIR	183645	17960	10026671-0001	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	971	975	4	1,006	1,011	5
NGFS	AIR	183645	17960	10026671-0001	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	3,036	3,053	17	3,142	3,158	16
NGFS	CSS	229264	11300	10001654-0001	10000	501000 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Budget	19	-	(19)	19	-	(19)
NGFS	CSS	229264	11300	10001654-0001	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	865,449	874,421	8,972	892,943	905,522	12,579
NGFS	CSS	229264	11300	10001654-0001	10000	513000 - Retirement - Budget	21,474	-	(21,474)	21,474	-	(21,474)
NGFS	CSS	229264	11300	10001654-0001	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	156,354	157,953	1,599	127,210	128,985	1,775
NGFS	CSS	229264	11300	10001654-0001	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	50,331	50,863	532	51,917	52,646	729
NGFS	CSS	229264	11300	10001654-0001	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	12,548	12,678	130	12,948	13,130	182
NGFS	CSS	229264	11300	10001654-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	36,887	36,885	(2)	39,100	39,098	(2)
NGFS	CSS	229264	11300	10001654-0001	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	5,363	5,419	56	5,534	5,611	77
NGFS	CSS	229264	11300	10001654-0001	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	3,292	3,326	34	3,397	3,445	48
NGFS	CSS	229264	11300	10001654-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	78,071	78,063	(8)	82,753	82,745	(8)
NGFS	CSS	229264	11300	10001654-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	7,384	7,383	(1)	7,607	7,606	(1)
NGFS	CSS	229264	11300	10001654-0001	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	865	875	10	893	905	12
NGFS	CSS	229264	11300	10001654-0001	10000	519010 - Fringe Adjustments-Budget	779	778	(1)	(516)	(516)	-
NGFS	CSS	229264	11300	10001654-0001	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	2,823	2,857	34	2,912	2,960	48
NGFS	CSS	229264	11300	10001654-0002	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	6,019,748	6,022,423	2,675	6,269,193	6,267,518	(1,675)
NGFS	CSS	229264	11300	10001654-0002	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	1,087,175	1,087,662	487	893,448	893,208	(240)
NGFS	CSS	229264	11300	10001654-0002	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	346,469	346,635	166	360,743	360,639	(104)
NGFS	CSS	229264	11300	10001654-0002	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	88,428	88,466	38	92,032	92,007	(25)
NGFS	CSS	229264	11300	10001654-0002	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	283,629	284,296	667	300,663	301,158	495
NGFS	CSS	229264	11300	10001654-0002	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	37,768	37,785	17	39,327	39,318	(9)
NGFS	CSS	229264	11300	10001654-0002	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	23,213	23,223	10	24,176	24,169	(7)
NGFS	CSS	229264	11300	10001654-0002	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	504,215	506,896	2,681	534,438	536,427	1,989
NGFS	CSS	229264	11300	10001654-0002	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	49,344	49,572	228	50,831	50,995	164
NGFS	CSS	229264	11300	10001654-0002	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	6,115	6,116	1	6,351	6,349	(2)
NGFS	CSS	229264	11300	10001654-0002	10000	581120 - GF-Con-Financial Systems	10,378	10,697	319	10,581	11,127	546
NGFS	CSS	229264	11300	10001654-0002	10000	581130 - GF-Con-Internal Audits	26,815	26,815	-	27,240	27,239	(1)
NGFS	CSS	229264	11300	10001654-0002	10000	581245 - GF-CON-Information System C	29,075	28,689	(386)	29,280	28,871	(409)
NGFS	CSS	229264	11300	10001654-0002	10000	581360 - DT Telecommunications Servic	16,184	16,184	-	16,184	16,417	233

**Technical Adjustments for May 1 Departments
FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24**

GFS Type	Dept Grp	Dept ID	Fund	Project-Activity	Authority	Account - Title	FY 2022-23 May 1 Proposed	FY 2022-23 Updated	Variance FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24 May 1 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Updated	Variance FY 2023-24
NGFS	CSS	229264	11300	10001654-0003	10000	581210 - DT Technology Infrastructure	149,194	152,337	3,143	162,656	167,676	5,020
NGFS	CSS	229264	11300	10001654-0004	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	14,280	14,295	15	15,137	15,154	17
NGFS	CSS	229264	11300	10001654-0004	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	25,773	25,835	62	27,318	27,384	66
NGFS	CSS	229264	11300	10001654-0004	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	2,514	2,520	6	2,590	2,595	5
NGFS	DBI	109735	10190	10001657-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	43,368	43,558	190	45,966	46,167	201
NGFS	DBI	109735	10190	10001657-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	133,027	133,790	763	141,010	141,818	808
NGFS	DBI	109735	10190	10001657-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	11,870	11,935	65	12,220	12,287	67
NGFS	DBI	109735	10190	10001657-0001	10000	519010 - Fringe Adjustments-Budget	0	(1)	(1)	-	-	-
NGFS	DBI	109737	10190	10001656-0001	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	3,075,553	3,106,195	30,642	3,184,676	3,249,081	64,405
NGFS	DBI	109737	10190	10001656-0001	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	542,612	548,041	5,429	441,174	450,129	8,955
NGFS	DBI	109737	10190	10001656-0001	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	191,367	191,399	32	197,448	197,448	-
NGFS	DBI	109737	10190	10001656-0001	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	46,099	46,552	453	47,690	48,623	933
NGFS	DBI	109737	10190	10001656-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	53,649	53,746	97	56,872	56,975	103
NGFS	DBI	109737	10190	10001656-0001	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	19,702	19,893	191	20,383	20,774	391
NGFS	DBI	109737	10190	10001656-0001	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	12,095	12,217	122	12,521	12,759	238
NGFS	DBI	109737	10190	10001656-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	340,691	341,081	390	361,118	361,531	413
NGFS	DBI	109737	10190	10001656-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	25,619	25,652	33	26,383	26,417	34
NGFS	DBI	109737	10190	10001656-0001	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	3,176	3,218	42	3,292	3,356	64
NGFS	DBI	109737	10190	10001656-0001	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	11,999	12,110	111	12,416	12,674	258
NGFS	DBI	207948	10190	10001656-0001	10000	461115 - Building Permits	10,650,000	10,821,381	171,381	10,650,000	11,071,687	421,687
NGFS	DBI	207948	10190	10001656-0001	10000	581120 - GF-Con-Financial Systems	3,239	3,339	100	3,303	3,473	170
NGFS	DBI	207948	10190	10001656-0001	10000	581130 - GF-Con-Internal Audits	53,943	54,043	100	49,510	49,754	244
NGFS	DBI	207948	10190	10001656-0001	10000	581140 - DT Technology Projects	-	49,129	49,129	-	50,550	50,550
NGFS	DBI	207948	10190	10001656-0001	10000	581210 - DT Technology Infrastructure	412,234	408,944	(3,290)	444,008	442,957	(1,051)
NGFS	DBI	207948	10190	10001656-0001	10000	581280 - DT SFGov TV Services	-	57,982	57,982	-	53,499	53,499
NGFS	DBI	207948	10190	10001656-0001	10000	581325 - DT Enterprise Tech Contracts	63,661	63,662	1	75,478	75,478	-
NGFS	DBI	207948	10190	10001656-0001	10000	581360 - DT Telecommunications Serv	69,032	69,032	-	69,032	69,577	545
NGFS	DBI	229322	10190	10001656-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	54,514	54,631	117	57,774	57,899	125
NGFS	DBI	229322	10190	10001656-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	395,918	396,390	472	419,669	420,169	500
NGFS	DBI	229322	10190	10001656-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	30,555	30,595	40	31,477	31,518	41
NGFS	DBI	229323	10190	10001656-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	135,874	136,148	274	144,007	144,298	291
NGFS	DBI	229323	10190	10001656-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	512,280	513,382	1,102	543,026	544,194	1,168
NGFS	DBI	229323	10190	10001656-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	44,416	44,510	94	45,725	45,821	96
NGFS	DBI	229323	10190	10001656-0001	10000	519010 - Fringe Adjustments-Budget	-	(344)	(344)	-	(843)	(843)
NGFS	DBI	229331	10190	10001657-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	130,562	130,727	165	138,395	138,570	175
NGFS	DBI	229331	10190	10001657-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	322,216	322,881	665	341,556	342,260	704
NGFS	DBI	229331	10190	10001657-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	29,441	29,497	56	30,330	30,388	58
NGFS	DBI	229314	10190	10001655-0001	10000	501000 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Budget	(1,960)	-	1,960	(1,960)	-	1,960
NGFS	DBI	229314	10190	10001655-0001	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	1,357,480	1,391,265	33,785	1,410,440	1,455,496	45,056
NGFS	DBI	229314	10190	10001655-0001	10000	513000 - Retirement - Budget	138,274	-	(138,274)	138,274	-	(138,274)
NGFS	DBI	229314	10190	10001655-0001	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	241,622	247,626	6,004	197,870	204,184	6,314

**Technical Adjustments for May 1 Departments
FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24**

GFS Type	Dept Grp	Dept ID	Fund	Project-Activity	Authority	Account - Title	FY 2022-23 May 1 Proposed	FY 2022-23 Updated	Variance FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24 May 1 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Updated	Variance FY 2023-24
NGFS	DBI	229314	10190	10001655-0001	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	76,336	76,545	209	79,262	79,854	592
NGFS	DBI	229314	10190	10001655-0001	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	19,707	20,195	488	20,474	21,127	653
NGFS	DBI	229314	10190	10001655-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	53,009	53,100	91	56,190	56,287	97
NGFS	DBI	229314	10190	10001655-0001	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	8,421	8,630	209	8,750	9,029	279
NGFS	DBI	229314	10190	10001655-0001	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	5,169	5,298	129	5,373	5,544	171
NGFS	DBI	229314	10190	10001655-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	116,306	116,673	367	123,283	123,671	388
NGFS	DBI	229314	10190	10001655-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	10,929	10,960	31	11,259	11,291	32
NGFS	DBI	229314	10190	10001655-0001	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	1,358	1,392	34	1,411	1,455	44
NGFS	DBI	229314	10190	10001655-0001	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	3,434	3,551	117	3,580	3,739	159
NGFS	DBI	229315	10190	10001655-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	79,048	79,147	99	83,795	83,900	105
NGFS	DBI	229315	10190	10001655-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	145,212	145,608	396	153,917	154,337	420
NGFS	DBI	229315	10190	10001655-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	14,137	14,170	33	14,562	14,597	35
NGFS	DBI	229316	10190	10001655-0001	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	473,856	480,977	7,121	490,303	497,654	7,351
NGFS	DBI	229316	10190	10001655-0001	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	84,373	85,635	1,262	68,746	69,768	1,022
NGFS	DBI	229316	10190	10001655-0001	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	27,407	27,824	417	28,338	28,743	405
NGFS	DBI	229316	10190	10001655-0001	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	6,876	6,980	104	7,115	7,221	106
NGFS	DBI	229316	10190	10001655-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	18,387	18,396	9	19,489	19,499	10
NGFS	DBI	229316	10190	10001655-0001	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	2,937	2,982	45	3,040	3,085	45
NGFS	DBI	229316	10190	10001655-0001	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	1,804	1,831	27	1,866	1,894	28
NGFS	DBI	229316	10190	10001655-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	38,704	38,742	38	41,025	41,066	41
NGFS	DBI	229316	10190	10001655-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	3,713	3,717	4	3,825	3,829	4
NGFS	DBI	229316	10190	10001655-0001	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	474	482	8	491	498	7
NGFS	DBI	229316	10190	10001655-0001	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	1,140	1,168	28	1,182	1,211	29
NGFS	DBI	229320	10190	10001655-0001	10000	506070 - Programmatic Projects-Budget	400,000	-	(400,000)	-	-	-
NGFS	DBI	229320	10190	10001655-0001	10000	527000 - Prof & Specialized Svcs-Bdgt	0	400,000	400,000	-	-	-
NGFS	DBI	229320	10190	10001655-0001	10000	581120 - GF-Con-Financial Systems	63,618	65,575	1,957	64,864	68,211	3,347
NGFS	DBI	229320	10190	10001655-0001	10000	581130 - GF-Con-Internal Audits	91,965	92,135	170	84,406	84,823	417
NGFS	DBI	229320	10190	10001655-0001	10000	581140 - DT Technology Projects	185,677	121,558	(64,119)	185,677	125,073	(60,604)
NGFS	DBI	229320	10190	10001655-0001	10000	581210 - DT Technology Infrastructure	155,466	275,947	120,481	167,449	298,898	131,449
NGFS	DBI	229320	10190	10001655-0001	10000	581245 - GF-CON-Information System C	193,831	191,258	(2,573)	195,201	192,476	(2,725)
NGFS	DBI	229320	10190	10001655-0001	10000	581280 - DT SFGov TV Services	-	24,649	24,649	-	22,743	22,743
NGFS	DBI	229320	10190	10001655-0001	10000	581360 - DT Telecommunications Servic	11,627	11,627	-	11,627	11,719	92
NGFS	DBI	229321	10190	10001655-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	9,472	9,480	8	10,040	10,049	9
NGFS	DBI	229321	10190	10001655-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	17,126	17,160	34	18,153	18,189	36
NGFS	DBI	229321	10190	10001655-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	1,688	1,691	3	1,739	1,742	3
NGFS	DBI	229330	10190	10001655-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	28,170	28,203	33	29,860	29,895	35
NGFS	DBI	229330	10190	10001655-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	70,404	70,534	130	74,628	74,765	137
NGFS	DBI	229330	10190	10001655-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	6,523	6,534	11	6,720	6,731	11
NGFS	DBI	229330	10190	10001655-0001	10000	581280 - DT SFGov TV Services	87,703	-	(87,703)	36,966	-	(36,966)
NGFS	DBI	229346	10190	10001655-0001	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	3,031,615	3,078,393	46,778	3,137,403	3,192,626	55,223
NGFS	DBI	229346	10190	10001655-0001	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	535,115	542,106	6,991	435,291	441,630	6,339

**Technical Adjustments for May 1 Departments
FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24**

GFS Type	Dept Grp	Dept ID	Fund	Project-Activity	Authority	Account - Title	FY 2022-23 May 1 Proposed	FY 2022-23 Updated	Variance FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24 May 1 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Updated	Variance FY 2023-24
NGFS	DBI	229346	10190	10001655-0001	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	164,396	164,792	396	169,863	170,703	840
NGFS	DBI	229346	10190	10001655-0001	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	44,358	45,036	678	45,890	46,692	802
NGFS	DBI	229346	10190	10001655-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	79,474	79,533	59	84,241	84,303	62
NGFS	DBI	229346	10190	10001655-0001	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	18,951	19,241	290	19,612	19,954	342
NGFS	DBI	229346	10190	10001655-0001	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	11,637	11,816	179	12,042	12,251	209
NGFS	DBI	229346	10190	10001655-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	210,863	211,100	237	223,521	223,772	251
NGFS	DBI	229346	10190	10001655-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	19,018	19,038	20	19,593	19,614	21
NGFS	DBI	229346	10190	10001655-0001	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	3,061	3,107	46	3,165	3,219	54
NGFS	DBI	229346	10190	10001655-0001	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	10,546	10,711	165	10,921	11,112	191
NGFS	DBI	207676	10190	10001658-0001	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	1,658,087	1,671,943	13,856	1,714,824	1,744,136	29,312
NGFS	DBI	207676	10190	10001658-0001	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	294,400	296,854	2,454	239,270	243,346	4,076
NGFS	DBI	207676	10190	10001658-0001	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	24,388	24,588	200	25,212	25,637	425
NGFS	DBI	207676	10190	10001658-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	49,134	49,169	35	52,079	52,116	37
NGFS	DBI	207676	10190	10001658-0001	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	10,419	10,507	88	10,774	10,955	181
NGFS	DBI	207676	10190	10001658-0001	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	6,401	6,452	51	6,618	6,729	111
NGFS	DBI	207676	10190	10001658-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	146,898	147,037	139	155,714	155,861	147
NGFS	DBI	207676	10190	10001658-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	13,075	13,087	12	13,465	13,477	12
NGFS	DBI	207676	10190	10001658-0001	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	1,680	1,694	14	1,740	1,769	29
NGFS	DBI	207676	10190	10001658-0001	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	6,206	6,254	48	6,415	6,518	103
NGFS	DBI	207949	10190	10001658-0001	10000	581120 - GF-Con-Financial Systems	2,331	2,403	72	2,377	2,500	123
NGFS	DBI	207949	10190	10001658-0001	10000	581130 - GF-Con-Internal Audits	40,146	40,220	74	36,847	37,029	182
NGFS	DBI	207949	10190	10001658-0001	10000	581140 - DT Technology Projects	-	9,772	9,772	-	10,054	10,054
NGFS	DBI	207949	10190	10001658-0001	10000	581210 - DT Technology Infrastructure	278,167	154,225	(123,942)	299,607	167,052	(132,555)
NGFS	DBI	207949	10190	10001658-0001	10000	581280 - DT SFGov TV Services	-	41,718	41,718	-	38,492	38,492
NGFS	DBI	207949	10190	10001658-0001	10000	581360 - DT Telecommunications Serv	49,796	49,796	-	49,796	50,190	394
NGFS	DBI	229332	10190	10001658-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	50,055	50,215	160	53,061	53,231	170
NGFS	DBI	229332	10190	10001658-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	74,682	75,326	644	79,157	79,839	682
NGFS	DBI	229332	10190	10001658-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	7,647	7,701	54	7,877	7,933	56
NGFS	DBI	229333	10190	10001658-0001	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	8,521,893	8,616,955	95,062	8,837,661	9,038,370	200,709
NGFS	DBI	229333	10190	10001658-0001	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	1,507,828	1,524,671	16,843	1,229,461	1,257,377	27,916
NGFS	DBI	229333	10190	10001658-0001	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	477,268	477,388	120	493,722	493,975	253
NGFS	DBI	229333	10190	10001658-0001	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	126,576	127,951	1,375	131,149	134,066	2,917
NGFS	DBI	229333	10190	10001658-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	255,633	256,060	427	270,966	271,419	453
NGFS	DBI	229333	10190	10001658-0001	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	54,027	54,624	597	55,983	57,222	1,239
NGFS	DBI	229333	10190	10001658-0001	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	33,183	33,525	342	34,377	35,139	762
NGFS	DBI	229333	10190	10001658-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	644,226	645,943	1,717	682,882	684,703	1,821
NGFS	DBI	229333	10190	10001658-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	58,882	59,028	146	60,650	60,800	150
NGFS	DBI	229333	10190	10001658-0001	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	8,727	8,817	90	9,048	9,243	195
NGFS	DBI	229333	10190	10001658-0001	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	29,500	29,830	330	30,619	31,321	702
NGFS	ENV	229994	12200	10026725-0001	10000	501000 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Budget	(1,817)	-	1,817	(1,817)	-	1,817
NGFS	ENV	229994	12200	10026725-0001	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	1,734,887	1,737,348	2,461	1,762,142	1,764,654	2,512

**Technical Adjustments for May 1 Departments
FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24**

GFS Type	Dept Grp	Dept ID	Fund	Project-Activity	Authority	Account - Title	FY 2022-23 May 1 Proposed	FY 2022-23 Updated	Variance FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24 May 1 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Updated	Variance FY 2023-24
NGFS	ENV	229994	12200	10026725-0001	10000	513000 - Retirement - Budget	5,313	-	(5,313)	5,313	-	(5,313)
NGFS	ENV	229994	12200	10026725-0001	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	312,062	312,510	448	248,359	248,720	361
NGFS	ENV	229994	12200	10026725-0001	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	116,304	116,457	153	118,197	118,353	156
NGFS	ENV	229994	12200	10026725-0001	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	28,177	28,213	36	28,662	28,699	37
NGFS	ENV	229994	12200	10026725-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	66,100	66,356	256	68,773	69,063	290
NGFS	ENV	229994	12200	10026725-0001	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	12,028	12,043	15	12,232	12,248	16
NGFS	ENV	229994	12200	10026725-0001	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	7,382	7,391	9	7,511	7,521	10
NGFS	ENV	229994	12200	10026725-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	148,100	149,126	1,026	151,767	152,934	1,167
NGFS	ENV	229994	12200	10026725-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	13,808	13,895	87	13,803	13,899	96
NGFS	ENV	229994	12200	10026725-0001	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	1,940	1,942	2	1,982	1,985	3
NGFS	ENV	229994	12200	10026725-0001	10000	519010 - Fringe Adjustments-Budget	11,325	11,324	(1)	1	-	(1)
NGFS	ENV	229994	12200	10026725-0001	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	5,354	5,364	10	5,414	5,424	10
NGFS	ENV	229994	12200	10026725-0001	10000	549990 - Other Materials & Supplies	3,692	2,202	(1,490)	3,692	1,326	(2,366)
NGFS	ENV	229994	12200	10026725-0001	10000	581130 - GF-Con-Internal Audits	17,217	17,027	(190)	13,484	13,540	56
NGFS	ENV	229994	12200	10026725-0001	10000	581210 - DT Technology Infrastructure	63,785	64,269	484	69,230	70,343	1,113
NGFS	ENV	229994	12200	10026725-0001	10000	581280 - DT SFGov TV Services	11,366	11,366	0	7,725	7,725	0
NGFS	ENV	229994	12200	10026725-0001	10000	581325 - DT Enterprise Tech Contracts	13,391	13,391	(0)	16,949	16,949	0
NGFS	ENV	229994	12200	10026725-0001	10000	581360 - DT Telecommunications Serv	9,256	9,256	-	9,256	9,348	92
NGFS	ENV	229994	12200	10026725-0017	10000	520190 - Department Overhead	35,949	36,139	190	35,949	35,893	(56)
NGFS	ENV	229994	12210	10035718-0001	10000	581069 - Sr-DPW-Street Use & Mapping	279,449	-	(279,449)	279,449	-	(279,449)
NGFS	ENV	229994	12210	10035718-0001	22131	520190 - Department Overhead	-	248,539	248,539	-	248,539	248,539
NGFS	ENV	229994	12210	10035718-0001	22131	527990 - Other Professional Services	339,650	27,023	(312,627)	356,537	43,910	(312,627)
NGFS	ENV	229994	12210	10035718-0001	22131	549990 - Other Materials & Supplies	-	8,200	8,200	-	8,200	8,200
NGFS	ENV	229994	12210	10035718-0001	22131	581069 - Sr-DPW-Street Use & Mapping	-	279,449	279,449	-	279,449	279,449
NGFS	ENV	229994	12210	10035718-0001	22131	581930 - GF-Sheriff	-	55,888	55,888	-	55,888	55,888
NGFS	ENV	229994	12230	10016297-0001	10001	519010 - Fringe Adjustments-Budget	(1)	-	1	-	-	-
NGFS	ENV	229994	12230	10034581-0001	10001	519010 - Fringe Adjustments-Budget	1	-	(1)	-	-	-
NGFS	ENV	229994	12230	10037412-0001	10001	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	14,227	-	(14,227)	14,684	-	(14,684)
NGFS	ENV	229994	12230	10037412-0001	10001	513010 - Retire City Misc	2,934	-	(2,934)	2,326	-	(2,326)
NGFS	ENV	229994	12230	10037412-0001	10001	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	882	-	(882)	910	-	(910)
NGFS	ENV	229994	12230	10037412-0001	10001	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	206	-	(206)	213	-	(213)
NGFS	ENV	229994	12230	10037412-0001	10001	515010 - Health Service-City Match	1,334	-	(1,334)	1,414	-	(1,414)
NGFS	ENV	229994	12230	10037412-0001	10001	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	88	-	(88)	91	-	(91)
NGFS	ENV	229994	12230	10037412-0001	10001	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	54	-	(54)	56	-	(56)
NGFS	ENV	229994	12230	10037412-0001	10001	515710 - Dependent Coverage	2,619	-	(2,619)	2,777	-	(2,777)
NGFS	ENV	229994	12230	10037412-0001	10001	516010 - Dental Coverage	251	-	(251)	258	-	(258)
NGFS	ENV	229994	12230	10037412-0001	10001	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	14	-	(14)	15	-	(15)
NGFS	ENV	229994	12230	10037412-0001	10001	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	55	-	(55)	57	-	(57)
NGFS	ENV	229994	12230	10038724-0001	10001	448999 - Other State Grants & Subventr	238,201	215,537	(22,664)	238,259	215,458	(22,801)
NGFS	ENV	229994	13990	10026725-0001	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	4,539,410	4,538,014	(1,396)	4,624,192	4,621,528	(2,664)
NGFS	ENV	229994	13990	10026725-0001	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	820,633	820,379	(254)	656,314	655,931	(383)

**Technical Adjustments for May 1 Departments
FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24**

GFS Type	Dept Grp	Dept ID	Fund	Project-Activity	Authority	Account - Title	FY 2022-23 May 1 Proposed	FY 2022-23 Updated	Variance FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24 May 1 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Updated	Variance FY 2023-24
NGFS	ENV	229994	13990	10026725-0001	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	283,119	283,032	(87)	288,254	288,089	(165)
NGFS	ENV	229994	13990	10026725-0001	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	68,698	68,678	(20)	70,017	69,978	(39)
NGFS	ENV	229994	13990	10026725-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	174,693	174,837	144	182,930	183,076	146
NGFS	ENV	229994	13990	10026725-0001	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	29,341	29,332	(9)	29,904	29,887	(17)
NGFS	ENV	229994	13990	10026725-0001	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	18,015	18,010	(5)	18,366	18,356	(10)
NGFS	ENV	229994	13990	10026725-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	427,202	427,778	576	443,814	444,402	588
NGFS	ENV	229994	13990	10026725-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	39,169	39,217	48	39,606	39,654	48
NGFS	ENV	229994	13990	10026725-0001	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	4,740	4,739	(1)	4,825	4,822	(3)
NGFS	ENV	229994	13990	10026725-0001	10000	519010 - Fringe Adjustments-Budget	(3,614)	(3,613)	1	-	1	1
NGFS	ENV	229994	13990	10026725-0001	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	14,600	14,595	(5)	14,833	14,823	(10)
NGFS	ENV	229994	13990	10026725-0001	10000	581130 - GF-Con-Internal Audits	35,827	35,431	(396)	28,058	28,176	118
NGFS	ENV	229994	13990	10026725-0001	10000	581210 - DT Technology Infrastructure	132,729	133,737	1,008	144,059	146,376	2,317
NGFS	ENV	229994	13990	10026725-0001	10000	581280 - DT SFGov TV Services	23,651	23,651	(0)	16,074	16,074	(0)
NGFS	ENV	229994	13990	10026725-0001	10000	581325 - DT Enterprise Tech Contracts	27,865	27,865	(0)	35,267	35,267	-
NGFS	ENV	229994	13990	10026725-0001	10000	581360 - DT Telecommunications Servic	19,261	19,261	-	19,261	19,452	191
NGFS	ENV	229994	13990	10026725-0010	10000	527990 - Other Professional Services	469,400	469,796	396	481,196	481,078	(118)
NGFS	ENV	229994	14000	10016233-0001	15740	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	1,098,718	1,097,117	(1,601)	1,139,150	1,137,381	(1,769)
NGFS	ENV	229994	14000	10016233-0001	15740	513010 - Retire City Misc	199,827	199,535	(292)	162,629	162,375	(254)
NGFS	ENV	229994	14000	10016233-0001	15740	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	75,610	75,510	(100)	78,042	77,932	(110)
NGFS	ENV	229994	14000	10016233-0001	15740	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	17,807	17,783	(24)	18,392	18,366	(26)
NGFS	ENV	229994	14000	10016233-0001	15740	515010 - Health Service-City Match	48,239	48,406	167	50,769	50,946	177
NGFS	ENV	229994	14000	10016233-0001	15740	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	7,610	7,600	(10)	7,858	7,848	(10)
NGFS	ENV	229994	14000	10016233-0001	15740	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	4,674	4,668	(6)	4,827	4,821	(6)
NGFS	ENV	229994	14000	10016233-0001	15740	515710 - Dependent Coverage	106,398	107,076	678	111,313	112,032	719
NGFS	ENV	229994	14000	10016233-0001	15740	516010 - Dental Coverage	9,935	9,993	58	10,113	10,170	57
NGFS	ENV	229994	14000	10016233-0001	15740	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	1,232	1,230	(2)	1,264	1,262	(2)
NGFS	ENV	229994	14000	10016233-0001	15740	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	3,672	3,666	(6)	3,808	3,802	(6)
NGFS	ENV	229994	14000	10016233-0001	15740	527990 - Other Professional Services	945,000	946,138	1,138	945,000	946,230	1,230
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10001714-0031	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	266,735	266,914	179	282,753	282,942	189
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10001714-0031	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	497,546	498,264	718	527,408	528,169	761
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10001714-0031	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	48,166	48,227	61	49,598	49,661	63
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10001717-0002	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	99,015	99,064	49	104,960	105,013	53
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10001717-0002	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	187,137	187,338	201	198,366	198,578	212
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10001717-0002	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	18,062	18,079	17	18,600	18,618	18
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10001718-0005	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	297,389	297,446	57	315,247	315,308	61
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10001718-0005	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	580,089	580,321	232	614,875	615,122	247
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10001718-0005	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	55,620	55,640	20	57,288	57,309	21
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026751-0001	10000	492001 - CTI Fr 1G-General Fund	98,930,000	98,960,000	30,000	106,350,000	106,460,000	110,000
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026751-0001	10000	499999 - Beg Fund Balance - Budget Or	10,420,521	10,762,178	341,657	-	-	-
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026751-0001	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	5,418,076	5,477,166	59,090	5,631,545	5,699,986	68,441
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026751-0001	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	967,368	977,909	10,541	791,295	800,899	9,604

**Technical Adjustments for May 1 Departments
FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24**

GFS Type	Dept Grp	Dept ID	Fund	Project-Activity	Authority	Account - Title	FY 2022-23 May 1 Proposed	FY 2022-23 Updated	Variance FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24 May 1 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Updated	Variance FY 2023-24
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026751-0001	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	311,838	315,213	3,375	323,743	327,277	3,534
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026751-0001	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	80,083	80,942	859	83,173	84,163	990
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026751-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	191,128	191,299	171	203,567	203,749	182
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026751-0001	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	34,217	34,587	370	35,545	35,965	420
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026751-0001	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	21,008	21,232	224	21,824	22,084	260
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026751-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	420,798	421,487	689	448,739	449,470	731
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026751-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	39,726	39,784	58	41,159	41,219	60
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026751-0001	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	5,519	5,583	64	5,736	5,801	65
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026751-0001	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	13,553	13,783	230	14,130	14,394	264
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026751-0001	10000	581130 - GF-Con-Internal Audits	370,784	371,434	650	364,931	365,256	325
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026751-0001	10000	581245 - GF-CON-Information System C	300,438	296,451	(3,987)	302,562	298,339	(4,223)
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026751-0001	10000	581870 - GF-City Hall Fellows Program	0	230,000	230,000	-	-	-
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026751-0001	10000	598040 - Designated For General Reser	-	-	-	3,897,111	3,802,726	(94,385)
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026751-0005	10000	530410 - Base Rent-Debt Svc-Bldg-Stru	1,723,784	1,690,474	(33,310)	1,723,784	1,692,034	(31,750)
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026752-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	1,065,847	1,066,475	628	1,129,846	1,130,512	666
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026752-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	2,009,441	2,011,970	2,529	2,130,155	2,132,835	2,680
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026752-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	194,115	194,329	214	199,832	200,053	221
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026753-0001	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	10,992,167	10,998,286	6,119	11,425,173	11,431,488	6,315
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026753-0001	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	2,001,961	2,002,423	462	1,642,657	1,642,893	236
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026753-0001	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	700,230	700,609	379	727,616	728,007	391
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026753-0001	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	165,382	165,470	88	171,859	171,950	91
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026753-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	611,198	611,468	270	651,530	651,816	286
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026753-0001	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	70,643	70,681	38	73,418	73,457	39
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026753-0001	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	43,424	43,447	23	45,112	45,136	24
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026753-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	1,354,274	1,355,359	1,085	1,442,634	1,443,784	1,150
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026753-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	125,935	126,027	92	130,376	130,471	95
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026753-0001	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	11,419	11,425	6	11,842	11,848	6
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026753-0001	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	40,212	40,236	24	41,791	41,816	25
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026753-0001	10000	581930 - GF-Sheriff	835,016	868,417	33,401	860,066	903,154	43,088
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026754-0001	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	4,387,902	4,403,660	15,758	4,534,925	4,568,283	33,358
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026754-0001	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	787,328	789,529	2,201	641,035	645,133	4,098
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026754-0001	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	262,670	263,644	974	271,197	273,264	2,067
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026754-0001	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	64,130	64,357	227	66,263	66,746	483
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026754-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	140,618	140,680	62	149,059	149,124	65
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026754-0001	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	27,399	27,498	99	28,318	28,526	208
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026754-0001	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	16,822	16,885	63	17,385	17,513	128
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026754-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	408,653	408,902	249	433,175	433,439	264
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026754-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	36,163	36,184	21	37,256	37,278	22
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026754-0001	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	4,422	4,438	16	4,570	4,604	34
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026754-0001	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	15,085	15,142	57	15,604	15,721	117
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026754-0001	10000	581210 - DT Technology Infrastructure	1,702,250	1,733,299	31,049	1,849,588	1,898,458	48,870

**Technical Adjustments for May 1 Departments
FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24**

GFS Type	Dept Grp	Dept ID	Fund	Project-Activity	Authority	Account - Title	FY 2022-23 May 1 Proposed	FY 2022-23 Updated	Variance FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24 May 1 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Updated	Variance FY 2023-24
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026754-0001	10000	581325 - DT Enterprise Tech Contracts	290,810	290,810	(0)	363,752	363,752	(0)
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026754-0001	10000	581360 - DT Telecommunications Serv	1,005,648	1,005,648	-	1,005,648	1,008,135	2,487
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026755-0001	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	13,238,926	13,362,350	123,424	13,725,965	13,853,353	127,388
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026755-0001	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	2,470,002	2,492,473	22,471	2,010,321	2,028,653	18,332
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026755-0001	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	838,777	846,429	7,652	869,903	877,801	7,898
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026755-0001	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	196,432	198,222	1,790	203,743	205,590	1,847
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026755-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	750,558	756,400	5,842	795,629	801,821	6,192
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026755-0001	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	83,979	84,744	765	87,082	87,871	789
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026755-0001	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	51,594	52,064	470	53,488	53,973	485
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026755-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	1,373,521	1,386,460	12,939	1,455,966	1,469,682	13,716
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026755-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	133,588	134,796	1,208	137,554	138,798	1,244
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026755-0001	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	13,545	13,668	123	14,046	14,173	127
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026755-0001	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	51,005	51,486	481	52,884	53,381	497
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10026755-0001	10000	581625 - Gf-Homelessness Services	266,976	94,315	(172,661)	266,976	94,315	(172,661)
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10031292-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	121,214	121,261	47	128,493	128,542	49
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10031292-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	244,151	244,340	189	258,793	258,994	201
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10031292-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	23,302	23,318	16	24,002	24,018	16
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10031292-0002	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	53,615	53,654	39	56,834	56,876	42
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10031292-0002	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	99,543	99,700	157	105,512	105,679	167
NGFS	LIB	232048	13140	10031292-0002	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	9,647	9,660	13	9,936	9,950	14
NGFS	MTA	168646	22260	10001726-0023	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	201,518	201,768	250	213,622	213,887	265
NGFS	MTA	168646	22260	10001726-0023	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	584,246	585,252	1,006	619,326	620,392	1,066
NGFS	MTA	168646	22260	10001726-0023	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	54,032	54,117	85	55,630	55,718	88
NGFS	MTA	175655	22260	10001726-0002	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	20,742	20,756	14	23,916	23,931	15
NGFS	MTA	175655	22260	10001726-0002	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	44,739	44,796	57	53,049	53,109	60
NGFS	MTA	175655	22260	10001726-0002	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	4,219	4,224	5	4,838	4,843	5
NGFS	MTA	175655	22265	10001726-0023	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	12,555	12,564	9	13,308	13,318	10
NGFS	MTA	175655	22265	10001726-0023	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	32,216	32,253	37	34,147	34,187	40
NGFS	MTA	175655	22265	10001726-0023	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	2,981	2,984	3	3,071	3,074	3
NGFS	MTA	175655	22265	10001726-0023	10000	528110 - Security	9,154,674	9,154,674	-	9,154,674	9,154,624	(50)
NGFS	MTA	138746	22870	10001723-0001	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	2,879,865	2,927,648	47,783	2,987,224	3,088,169	100,945
NGFS	MTA	138746	22870	10001723-0001	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	511,219	519,688	8,469	416,378	430,423	14,045
NGFS	MTA	138746	22870	10001723-0001	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	194,732	196,903	2,171	201,010	205,599	4,589
NGFS	MTA	138746	22870	10001723-0001	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	47,322	48,015	693	48,878	50,336	1,458
NGFS	MTA	138746	22870	10001723-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	50,695	50,875	180	53,729	53,920	191
NGFS	MTA	138746	22870	10001723-0001	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	20,225	20,513	288	20,888	21,511	623
NGFS	MTA	138746	22870	10001723-0001	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	12,415	12,595	180	12,821	13,209	388
NGFS	MTA	138746	22870	10001723-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	313,511	314,235	724	332,319	333,086	767
NGFS	MTA	138746	22870	10001723-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	24,577	24,638	61	25,318	25,382	64
NGFS	MTA	138746	22870	10001723-0001	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	3,270	3,308	38	3,368	3,476	108
NGFS	MTA	138746	22870	10001723-0001	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	10,416	10,607	191	10,809	11,201	392

**Technical Adjustments for May 1 Departments
FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24**

GFS Type	Dept Grp	Dept ID	Fund	Project-Activity	Authority	Account - Title	FY 2022-23 May 1 Proposed	FY 2022-23 Updated	Variance FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24 May 1 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Updated	Variance FY 2023-24
NGFS	MTA	207799	22870	10001723-0001	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	3,523,854	3,588,377	64,523	3,698,041	3,819,267	121,226
NGFS	MTA	207799	22870	10001723-0001	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	619,412	630,848	11,436	511,116	527,976	16,860
NGFS	MTA	207799	22870	10001723-0001	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	203,198	204,132	934	212,897	214,921	2,024
NGFS	MTA	207799	22870	10001723-0001	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	53,055	53,989	934	55,571	57,342	1,771
NGFS	MTA	207799	22870	10001723-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	102,355	102,657	302	109,468	109,788	320
NGFS	MTA	207799	22870	10001723-0001	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	22,673	23,076	403	23,754	24,499	745
NGFS	MTA	207799	22870	10001723-0001	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	13,922	14,158	236	14,585	15,041	456
NGFS	MTA	207799	22870	10001723-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	253,659	254,875	1,216	271,587	272,876	1,289
NGFS	MTA	207799	22870	10001723-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	23,189	23,292	103	24,126	24,232	106
NGFS	MTA	207799	22870	10001723-0001	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	3,663	3,723	60	3,833	3,954	121
NGFS	MTA	207799	22870	10001723-0001	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	11,454	11,678	224	12,040	12,465	425
NGFS	MTA	207799	22870	10001723-0001	10000	581069 - Sr-DPW-Street Use & Mapping	126,271	196,721	70,450	60,240	130,690	70,450
NGFS	MTA	207799	22870	10001723-0001	10000	581089 - Sr-SAS-Street Cleaning	281,798	211,348	(70,450)	362,111	291,661	(70,450)
NGFS	MTA	207801	22870	10001723-0001	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	2,631,096	2,634,860	3,764	2,727,049	2,734,981	7,932
NGFS	MTA	207801	22870	10001723-0001	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	468,674	469,341	667	382,007	383,110	1,103
NGFS	MTA	207801	22870	10001723-0001	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	38,315	38,369	54	39,707	39,822	115
NGFS	MTA	207801	22870	10001723-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	76,506	76,635	129	81,097	81,234	137
NGFS	MTA	207801	22870	10001723-0001	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	16,375	16,399	24	16,967	17,016	49
NGFS	MTA	207801	22870	10001723-0001	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	10,053	10,067	14	10,418	10,448	30
NGFS	MTA	207801	22870	10001723-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	174,390	174,912	522	184,850	185,403	553
NGFS	MTA	207801	22870	10001723-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	16,368	16,413	45	16,863	16,909	46
NGFS	MTA	207801	22870	10001723-0001	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	2,641	2,645	4	2,739	2,747	8
NGFS	MTA	207801	22870	10001723-0001	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	4,906	4,920	14	5,111	5,139	28
NGFS	MTA	207801	22870	10001723-0001	10000	581360 - DT Telecommunications Serv	91,936	91,936	-	91,936	92,924	988
NGFS	MTA	138751	22260	10001722-0002	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	31,670	31,688	18	46,557	46,576	19
NGFS	MTA	138751	22260	10001722-0002	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	86,515	86,589	74	127,717	127,795	78
NGFS	MTA	138751	22260	10001722-0002	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	7,851	7,857	6	11,244	11,251	7
NGFS	MTA	207809	22305	10001722-0002	10000	579030 - MTA Division OH Cost Recove	(1,523,698)	(1,619,398)	(95,700)	(1,541,143)	(1,542,535)	(1,392)
NGFS	MTA	207809	22305	10001722-0002	10000	581360 - DT Telecommunications Serv	129,543	129,543	-	129,543	130,935	1,392
NGFS	MTA	165646	22870	10001723-0001	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	2,804,306	2,869,812	65,506	2,987,386	3,055,002	67,616
NGFS	MTA	165646	22870	10001723-0001	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	506,203	518,129	11,926	426,027	435,755	9,728
NGFS	MTA	165646	22870	10001723-0001	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	177,485	181,547	4,062	188,700	192,890	4,190
NGFS	MTA	165646	22870	10001723-0001	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	41,902	42,856	954	44,553	45,531	978
NGFS	MTA	165646	22870	10001723-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	118,512	118,656	144	129,259	129,412	153
NGFS	MTA	165646	22870	10001723-0001	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	17,913	18,317	404	19,043	19,459	416
NGFS	MTA	165646	22870	10001723-0001	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	10,986	11,236	250	11,687	11,945	258
NGFS	MTA	165646	22870	10001723-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	286,009	286,587	578	311,677	312,290	613
NGFS	MTA	165646	22870	10001723-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	27,584	27,633	49	29,221	29,272	51
NGFS	MTA	165646	22870	10001723-0001	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	2,888	2,956	68	3,069	3,137	68
NGFS	MTA	165646	22870	10001723-0001	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	8,628	8,868	240	9,264	9,512	248
NGFS	MTA	165647	22870	10001723-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	75,257	75,415	158	81,926	82,093	167

**Technical Adjustments for May 1 Departments
FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24**

GFS Type	Dept Grp	Dept ID	Fund	Project-Activity	Authority	Account - Title	FY 2022-23 May 1 Proposed	FY 2022-23 Updated	Variance FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24 May 1 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Updated	Variance FY 2023-24
NGFS	MTA	165647	22870	10001723-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	319,790	320,423	633	348,546	349,216	670
NGFS	MTA	165647	22870	10001723-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	27,954	28,007	53	29,617	29,673	56
NGFS	MTA	165648	22870	10001723-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	95,917	96,049	132	105,079	105,219	140
NGFS	MTA	165648	22870	10001723-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	245,768	246,298	530	269,970	270,532	562
NGFS	MTA	165648	22870	10001723-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	22,303	22,348	45	23,800	23,846	46
NGFS	MTA	207808	22870	10001723-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	47,506	47,576	70	57,995	58,069	74
NGFS	MTA	207808	22870	10001723-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	114,190	114,471	281	138,797	139,095	298
NGFS	MTA	207808	22870	10001723-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	10,514	10,538	24	12,425	12,450	25
NGFS	MTA	165650	22870	10001722-0001	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	396,211	398,817	2,606	468,047	473,536	5,489
NGFS	MTA	165650	22870	10001722-0001	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	70,496	70,958	462	65,666	66,430	764
NGFS	MTA	165650	22870	10001722-0001	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	5,746	5,784	38	6,785	6,865	80
NGFS	MTA	165650	22870	10001722-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	10,300	10,301	1	13,028	13,029	1
NGFS	MTA	165650	22870	10001722-0001	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	2,455	2,471	16	2,900	2,934	34
NGFS	MTA	165650	22870	10001722-0001	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	1,508	1,517	9	1,781	1,802	21
NGFS	MTA	165650	22870	10001722-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	28,405	28,411	6	35,959	35,966	7
NGFS	MTA	165650	22870	10001722-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	2,545	2,546	1	3,131	3,131	-
NGFS	MTA	165650	22870	10001722-0001	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	396	398	2	468	473	5
NGFS	MTA	165650	22870	10001722-0001	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	1,385	1,394	9	1,637	1,656	19
NGFS	MTA	165653	22870	10001723-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	26,077	26,112	35	27,643	27,680	37
NGFS	MTA	165653	22870	10001723-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	54,942	55,084	142	58,236	58,386	150
NGFS	MTA	165653	22870	10001723-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	5,236	5,248	12	5,394	5,407	13
NGFS	MTA	207964	22870	10022175-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	2,129,066	2,130,950	1,884	2,269,737	2,271,735	1,998
NGFS	MTA	207964	22870	10022175-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	3,941,063	3,948,640	7,577	4,204,070	4,212,103	8,033
NGFS	MTA	207964	22870	10022175-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	382,303	382,946	643	396,263	396,925	662
NGFS	MTA	207964	22870	10022175-0001	10000	581360 - DT Telecommunications Serv	131,595	131,595	-	131,595	133,008	1,413
NGFS	MTA	207813	22870	10001723-0001	10000	527990 - Other Professional Services	15,798,700	15,818,968	20,268	15,498,700	15,618,963	120,263
NGFS	MTA	207813	22870	10001725-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	118,111	118,297	186	125,197	125,395	198
NGFS	MTA	207813	22870	10001725-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	303,702	304,451	749	321,926	322,720	794
NGFS	MTA	207813	22870	10001725-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	27,775	27,839	64	28,615	28,681	66
NGFS	MTA	207813	22870	10001725-0001	10000	581130 - GF-Con-Internal Audits	139,771	139,538	(233)	147,526	147,297	(229)
NGFS	MTA	208667	22260	10001726-0002	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	2,080,597	2,190,901	110,304	2,143,676	2,278,212	134,536
NGFS	MTA	208667	22260	10001726-0002	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	425,243	447,985	22,742	336,785	358,096	21,311
NGFS	MTA	208667	22260	10001726-0002	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	129,709	136,547	6,838	133,568	141,906	8,338
NGFS	MTA	208667	22260	10001726-0002	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	30,462	32,060	1,598	31,356	33,308	1,952
NGFS	MTA	208667	22260	10001726-0002	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	238,948	239,034	86	253,297	253,388	91
NGFS	MTA	208667	22260	10001726-0002	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	13,025	13,710	685	13,383	14,218	835
NGFS	MTA	208667	22260	10001726-0002	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	7,977	8,400	423	8,241	8,754	513
NGFS	MTA	208667	22260	10001726-0002	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	461,160	461,505	345	488,806	489,172	366
NGFS	MTA	208667	22260	10001726-0002	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	44,328	44,357	29	45,662	45,692	30
NGFS	MTA	208667	22260	10001726-0002	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	2,093	2,202	109	2,156	2,295	139
NGFS	MTA	208667	22260	10001726-0002	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	7,518	7,943	425	7,738	8,255	517

**Technical Adjustments for May 1 Departments
FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24**

GFS Type	Dept Grp	Dept ID	Fund	Project-Activity	Authority	Account - Title	FY 2022-23 May 1 Proposed	FY 2022-23 Updated	Variance FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24 May 1 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Updated	Variance FY 2023-24
NGFS	MTA	103757	22265	10001719-0023	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	2,000,937	2,054,857	53,920	2,065,761	2,121,419	55,658
NGFS	MTA	103757	22265	10001719-0023	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	358,527	368,173	9,646	291,333	299,164	7,831
NGFS	MTA	103757	22265	10001719-0023	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	121,954	125,176	3,222	125,834	129,029	3,195
NGFS	MTA	103757	22265	10001719-0023	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	29,013	29,797	784	29,954	30,760	806
NGFS	MTA	103757	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	76,858	76,865	7	81,466	81,473	7
NGFS	MTA	103757	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	12,397	12,733	336	12,802	13,144	342
NGFS	MTA	103757	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	7,614	7,818	204	7,857	8,069	212
NGFS	MTA	103757	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	161,439	161,467	28	171,121	171,150	29
NGFS	MTA	103757	22265	10001719-0023	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	15,455	15,458	3	15,921	15,924	3
NGFS	MTA	103757	22265	10001719-0023	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	1,999	2,057	58	2,067	2,120	53
NGFS	MTA	103757	22265	10001719-0023	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	5,923	6,135	212	6,118	6,335	217
NGFS	MTA	207963	22260	10001719-0023	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	579,924	586,029	6,105	598,550	604,851	6,301
NGFS	MTA	207963	22260	10001719-0023	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	103,885	104,997	1,112	84,386	85,293	907
NGFS	MTA	207963	22260	10001719-0023	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	32,674	33,053	379	33,674	34,064	390
NGFS	MTA	207963	22260	10001719-0023	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	8,409	8,497	88	8,678	8,770	92
NGFS	MTA	207963	22260	10001719-0023	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	3,593	3,630	37	3,709	3,748	39
NGFS	MTA	207963	22260	10001719-0023	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	2,206	2,229	23	2,276	2,300	24
NGFS	MTA	207963	22260	10001719-0023	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	581	587	6	599	605	6
NGFS	MTA	207963	22260	10001719-0023	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	892	916	24	921	945	24
NGFS	MTA	207963	22265	10001719-0023	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	1,417,442	1,447,967	30,525	1,442,082	1,473,587	31,505
NGFS	MTA	207963	22265	10001719-0023	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	273,003	278,563	5,560	216,167	220,702	4,535
NGFS	MTA	207963	22265	10001719-0023	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	87,415	89,310	1,895	88,907	90,857	1,950
NGFS	MTA	207963	22265	10001719-0023	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	20,555	20,995	440	20,908	21,368	460
NGFS	MTA	207963	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	8,784	8,969	185	8,936	9,131	195
NGFS	MTA	207963	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	5,395	5,510	115	5,484	5,604	120
NGFS	MTA	207963	22265	10001719-0023	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	1,417	1,447	30	1,442	1,472	30
NGFS	MTA	207963	22265	10001719-0023	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	4,916	5,036	120	4,996	5,116	120
NGFS	MTA	207789	22265	10001719-0023	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	1,930,174	1,982,062	51,888	1,993,768	2,047,326	53,558
NGFS	MTA	207789	22265	10001719-0023	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	344,496	353,842	9,346	280,307	287,908	7,601
NGFS	MTA	207789	22265	10001719-0023	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	109,944	113,090	3,146	113,478	116,643	3,165
NGFS	MTA	207789	22265	10001719-0023	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	28,003	28,755	752	28,923	29,701	778
NGFS	MTA	207789	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	11,966	12,286	320	12,360	12,690	330
NGFS	MTA	207789	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	7,349	7,545	196	7,585	7,789	204
NGFS	MTA	207789	22265	10001719-0023	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	1,929	1,983	54	1,995	2,046	51
NGFS	MTA	207789	22265	10001719-0023	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	5,291	5,495	204	5,472	5,679	207
NGFS	MTA	207790	22265	10001719-0023	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	1,352,536	1,358,641	6,105	1,730,651	1,736,952	6,301
NGFS	MTA	207790	22265	10001719-0023	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	241,887	242,999	1,112	244,711	245,618	907
NGFS	MTA	207790	22265	10001719-0023	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	86,779	87,158	379	109,594	109,984	390
NGFS	MTA	207790	22265	10001719-0023	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	23,664	23,752	88	29,132	29,224	92
NGFS	MTA	207790	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	39,036	39,225	189	53,632	53,833	201
NGFS	MTA	207790	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	10,113	10,150	37	12,448	12,487	39

**Technical Adjustments for May 1 Departments
FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24**

GFS Type	Dept Grp	Dept ID	Fund	Project-Activity	Authority	Account - Title	FY 2022-23 May 1 Proposed	FY 2022-23 Updated	Variance FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24 May 1 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Updated	Variance FY 2023-24
NGFS	MTA	207790	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	6,208	6,231	23	7,642	7,666	24
NGFS	MTA	207790	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	84,372	85,132	760	119,013	119,818	805
NGFS	MTA	207790	22265	10001719-0023	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	8,063	8,127	64	10,944	11,011	67
NGFS	MTA	207790	22265	10001719-0023	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	1,632	1,638	6	2,008	2,014	6
NGFS	MTA	207790	22265	10001719-0023	10000	519010 - Fringe Adjustments-Budget	-	(3,622)	(3,622)	-	(3,688)	(3,688)
NGFS	MTA	207790	22265	10001719-0023	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	1,755	1,779	24	3,033	3,057	24
NGFS	MTA	207790	22265	10001719-0023	10000	581610 - GF-DHR-Mta Prop E Services	326,000	443,380	117,380	326,000	443,380	117,380
NGFS	MTA	207790	22265	10001719-0023	22197	522020 - Training Costs Paid To Vendor	-	40,000	40,000	-	40,000	40,000
NGFS	MTA	207793	22265	10001719-0023	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	5,136,500	5,297,253	160,753	5,332,032	5,497,957	165,925
NGFS	MTA	207793	22265	10001719-0023	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	919,302	948,302	29,000	753,259	776,854	23,595
NGFS	MTA	207793	22265	10001719-0023	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	309,280	319,059	9,779	320,972	330,842	9,870
NGFS	MTA	207793	22265	10001719-0023	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	74,486	76,814	2,328	77,312	79,724	2,412
NGFS	MTA	207793	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	230,801	231,085	284	244,637	244,938	301
NGFS	MTA	207793	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	31,831	32,820	989	33,043	34,066	1,023
NGFS	MTA	207793	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	19,548	20,155	607	20,275	20,907	632
NGFS	MTA	207793	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	427,232	428,374	1,142	452,851	454,062	1,211
NGFS	MTA	207793	22265	10001719-0023	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	42,060	42,156	96	43,328	43,428	100
NGFS	MTA	207793	22265	10001719-0023	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	5,130	5,296	166	5,331	5,489	158
NGFS	MTA	207793	22265	10001719-0023	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	16,668	17,300	632	17,329	17,969	640
NGFS	MTA	138711	22265	10001719-0023	10000	581120 - GF-Con-Financial Systems	634,218	653,738	19,520	646,645	680,012	33,367
NGFS	MTA	175647	22870	10001723-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	47,438	47,525	87	52,394	52,486	92
NGFS	MTA	175647	22870	10001723-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	116,620	116,969	349	129,468	129,838	370
NGFS	MTA	175647	22870	10001723-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	10,692	10,722	30	11,524	11,555	31
NGFS	MTA	103760	22265	10001719-0023	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	1,873,510	1,896,943	23,433	1,944,604	2,010,787	66,183
NGFS	MTA	103760	22265	10001719-0023	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	335,413	339,631	4,218	274,215	283,615	9,400
NGFS	MTA	103760	22265	10001719-0023	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	105,657	106,514	857	109,577	112,001	2,424
NGFS	MTA	103760	22265	10001719-0023	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	27,168	27,502	334	28,197	29,154	957
NGFS	MTA	103760	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	59,126	59,250	124	62,673	62,804	131
NGFS	MTA	103760	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	11,608	11,752	144	12,050	12,458	408
NGFS	MTA	103760	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	7,126	7,216	90	7,397	7,649	252
NGFS	MTA	103760	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	146,939	147,435	496	155,758	156,283	525
NGFS	MTA	103760	22265	10001719-0023	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	13,467	13,509	42	13,874	13,917	43
NGFS	MTA	103760	22265	10001719-0023	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	1,874	1,899	25	1,946	2,009	63
NGFS	MTA	103760	22265	10001719-0023	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	5,128	5,206	78	5,331	5,566	235
NGFS	MTA	138709	22265	10001719-0023	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	1,588,516	1,605,362	16,846	1,648,411	1,695,989	47,578
NGFS	MTA	138709	22265	10001719-0023	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	285,987	289,040	3,053	234,317	241,133	6,816
NGFS	MTA	138709	22265	10001719-0023	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	102,897	103,775	878	106,441	108,921	2,480
NGFS	MTA	138709	22265	10001719-0023	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	24,735	24,974	239	25,594	26,283	689
NGFS	MTA	138709	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	57,314	57,406	92	60,752	60,850	98
NGFS	MTA	138709	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	10,571	10,672	101	10,939	11,232	293
NGFS	MTA	138709	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	6,487	6,551	64	6,717	6,900	183

**Technical Adjustments for May 1 Departments
FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24**

GFS Type	Dept Grp	Dept ID	Fund	Project-Activity	Authority	Account - Title	FY 2022-23 May 1 Proposed	FY 2022-23 Updated	Variance FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24 May 1 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Updated	Variance FY 2023-24	
NGFS	MTA	138709	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	134,673	135,041	368	142,755	143,145	390	
NGFS	MTA	138709	22265	10001719-0023	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	12,434	12,465	31	12,810	12,842	32	
NGFS	MTA	138709	22265	10001719-0023	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	1,705	1,724	19	1,766	1,812	46	
NGFS	MTA	138709	22265	10001719-0023	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	5,193	5,248	55	5,388	5,558	170	
NGFS	MTA	138710	22265	10001719-0023	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	134,386	136,302	1,916	268,158	278,614	10,456	
NGFS	MTA	138710	22265	10001719-0023	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	24,466	24,814	348	38,590	40,096	1,506	
NGFS	MTA	138710	22265	10001719-0023	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	8,332	8,450	118	16,626	17,274	648	
NGFS	MTA	138710	22265	10001719-0023	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	1,948	1,976	28	3,888	4,040	152	
NGFS	MTA	138710	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	832	844	12	1,662	1,726	64	
NGFS	MTA	138710	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	512	518	6	1,020	1,060	40	
NGFS	MTA	138710	22265	10001719-0023	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	134	136	2	268	278	10	
NGFS	MTA	138710	22265	10001719-0023	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	470	478	8	938	976	38	
NGFS	MTA	138710	22305	10001719-0023	10000	581130 - GF-Con-Internal Audits	481,796	480,993	(803)	508,530	507,740	(790)	
NGFS	MTA	161644	22265	10001719-0023	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	1,209,221	1,214,904	5,683	1,276,494	1,292,545	16,051	
NGFS	MTA	161644	22265	10001719-0023	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	219,368	220,391	1,023	182,894	185,174	2,280	
NGFS	MTA	161644	22265	10001719-0023	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	74,283	74,492	209	78,403	78,995	592	
NGFS	MTA	161644	22265	10001719-0023	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	17,551	17,632	81	18,531	18,763	232	
NGFS	MTA	161644	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	62,324	62,399	75	67,273	67,353	80	
NGFS	MTA	161644	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	7,503	7,538	35	7,923	8,022	99	
NGFS	MTA	161644	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	4,602	4,624	22	4,862	4,923	61	
NGFS	MTA	161644	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	121,411	121,711	300	131,064	131,383	319	
NGFS	MTA	161644	22265	10001719-0023	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	11,639	11,664	25	12,210	12,236	26	
NGFS	MTA	161644	22265	10001719-0023	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	1,210	1,216	6	1,281	1,296	15	
NGFS	MTA	161644	22265	10001719-0023	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	4,559	4,578	19	4,812	4,869	57	
NGFS	MTA	210676	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	98,279	98,378	99	107,569	107,674	105	
NGFS	MTA	210676	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	194,387	194,787	400	213,487	213,911	424	
NGFS	MTA	210676	22265	10001719-0023	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	18,659	18,693	34	19,897	19,932	35	
NGFS	MTA	138725	22260	10001719-0023	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	8,189,425	8,216,503	27,078	8,489,546	8,536,069	46,523	
NGFS	MTA	138725	22260	10001719-0023	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	1,486,461	1,489,394	2,933	1,217,083	1,221,714	4,631	
NGFS	MTA	138725	22260	10001719-0023	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	547,048	548,548	1,500	565,520	568,194	2,674	
NGFS	MTA	138725	22260	10001719-0023	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	128,570	128,963	393	132,876	133,546	670	
NGFS	MTA	138725	22260	10001719-0023	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	415,646	416,094	448	440,613	441,089	476	
NGFS	MTA	138725	22260	10001719-0023	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	54,901	55,069	168	56,767	57,056	289	
NGFS	MTA	138725	22260	10001719-0023	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	33,750	33,852	102	34,887	35,066	179	
NGFS	MTA	138725	22260	10001719-0023	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	1,038,862	1,040,667	1,805	1,101,165	1,103,077	1,912	
NGFS	MTA	138725	22260	10001719-0023	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	93,745	93,898	153	96,574	96,731	157	
NGFS	MTA	138725	22260	10001719-0023	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	8,877	8,905	28	9,151	9,197	46	
NGFS	MTA	138725	22260	10001719-0023	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	30,646	30,752	106	31,754	31,934	180	
NGFS	MTA	138725	22260	10001719-0023	10000	581066 - Sr-DPW-Architecture	-	321,369	321,369	-	332,616	332,616	332,616
NGFS	MTA	138725	22260	10001719-0023	10000	581089 - Sr-SAS-Street Cleaning	994,368	594,368	(400,000)	1,220,228	820,228	(400,000)	
NGFS	MTA	138725	22265	10001719-0023	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	1,996,060	1,999,075	3,015	2,076,088	2,082,442	6,354	

**Technical Adjustments for May 1 Departments
FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24**

GFS Type	Dept Grp	Dept ID	Fund	Project-Activity	Authority	Account - Title	FY 2022-23 May 1 Proposed	FY 2022-23 Updated	Variance FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24 May 1 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Updated	Variance FY 2023-24
NGFS	MTA	138725	22265	10001719-0023	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	351,948	352,482	534	286,950	287,834	884
NGFS	MTA	138725	22265	10001719-0023	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	28,945	28,989	44	30,101	30,194	93
NGFS	MTA	138725	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	47,652	47,845	193	50,511	50,715	204
NGFS	MTA	138725	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	12,368	12,387	19	12,862	12,901	39
NGFS	MTA	138725	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	7,589	7,600	11	7,900	7,924	24
NGFS	MTA	138725	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	120,650	121,423	773	127,891	128,711	820
NGFS	MTA	138725	22265	10001719-0023	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	11,035	11,101	66	11,370	11,437	67
NGFS	MTA	138725	22265	10001719-0023	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	1,997	2,000	3	2,074	2,081	7
NGFS	MTA	138725	22265	10001719-0023	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	4,697	4,707	10	4,912	4,935	23
NGFS	MTA	138717	22265	10001719-0023	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	1,834,772	1,845,107	10,335	2,136,071	2,146,738	10,667
NGFS	MTA	138717	22265	10001719-0023	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	324,830	326,662	1,832	297,217	298,701	1,484
NGFS	MTA	138717	22265	10001719-0023	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	26,808	26,958	150	31,175	31,330	155
NGFS	MTA	138717	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	46,227	46,315	88	56,489	56,582	93
NGFS	MTA	138717	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	11,457	11,521	64	13,323	13,389	66
NGFS	MTA	138717	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	7,035	7,074	39	8,180	8,220	40
NGFS	MTA	138717	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	117,528	117,882	354	143,222	143,598	376
NGFS	MTA	138717	22265	10001719-0023	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	10,767	10,797	30	12,746	12,777	31
NGFS	MTA	138717	22265	10001719-0023	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	1,847	1,857	10	2,151	2,161	10
NGFS	MTA	138717	22265	10001719-0023	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	4,178	4,214	36	5,186	5,223	37
NGFS	MTA	138719	22265	10001719-0023	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	1,499,517	1,540,857	41,340	1,561,582	1,604,250	42,668
NGFS	MTA	138719	22265	10001719-0023	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	261,005	268,333	7,328	214,029	219,965	5,936
NGFS	MTA	138719	22265	10001719-0023	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	23,979	24,579	600	24,879	25,499	620
NGFS	MTA	138719	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	37,931	38,037	106	40,206	40,318	112
NGFS	MTA	138719	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	10,247	10,503	256	10,633	10,897	264
NGFS	MTA	138719	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	6,292	6,448	156	6,530	6,690	160
NGFS	MTA	138719	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	95,695	96,119	424	101,441	101,890	449
NGFS	MTA	138719	22265	10001719-0023	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	8,709	8,745	36	8,972	9,009	37
NGFS	MTA	138719	22265	10001719-0023	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	1,652	1,692	40	1,716	1,756	40
NGFS	MTA	138719	22265	10001719-0023	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	5,076	5,220	144	5,294	5,442	148
NGFS	MTA	146649	22260	10001719-0023	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	44,040	44,132	92	46,681	46,779	98
NGFS	MTA	146649	22260	10001719-0023	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	109,709	110,078	369	116,295	116,686	391
NGFS	MTA	146649	22260	10001719-0023	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	10,007	10,038	31	10,310	10,342	32
NGFS	MTA	207962	22265	10001719-0023	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	4,561,287	4,687,315	126,028	4,724,213	4,855,563	131,350
NGFS	MTA	207962	22265	10001719-0023	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	808,243	830,668	22,425	656,305	674,661	18,356
NGFS	MTA	207962	22265	10001719-0023	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	238,160	238,344	184	245,868	246,137	269
NGFS	MTA	207962	22265	10001719-0023	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	68,928	70,757	1,829	71,295	73,204	1,909
NGFS	MTA	207962	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	103,375	103,547	172	109,574	109,757	183
NGFS	MTA	207962	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	29,454	30,234	780	30,472	31,285	813
NGFS	MTA	207962	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	18,091	18,567	476	18,708	19,201	493
NGFS	MTA	207962	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	271,022	271,717	695	287,292	288,029	737
NGFS	MTA	207962	22265	10001719-0023	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	24,495	24,554	59	25,236	25,297	61

**Technical Adjustments for May 1 Departments
FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24**

GFS Type	Dept Grp	Dept ID	Fund	Project-Activity	Authority	Account - Title	FY 2022-23 May 1 Proposed	FY 2022-23 Updated	Variance FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24 May 1 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Updated	Variance FY 2023-24
NGFS	MTA	207962	22265	10001719-0023	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	4,754	4,877	123	4,920	5,044	124
NGFS	MTA	207962	22265	10001719-0023	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	15,755	16,194	439	16,328	16,784	456
NGFS	MTA	138713	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	44,200	44,302	102	46,851	46,960	109
NGFS	MTA	138713	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	106,276	106,686	410	112,654	113,089	435
NGFS	MTA	138713	22265	10001719-0023	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	9,787	9,822	35	10,083	10,119	36
NGFS	MTA	139650	22870	10001723-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	221,137	221,428	291	234,416	234,725	309
NGFS	MTA	139650	22870	10001723-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	406,991	408,162	1,171	431,388	432,630	1,242
NGFS	MTA	139650	22870	10001723-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	39,581	39,680	99	40,773	40,875	102
NGFS	MTA	139651	22260	10001719-0023	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	298,866	299,287	421	316,814	317,261	447
NGFS	MTA	139651	22260	10001719-0023	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	542,825	544,517	1,692	575,362	577,156	1,794
NGFS	MTA	139651	22260	10001719-0023	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	52,993	53,136	143	54,588	54,736	148
NGFS	MTA	207785	22260	10001719-0009	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	30,887	30,916	29	32,739	32,771	32
NGFS	MTA	207785	22260	10001719-0009	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	84,176	84,294	118	89,228	89,353	125
NGFS	MTA	207785	22260	10001719-0009	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	7,586	7,596	10	7,815	7,826	11
NGFS	MTA	207786	22260	10001719-0009	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	247,456	247,740	284	262,316	262,617	301
NGFS	MTA	207786	22260	10001719-0009	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	457,464	458,608	1,144	484,889	486,101	1,212
NGFS	MTA	207786	22260	10001719-0009	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	44,378	44,475	97	45,714	45,814	100
NGFS	MTA	210687	22265	10037953-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	61,012	61,025	13	80,665	80,678	13
NGFS	MTA	210687	22265	10037953-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	147,014	147,063	49	192,366	192,418	52
NGFS	MTA	210687	22265	10037953-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	13,609	13,614	5	17,310	17,315	5
NGFS	MTA	138688	22305	10001721-0023	10000	579030 - MTA Division OH Cost Recove	(3,376,033)	(3,400,043)	(24,010)	(3,137,894)	(3,280,453)	(142,559)
NGFS	MTA	138688	22305	10001721-0023	10000	581210 - DT Technology Infrastructure	174,950	188,340	13,390	176,480	206,888	30,408
NGFS	MTA	138688	22305	10001721-0023	10000	581360 - DT Telecommunications Serv	192,569	192,569	-	192,569	194,638	2,069
NGFS	MTA	149686	22260	10001724-0016	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	3,790,417	3,817,036	26,619	5,986,853	6,105,467	118,614
NGFS	MTA	149686	22260	10001724-0016	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	675,465	680,252	4,787	843,636	860,394	16,758
NGFS	MTA	149686	22260	10001724-0016	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	235,199	236,847	1,648	363,236	367,997	4,761
NGFS	MTA	149686	22260	10001724-0016	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	56,558	56,947	389	88,396	90,119	1,723
NGFS	MTA	149686	22260	10001724-0016	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	88,576	88,678	102	140,097	140,205	108
NGFS	MTA	149686	22260	10001724-0016	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	24,168	24,335	167	37,773	38,511	738
NGFS	MTA	149686	22260	10001724-0016	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	14,835	14,939	104	23,194	23,645	451
NGFS	MTA	149686	22260	10001724-0016	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	426,792	427,201	409	705,023	705,457	434
NGFS	MTA	149686	22260	10001724-0016	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	34,689	34,723	34	55,337	55,373	36
NGFS	MTA	149686	22260	10001724-0016	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	3,902	3,927	25	6,096	6,212	116
NGFS	MTA	149686	22260	10001724-0016	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	11,503	11,603	100	19,106	19,560	454
NGFS	MTA	207852	22260	10001724-0016	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	879,466	891,915	12,449	922,577	944,910	22,333
NGFS	MTA	207852	22260	10001724-0016	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	154,019	156,225	2,206	126,772	129,878	3,106
NGFS	MTA	207852	22260	10001724-0016	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	40,087	40,207	120	42,184	42,437	253
NGFS	MTA	207852	22260	10001724-0016	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	12,841	13,021	180	13,464	13,790	326
NGFS	MTA	207852	22260	10001724-0016	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	20,581	20,750	169	21,817	21,995	178
NGFS	MTA	207852	22260	10001724-0016	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	5,486	5,564	78	5,752	5,889	137
NGFS	MTA	207852	22260	10001724-0016	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	3,370	3,416	46	3,534	3,618	84

**Technical Adjustments for May 1 Departments
FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24**

GFS Type	Dept Grp	Dept ID	Fund	Project-Activity	Authority	Account - Title	FY 2022-23 May 1 Proposed	FY 2022-23 Updated	Variance FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24 May 1 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Updated	Variance FY 2023-24
NGFS	MTA	207852	22260	10001724-0016	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	45,346	46,024	678	48,068	48,787	719
NGFS	MTA	207852	22260	10001724-0016	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	4,240	4,297	57	4,369	4,428	59
NGFS	MTA	207852	22260	10001724-0016	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	886	898	12	928	951	23
NGFS	MTA	207852	22260	10001724-0016	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	2,253	2,296	43	2,383	2,462	79
NGFS	MTA	207854	22260	10001724-0016	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	1,078,854	1,089,106	10,252	1,127,850	1,149,929	22,079
NGFS	MTA	207854	22260	10001724-0016	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	191,329	192,540	1,211	158,307	160,805	2,498
NGFS	MTA	207854	22260	10001724-0016	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	102,981	103,616	635	105,973	107,341	1,368
NGFS	MTA	207854	22260	10001724-0016	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	24,222	24,371	149	24,935	25,253	318
NGFS	MTA	207854	22260	10001724-0016	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	31,449	31,576	127	33,340	33,475	135
NGFS	MTA	207854	22260	10001724-0016	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	10,350	10,414	64	10,651	10,788	137
NGFS	MTA	207854	22260	10001724-0016	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	6,353	6,392	39	6,540	6,624	84
NGFS	MTA	207854	22260	10001724-0016	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	138,937	139,448	511	147,278	147,819	541
NGFS	MTA	207854	22260	10001724-0016	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	11,386	11,430	44	11,732	11,777	45
NGFS	MTA	207854	22260	10001724-0016	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	1,670	1,680	10	1,717	1,739	22
NGFS	MTA	207854	22260	10001724-0016	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	3,587	3,627	40	3,760	3,846	86
NGFS	MTA	207854	22260	10033100-0021	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	357,969	357,969	-	373,464	378,753	5,289
NGFS	MTA	207854	22260	10033100-0021	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	65,171	65,171	-	53,746	54,505	759
NGFS	MTA	207854	22260	10033100-0021	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	22,195	22,195	-	23,154	23,481	327
NGFS	MTA	207854	22260	10033100-0021	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	5,189	5,189	-	5,415	5,490	75
NGFS	MTA	207854	22260	10033100-0021	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	7,833	7,881	48	8,305	8,356	51
NGFS	MTA	207854	22260	10033100-0021	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	2,218	2,218	-	2,313	2,346	33
NGFS	MTA	207854	22260	10033100-0021	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	1,362	1,362	-	1,420	1,441	21
NGFS	MTA	207854	22260	10033100-0021	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	42,810	43,005	195	45,382	45,588	206
NGFS	MTA	207854	22260	10033100-0021	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	3,417	3,434	17	3,522	3,539	17
NGFS	MTA	207854	22260	10033100-0021	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	359	359	-	373	379	6
NGFS	MTA	207854	22260	10033100-0021	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	1,396	1,396	-	1,457	1,478	21
NGFS	MTA	207855	22260	10001724-0016	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	2,481,751	2,527,505	45,754	2,578,278	2,687,156	108,878
NGFS	MTA	207855	22260	10001724-0016	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	445,489	453,764	8,275	364,713	380,200	15,487
NGFS	MTA	207855	22260	10001724-0016	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	178,742	180,856	2,114	184,561	189,568	5,007
NGFS	MTA	207855	22260	10001724-0016	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	42,297	42,961	664	43,696	45,275	1,579
NGFS	MTA	207855	22260	10001724-0016	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	39,061	39,256	195	41,395	41,602	207
NGFS	MTA	207855	22260	10001724-0016	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	18,075	18,356	281	18,673	19,350	677
NGFS	MTA	207855	22260	10001724-0016	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	11,098	11,275	177	11,460	11,875	415
NGFS	MTA	207855	22260	10001724-0016	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	330,476	331,261	785	350,303	351,135	832
NGFS	MTA	207855	22260	10001724-0016	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	25,152	25,219	67	25,912	25,981	69
NGFS	MTA	207855	22260	10001724-0016	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	2,916	2,962	46	3,013	3,119	106
NGFS	MTA	207855	22260	10001724-0016	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	9,000	9,177	177	9,353	9,778	425
NGFS	MTA	207855	22260	10033100-0021	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	146,874	146,874	-	156,086	161,862	5,776
NGFS	MTA	207855	22260	10033100-0021	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	25,355	25,355	-	21,033	21,837	804
NGFS	MTA	207855	22260	10033100-0021	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	9,106	9,106	-	9,678	10,036	358
NGFS	MTA	207855	22260	10033100-0021	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	2,130	2,130	-	2,262	2,346	84

**Technical Adjustments for May 1 Departments
FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24**

GFS Type	Dept Grp	Dept ID	Fund	Project-Activity	Authority	Account - Title	FY 2022-23 May 1 Proposed	FY 2022-23 Updated	Variance FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24 May 1 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Updated	Variance FY 2023-24
NGFS	MTA	207855	22260	10033100-0021	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	315	369	54	333	391	58
NGFS	MTA	207855	22260	10033100-0021	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	911	911	-	967	1,003	36
NGFS	MTA	207855	22260	10033100-0021	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	560	560	-	594	616	22
NGFS	MTA	207855	22260	10033100-0021	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	17,091	17,310	219	18,116	18,348	232
NGFS	MTA	207855	22260	10033100-0021	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	1,190	1,208	18	1,226	1,245	19
NGFS	MTA	207855	22260	10033100-0021	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	146	146	-	156	162	6
NGFS	MTA	207855	22260	10033100-0021	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	572	572	-	608	632	24
NGFS	MTA	207856	22260	10001724-0016	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	6,159,625	6,389,209	229,584	6,596,401	7,084,032	487,631
NGFS	MTA	207856	22260	10001724-0016	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	1,090,158	1,130,837	40,679	917,902	985,758	67,856
NGFS	MTA	207856	22260	10001724-0016	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	388,895	397,940	9,045	415,392	426,922	11,530
NGFS	MTA	207856	22260	10001724-0016	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	92,599	95,952	3,353	98,955	106,033	7,078
NGFS	MTA	207856	22260	10001724-0016	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	85,818	86,269	451	94,670	95,148	478
NGFS	MTA	207856	22260	10001724-0016	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	39,577	40,988	1,411	42,279	45,290	3,011
NGFS	MTA	207856	22260	10001724-0016	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	24,299	25,161	862	25,946	27,808	1,862
NGFS	MTA	207856	22260	10001724-0016	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	730,460	732,272	1,812	803,230	805,150	1,920
NGFS	MTA	207856	22260	10001724-0016	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	55,534	55,688	154	59,372	59,531	159
NGFS	MTA	207856	22260	10001724-0016	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	6,389	6,635	246	6,835	7,306	471
NGFS	MTA	207856	22260	10001724-0016	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	23,957	24,850	893	25,666	27,571	1,905
NGFS	MTA	207856	22260	10033100-0021	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	732,361	750,319	17,958	776,507	819,750	43,243
NGFS	MTA	207856	22260	10033100-0021	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	129,668	132,851	3,183	107,962	113,978	6,016
NGFS	MTA	207856	22260	10033100-0021	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	43,858	43,858	-	46,472	46,830	358
NGFS	MTA	207856	22260	10033100-0021	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	10,617	10,879	262	11,257	11,886	629
NGFS	MTA	207856	22260	10033100-0021	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	8,253	8,502	249	8,745	9,009	264
NGFS	MTA	207856	22260	10033100-0021	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	4,539	4,651	112	4,812	5,080	268
NGFS	MTA	207856	22260	10033100-0021	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	2,787	2,856	69	2,953	3,118	165
NGFS	MTA	207856	22260	10033100-0021	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	78,635	79,637	1,002	83,355	84,418	1,063
NGFS	MTA	207856	22260	10033100-0021	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	5,999	6,084	85	6,176	6,263	87
NGFS	MTA	207856	22260	10033100-0021	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	734	752	18	779	822	43
NGFS	MTA	207856	22260	10033100-0021	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	2,856	2,926	70	3,027	3,197	170
NGFS	MTA	207859	22260	10001724-0016	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	3,412,262	3,412,262	-	3,547,517	3,629,337	81,820
NGFS	MTA	207859	22260	10001724-0016	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	599,489	599,489	-	488,685	500,073	11,388
NGFS	MTA	207859	22260	10001724-0016	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	236,567	236,567	-	244,815	249,111	4,296
NGFS	MTA	207859	22260	10001724-0016	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	55,689	55,689	-	57,629	58,821	1,192
NGFS	MTA	207859	22260	10001724-0016	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	41,178	41,466	288	43,638	43,943	305
NGFS	MTA	207859	22260	10001724-0016	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	23,800	23,800	-	24,626	25,134	508
NGFS	MTA	207859	22260	10001724-0016	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	14,620	14,620	-	15,122	15,430	308
NGFS	MTA	207859	22260	10001724-0016	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	389,958	391,115	1,157	413,353	414,579	1,226
NGFS	MTA	207859	22260	10001724-0016	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	29,387	29,485	98	30,275	30,376	101
NGFS	MTA	207859	22260	10001724-0016	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	3,830	3,830	-	3,974	4,058	84
NGFS	MTA	207859	22260	10001724-0016	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	13,298	13,298	-	13,829	14,165	336
NGFS	MTA	207860	22260	10001724-0021	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	5,777,344	5,877,069	99,725	6,036,572	6,231,791	195,219

**Technical Adjustments for May 1 Departments
FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24**

GFS Type	Dept Grp	Dept ID	Fund	Project-Activity	Authority	Account - Title	FY 2022-23 May 1 Proposed	FY 2022-23 Updated	Variance FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24 May 1 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Updated	Variance FY 2023-24
NGFS	MTA	207860	22260	10001724-0021	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	1,049,403	1,067,566	18,163	866,120	894,210	28,090
NGFS	MTA	207860	22260	10001724-0021	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	468,293	474,480	6,187	482,191	494,298	12,107
NGFS	MTA	207860	22260	10001724-0021	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	109,822	111,276	1,454	113,578	116,413	2,835
NGFS	MTA	207860	22260	10001724-0021	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	224,315	224,717	402	238,758	239,184	426
NGFS	MTA	207860	22260	10001724-0021	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	46,928	47,552	624	48,528	49,740	1,212
NGFS	MTA	207860	22260	10001724-0021	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	28,811	29,202	391	29,814	30,540	726
NGFS	MTA	207860	22260	10001724-0021	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	747,098	748,716	1,618	794,841	796,555	1,714
NGFS	MTA	207860	22260	10001724-0021	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	64,135	64,273	138	66,321	66,462	141
NGFS	MTA	207860	22260	10001724-0021	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	7,556	7,659	103	7,830	8,015	185
NGFS	MTA	207860	22260	10001724-0021	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	19,852	20,243	391	20,623	21,390	767
NGFS	MTA	207860	22260	10033100-0021	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	469,219	477,411	8,192	484,288	501,636	17,348
NGFS	MTA	207860	22260	10033100-0021	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	85,427	86,919	1,492	69,695	72,191	2,496
NGFS	MTA	207860	22260	10033100-0021	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	29,091	29,599	508	30,026	31,102	1,076
NGFS	MTA	207860	22260	10033100-0021	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	6,802	6,922	120	7,020	7,272	252
NGFS	MTA	207860	22260	10033100-0021	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	2,906	2,958	52	2,999	3,107	108
NGFS	MTA	207860	22260	10033100-0021	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	1,785	1,817	32	1,844	1,908	64
NGFS	MTA	207860	22260	10033100-0021	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	468	476	8	484	500	16
NGFS	MTA	207860	22260	10033100-0021	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	1,829	1,861	32	1,888	1,956	68
NGFS	MTA	149699	22260	10001724-0002	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	49,864	50,089	225	52,855	53,093	238
NGFS	MTA	149699	22260	10001724-0002	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	120,459	121,363	904	127,691	128,649	958
NGFS	MTA	149699	22260	10001724-0002	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	11,109	11,185	76	11,446	11,525	79
NGFS	MTA	149699	22260	10001724-0002	10000	519010 - Fringe Adjustments-Budget	-	141,163	141,163	-	399,873	399,873
NGFS	MTA	149699	22260	10001724-0002	10000	581130 - GF-Con-Internal Audits	1,517,812	1,515,281	(2,531)	1,602,032	1,599,543	(2,489)
NGFS	MTA	205662	22260	10001724-0009	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	3,696,534	3,711,549	15,015	3,844,679	3,913,827	69,148
NGFS	MTA	205662	22260	10001724-0009	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	665,134	667,795	2,661	545,789	555,562	9,773
NGFS	MTA	205662	22260	10001724-0009	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	256,931	256,931	-	265,991	268,860	2,869
NGFS	MTA	205662	22260	10001724-0009	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	60,494	60,710	216	62,628	63,634	1,006
NGFS	MTA	205662	22260	10001724-0009	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	71,908	72,241	333	76,205	76,558	353
NGFS	MTA	205662	22260	10001724-0009	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	25,840	25,934	94	26,765	27,193	428
NGFS	MTA	205662	22260	10001724-0009	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	15,877	15,933	56	16,426	16,694	268
NGFS	MTA	205662	22260	10001724-0009	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	485,807	487,147	1,340	514,952	516,372	1,420
NGFS	MTA	205662	22260	10001724-0009	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	37,762	37,876	114	38,905	39,022	117
NGFS	MTA	205662	22260	10001724-0009	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	4,163	4,178	15	4,324	4,390	66
NGFS	MTA	205662	22260	10001724-0009	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	8,816	8,871	55	9,211	9,482	271
NGFS	MTA	207886	22260	10001724-0002	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	20,896	20,973	77	23,357	23,440	83
NGFS	MTA	207886	22260	10001724-0002	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	41,830	42,143	313	46,711	47,043	332
NGFS	MTA	207886	22260	10001724-0002	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	4,044	4,071	27	4,387	4,414	27
NGFS	MTA	207890	22260	10001724-0009	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	889,353	895,509	6,156	945,696	959,101	13,405
NGFS	MTA	207890	22260	10001724-0009	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	157,406	157,871	465	131,441	132,691	1,250
NGFS	MTA	207890	22260	10001724-0009	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	51,884	52,265	381	55,198	56,028	830
NGFS	MTA	207890	22260	10001724-0009	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	12,895	12,984	89	13,713	13,905	192

**Technical Adjustments for May 1 Departments
FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24**

GFS Type	Dept Grp	Dept ID	Fund	Project-Activity	Authority	Account - Title	FY 2022-23 May 1 Proposed	FY 2022-23 Updated	Variance FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24 May 1 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Updated	Variance FY 2023-24
NGFS	MTA	207890	22260	10001724-0009	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	17,681	18,016	335	18,744	19,100	356
NGFS	MTA	207890	22260	10001724-0009	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	5,510	5,548	38	5,859	5,942	83
NGFS	MTA	207890	22260	10001724-0009	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	3,381	3,404	23	3,597	3,649	52
NGFS	MTA	207890	22260	10001724-0009	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	79,702	81,052	1,350	84,487	85,919	1,432
NGFS	MTA	207890	22260	10001724-0009	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	6,450	6,564	114	6,648	6,766	118
NGFS	MTA	207890	22260	10001724-0009	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	890	896	6	944	958	14
NGFS	MTA	207890	22260	10001724-0009	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	2,082	2,106	24	2,258	2,310	52
NGFS	MTA	207890	22305	10001724-0009	10000	581066 - Sr-DPW-Architecture	-	107,123	107,123	-	110,872	110,872
NGFS	MTA	207891	22260	10001724-0002	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	103,700	104,015	315	109,913	110,248	335
NGFS	MTA	207891	22260	10001724-0002	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	464,697	465,967	1,270	492,601	493,948	1,347
NGFS	MTA	207891	22260	10001724-0002	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	39,248	39,356	108	40,394	40,505	111
NGFS	MTA	207892	22260	10001724-0002	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	24,356	24,376	20	25,817	25,838	21
NGFS	MTA	207892	22260	10001724-0002	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	83,076	83,156	80	88,062	88,147	85
NGFS	MTA	207892	22260	10001724-0002	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	7,263	7,270	7	7,478	7,485	7
NGFS	MTA	207893	22260	10001724-0002	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	1,084,580	1,091,701	7,121	1,125,394	1,132,745	7,351
NGFS	MTA	207893	22260	10001724-0002	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	193,672	194,934	1,262	158,424	159,446	1,022
NGFS	MTA	207893	22260	10001724-0002	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	68,717	69,134	417	71,143	71,548	405
NGFS	MTA	207893	22260	10001724-0002	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	16,469	16,573	104	17,064	17,170	106
NGFS	MTA	207893	22260	10001724-0002	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	36,904	36,963	59	39,118	39,180	62
NGFS	MTA	207893	22260	10001724-0002	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	7,039	7,084	45	7,292	7,337	45
NGFS	MTA	207893	22260	10001724-0002	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	4,322	4,349	27	4,479	4,507	28
NGFS	MTA	207893	22260	10001724-0002	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	100,717	100,951	234	106,761	107,009	248
NGFS	MTA	207893	22260	10001724-0002	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	9,088	9,108	20	9,358	9,379	21
NGFS	MTA	207893	22260	10001724-0002	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	1,138	1,146	8	1,179	1,186	7
NGFS	MTA	207893	22260	10001724-0002	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	4,108	4,136	28	4,266	4,295	29
NGFS	MTA	207895	22260	10001724-0023	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	8,088	8,106	18	8,573	8,591	18
NGFS	MTA	207895	22260	10001724-0023	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	36,057	36,128	71	38,222	38,298	76
NGFS	MTA	207895	22260	10001724-0023	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	3,046	3,052	6	3,135	3,141	6
NGFS	MTA	210668	22260	10001724-0023	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	1,802,703	1,807,583	4,880	2,543,193	2,559,172	15,979
NGFS	MTA	210668	22260	10001724-0023	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	326,323	327,187	864	363,028	365,250	2,222
NGFS	MTA	210668	22260	10001724-0023	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	111,772	112,074	302	155,959	156,212	253
NGFS	MTA	210668	22260	10001724-0023	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	26,141	26,211	70	36,869	37,102	233
NGFS	MTA	210668	22260	10001724-0023	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	51,420	51,501	81	75,039	75,125	86
NGFS	MTA	210668	22260	10001724-0023	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	11,167	11,197	30	15,763	15,861	98
NGFS	MTA	210668	22260	10001724-0023	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	6,857	6,875	18	9,674	9,734	60
NGFS	MTA	210668	22260	10001724-0023	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	176,322	176,650	328	256,045	256,392	347
NGFS	MTA	210668	22260	10001724-0023	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	15,346	15,374	28	21,657	21,686	29
NGFS	MTA	210668	22260	10001724-0023	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	1,805	1,810	5	2,548	2,564	16
NGFS	MTA	210668	22260	10001724-0023	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	6,768	6,784	16	9,522	9,578	56
NGFS	MTA	210669	22260	10001724-0002	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	218,163	219,063	900	243,590	244,545	955
NGFS	MTA	210669	22260	10001724-0002	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	904,503	908,123	3,620	1,010,219	1,014,056	3,837

**Technical Adjustments for May 1 Departments
FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24**

GFS Type	Dept Grp	Dept ID	Fund	Project-Activity	Authority	Account - Title	FY 2022-23 May 1 Proposed	FY 2022-23 Updated	Variance FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24 May 1 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Updated	Variance FY 2023-24
NGFS	MTA	210669	22260	10001724-0002	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	77,228	77,535	307	83,734	84,050	316
NGFS	MTA	149704	22260	10001724-0006	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	21,261	21,292	31	22,538	22,570	32
NGFS	MTA	149704	22260	10001724-0006	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	46,125	46,250	125	48,891	49,023	132
NGFS	MTA	149704	22260	10001724-0006	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	4,379	4,390	11	4,511	4,522	11
NGFS	MTA	149705	22260	10001724-0006	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	17,870	17,877	7	18,943	18,950	7
NGFS	MTA	149705	22260	10001724-0006	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	43,039	43,066	27	45,619	45,648	29
NGFS	MTA	149705	22260	10001724-0006	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	4,008	4,010	2	4,129	4,132	3
NGFS	MTA	149706	22260	10001724-0005	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	17,776	17,784	8	18,843	18,852	9
NGFS	MTA	149706	22260	10001724-0005	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	42,662	42,695	33	45,220	45,255	35
NGFS	MTA	149706	22260	10001724-0005	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	3,976	3,979	3	4,096	4,099	3
NGFS	MTA	149707	22260	10001724-0005	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	21,337	21,367	30	22,618	22,650	32
NGFS	MTA	149707	22260	10001724-0005	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	46,431	46,551	120	49,214	49,342	128
NGFS	MTA	149707	22260	10001724-0005	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	4,405	4,415	10	4,538	4,549	11
NGFS	MTA	149708	22260	10001724-0006	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	78,896	79,032	136	83,630	83,773	143
NGFS	MTA	149708	22260	10001724-0006	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	247,142	247,686	544	261,973	262,550	577
NGFS	MTA	149708	22260	10001724-0006	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	21,883	21,929	46	22,530	22,578	48
NGFS	MTA	149709	22260	10001724-0002	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	25,301	25,546	245	26,819	27,078	259
NGFS	MTA	149709	22260	10001724-0002	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	43,365	44,351	986	45,966	47,012	1,046
NGFS	MTA	149709	22260	10001724-0002	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	4,389	4,473	84	4,523	4,609	86
NGFS	MTA	149712	22260	10001724-0007	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	19,639	19,678	39	20,818	20,859	41
NGFS	MTA	149712	22260	10001724-0007	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	46,295	46,450	155	49,070	49,235	165
NGFS	MTA	149712	22260	10001724-0007	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	4,353	4,367	14	4,485	4,499	14
NGFS	MTA	149712	22260	10001724-0007	10000	581051 - GF-PUC-Light Heat & Power	11,064,281	11,064,280	(1)	14,362,139	14,362,139	-
NGFS	MTA	149715	22260	10001724-0006	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	23,530,686	23,990,409	459,723	24,208,850	25,022,597	813,747
NGFS	MTA	149715	22260	10001724-0006	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	4,181,024	4,264,721	83,697	3,422,099	3,539,205	117,106
NGFS	MTA	149715	22260	10001724-0006	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	1,656,391	1,684,894	28,503	1,698,436	1,748,888	50,452
NGFS	MTA	149715	22260	10001724-0006	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	391,652	398,318	6,666	401,486	413,285	11,799
NGFS	MTA	149715	22260	10001724-0006	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	167,351	170,199	2,848	171,553	176,595	5,042
NGFS	MTA	149715	22260	10001724-0006	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	102,753	104,502	1,749	105,334	108,430	3,096
NGFS	MTA	149715	22260	10001724-0006	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	27,011	27,471	460	27,688	28,502	814
NGFS	MTA	149716	22260	10001724-0007	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	29,083,074	29,665,579	582,505	29,942,359	30,973,446	1,031,087
NGFS	MTA	149716	22260	10001724-0007	10000	511010 - Overtime - Scheduled Misc	7,063,727	4,063,723	(3,000,004)	7,063,717	4,063,717	(3,000,000)
NGFS	MTA	149716	22260	10001724-0007	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	5,146,728	5,252,779	106,051	4,220,107	4,368,490	148,383
NGFS	MTA	149716	22260	10001724-0007	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	2,484,838	2,334,953	(149,885)	2,538,064	2,415,991	(122,073)
NGFS	MTA	149716	22260	10001724-0007	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	588,232	553,178	(35,054)	600,679	572,130	(28,549)
NGFS	MTA	149716	22260	10001724-0007	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	251,348	236,370	(14,978)	256,667	244,468	(12,199)
NGFS	MTA	149716	22260	10001724-0007	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	154,348	145,151	(9,197)	157,614	150,123	(7,491)
NGFS	MTA	149716	22260	10001724-0007	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	40,583	38,166	(2,417)	41,442	39,473	(1,969)
NGFS	MTA	149716	22260	10033100-0007	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	579,513	590,935	11,422	596,362	616,579	20,217
NGFS	MTA	149716	22260	10033100-0007	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	102,824	104,903	2,079	84,214	87,123	2,909
NGFS	MTA	149716	22260	10033100-0007	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	35,930	36,638	708	36,975	38,228	1,253

**Technical Adjustments for May 1 Departments
FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24**

GFS Type	Dept Grp	Dept ID	Fund	Project-Activity	Authority	Account - Title	FY 2022-23 May 1 Proposed	FY 2022-23 Updated	Variance FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24 May 1 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Updated	Variance FY 2023-24
NGFS	MTA	149716	22260	10033100-0007	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	8,403	8,569	166	8,647	8,940	293
NGFS	MTA	149716	22260	10033100-0007	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	3,591	3,662	71	3,695	3,820	125
NGFS	MTA	149716	22260	10033100-0007	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	2,205	2,248	43	2,269	2,346	77
NGFS	MTA	149716	22260	10033100-0007	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	580	591	11	597	617	20
NGFS	MTA	149718	22260	10001724-0006	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	29,596,049	30,174,273	578,224	30,449,020	31,472,521	1,023,501
NGFS	MTA	149718	22260	10001724-0006	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	5,258,742	5,364,013	105,271	4,304,193	4,451,484	147,291
NGFS	MTA	149718	22260	10001724-0006	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	2,082,225	2,118,075	35,850	2,135,109	2,198,566	63,457
NGFS	MTA	149718	22260	10001724-0006	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	492,293	500,677	8,384	504,663	519,504	14,841
NGFS	MTA	149718	22260	10001724-0006	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	210,355	213,938	3,583	215,640	221,981	6,341
NGFS	MTA	149718	22260	10001724-0006	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	129,159	131,359	2,200	132,403	136,297	3,894
NGFS	MTA	149718	22260	10001724-0006	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	33,951	34,529	578	34,804	35,828	1,024
NGFS	MTA	149720	22260	10001724-0005	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	32,446,038	33,079,943	633,905	33,381,147	34,503,208	1,122,061
NGFS	MTA	149720	22260	10001724-0005	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	5,765,139	5,880,547	115,408	4,718,670	4,880,145	161,475
NGFS	MTA	149720	22260	10001724-0005	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	2,289,703	2,329,005	39,302	2,347,680	2,417,248	69,568
NGFS	MTA	149720	22260	10001724-0005	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	541,123	550,315	9,192	554,682	570,952	16,270
NGFS	MTA	149720	22260	10001724-0005	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	231,219	235,147	3,928	237,014	243,966	6,952
NGFS	MTA	149720	22260	10001724-0005	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	141,969	144,381	2,412	145,527	149,796	4,269
NGFS	MTA	149720	22260	10001724-0005	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	37,318	37,952	634	38,253	39,375	1,122
NGFS	MTA	149721	22260	10001724-0005	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	25,576,831	26,076,531	499,700	26,313,967	27,198,474	884,507
NGFS	MTA	149721	22260	10001724-0005	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	4,544,591	4,635,566	90,975	3,719,672	3,846,961	127,289
NGFS	MTA	149721	22260	10001724-0005	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	1,832,391	1,863,372	30,981	1,878,095	1,932,934	54,839
NGFS	MTA	149721	22260	10001724-0005	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	434,155	441,401	7,246	444,841	457,666	12,825
NGFS	MTA	149721	22260	10001724-0005	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	185,511	188,607	3,096	190,078	195,558	5,480
NGFS	MTA	149721	22260	10001724-0005	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	113,905	115,806	1,901	116,709	120,074	3,365
NGFS	MTA	149721	22260	10001724-0005	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	29,941	30,441	500	30,678	31,563	885
NGFS	MTA	149723	22260	10001724-0006	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	39,698,647	40,479,606	780,959	40,850,684	42,233,044	1,382,360
NGFS	MTA	149723	22260	10001724-0006	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	7,045,991	7,188,172	142,181	5,769,872	5,968,806	198,934
NGFS	MTA	149723	22260	10001724-0006	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	2,823,095	2,871,514	48,419	2,894,521	2,980,227	85,706
NGFS	MTA	149723	22260	10001724-0006	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	666,694	678,018	11,324	683,398	703,442	20,044
NGFS	MTA	149723	22260	10001724-0006	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	284,877	289,716	4,839	292,014	300,579	8,565
NGFS	MTA	149723	22260	10001724-0006	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	174,917	177,888	2,971	179,300	184,559	5,259
NGFS	MTA	149723	22260	10001724-0006	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	45,981	46,762	781	47,133	48,515	1,382
NGFS	MTA	154645	22260	10001724-0002	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	4,903,025	5,018,503	115,478	8,083,169	8,358,875	275,706
NGFS	MTA	154645	22260	10001724-0002	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	896,571	920,375	23,804	1,166,757	1,209,775	43,018
NGFS	MTA	154645	22260	10001724-0002	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	292,300	299,472	7,172	483,584	500,682	17,098
NGFS	MTA	154645	22260	10001724-0002	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	71,269	72,941	1,672	117,367	121,371	4,004
NGFS	MTA	154645	22260	10001724-0002	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	174,533	174,536	3	308,970	308,974	4
NGFS	MTA	154645	22260	10001724-0002	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	30,452	31,156	704	50,159	51,869	1,710
NGFS	MTA	154645	22260	10001724-0002	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	18,684	19,124	440	30,788	31,848	1,060
NGFS	MTA	154645	22260	10001724-0002	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	561,594	561,608	14	1,022,175	1,022,190	15
NGFS	MTA	154645	22260	10001724-0002	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	48,859	48,860	1	85,832	85,833	1

**Technical Adjustments for May 1 Departments
FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24**

GFS Type	Dept Grp	Dept ID	Fund	Project-Activity	Authority	Account - Title	FY 2022-23 May 1 Proposed	FY 2022-23 Updated	Variance FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24 May 1 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Updated	Variance FY 2023-24
NGFS	MTA	154645	22260	10001724-0002	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	4,915	5,025	110	8,096	8,378	282
NGFS	MTA	154645	22260	10001724-0002	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	13,817	14,279	462	24,636	25,696	1,060
NGFS	MTA	208670	22260	10001724-0007	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	203,575	203,868	293	215,775	216,086	311
NGFS	MTA	208670	22260	10001724-0007	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	903,417	904,598	1,181	957,663	958,914	1,251
NGFS	MTA	208670	22260	10001724-0007	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	76,333	76,433	100	78,565	78,668	103
NGFS	MTA	149725	22260	10001724-0002	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	7,991,770	8,003,915	12,145	8,470,841	8,500,092	29,251
NGFS	MTA	149725	22260	10001724-0002	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	1,407,264	1,409,439	2,175	1,174,664	1,178,787	4,123
NGFS	MTA	149725	22260	10001724-0002	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	638,180	638,468	288	665,969	667,044	1,075
NGFS	MTA	149725	22260	10001724-0002	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	160,453	160,629	176	167,401	167,825	424
NGFS	MTA	149725	22260	10001724-0002	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	187,410	189,059	1,649	201,563	203,310	1,747
NGFS	MTA	149725	22260	10001724-0002	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	68,560	68,635	75	71,551	71,733	182
NGFS	MTA	149725	22260	10001724-0002	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	42,087	42,133	46	43,938	44,048	110
NGFS	MTA	149725	22260	10001724-0002	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	777,502	784,131	6,629	832,287	839,314	7,027
NGFS	MTA	149725	22260	10001724-0002	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	66,278	66,840	562	68,921	69,500	579
NGFS	MTA	149725	22260	10001724-0002	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	11,075	11,086	11	11,559	11,589	30
NGFS	MTA	149725	22260	10001724-0002	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	27,156	27,200	44	28,865	28,976	111
NGFS	MTA	207976	22260	10001724-0002	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	53,630	53,738	108	117,215	117,329	114
NGFS	MTA	207976	22260	10001724-0002	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	229,699	230,133	434	500,181	500,640	459
NGFS	MTA	207976	22260	10001724-0002	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	19,494	19,531	37	41,252	41,290	38
NGFS	MTA	207976	22260	10001724-0007	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	258,450	258,798	348	273,969	274,337	368
NGFS	MTA	207976	22260	10001724-0007	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	509,483	510,883	1,400	540,031	541,514	1,483
NGFS	MTA	207976	22260	10001724-0007	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	48,765	48,883	118	50,226	50,348	122
NGFS	MTA	207976	22260	10033100-0007	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	56,163	56,238	75	59,536	59,616	80
NGFS	MTA	207976	22260	10033100-0007	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	99,245	99,547	302	105,194	105,514	320
NGFS	MTA	207976	22260	10033100-0007	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	9,731	9,756	25	10,024	10,050	26
NGFS	MTA	207977	22260	10001724-0002	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	230,314	230,990	676	244,122	244,839	717
NGFS	MTA	207977	22260	10001724-0002	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	887,602	890,322	2,720	940,892	943,775	2,883
NGFS	MTA	207977	22260	10001724-0002	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	76,246	76,477	231	78,478	78,716	238
NGFS	MTA	186649	22260	10001724-0004	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	5,075	5,091	16	5,379	5,396	17
NGFS	MTA	186649	22260	10001724-0004	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	22,763	22,828	65	24,129	24,199	70
NGFS	MTA	186649	22260	10001724-0004	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	1,922	1,928	6	1,979	1,984	5
NGFS	MTA	186650	22260	10001724-0004	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	24,254	24,302	48	25,709	25,760	51
NGFS	MTA	186650	22260	10001724-0004	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	72,244	72,438	194	76,578	76,784	206
NGFS	MTA	186650	22260	10001724-0004	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	6,473	6,489	16	6,665	6,682	17
NGFS	MTA	186651	22260	10001724-0004	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	13,580,130	13,845,685	265,555	13,971,865	14,441,918	470,053
NGFS	MTA	186651	22260	10001724-0004	10000	511010 - Overtime - Scheduled Misc	3,585,095	2,585,094	(1,000,001)	3,585,090	2,585,090	(1,000,000)
NGFS	MTA	186651	22260	10001724-0004	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	2,412,625	2,460,972	48,347	1,974,819	2,042,464	67,645
NGFS	MTA	186651	22260	10001724-0004	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	1,161,221	1,115,685	(45,536)	1,185,509	1,152,652	(32,857)
NGFS	MTA	186651	22260	10001724-0004	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	276,521	265,872	(10,649)	282,201	274,517	(7,684)
NGFS	MTA	186651	22260	10001724-0004	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	118,156	113,605	(4,551)	120,583	117,299	(3,284)
NGFS	MTA	186651	22260	10001724-0004	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	72,547	69,753	(2,794)	74,036	72,020	(2,016)

**Technical Adjustments for May 1 Departments
FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24**

GFS Type	Dept Grp	Dept ID	Fund	Project-Activity	Authority	Account - Title	FY 2022-23 May 1 Proposed	FY 2022-23 Updated	Variance FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24 May 1 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Updated	Variance FY 2023-24
NGFS	MTA	186651	22260	10001724-0004	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	19,071	18,337	(734)	19,463	18,933	(530)
NGFS	MTA	207846	22260	10001724-0011	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	3,719,549	3,731,837	12,288	3,862,668	3,942,548	79,880
NGFS	MTA	207846	22260	10001724-0011	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	676,865	679,103	2,238	555,689	567,184	11,495
NGFS	MTA	207846	22260	10001724-0011	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	328,688	329,450	762	337,572	342,538	4,966
NGFS	MTA	207846	22260	10001724-0011	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	76,875	77,055	180	78,939	80,101	1,162
NGFS	MTA	207846	22260	10001724-0011	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	87,874	88,155	281	93,141	93,439	298
NGFS	MTA	207846	22260	10001724-0011	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	32,837	32,915	78	33,734	34,229	495
NGFS	MTA	207846	22260	10001724-0011	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	20,177	20,225	48	20,706	21,016	310
NGFS	MTA	207846	22260	10001724-0011	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	534,940	536,071	1,131	567,032	568,231	1,199
NGFS	MTA	207846	22260	10001724-0011	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	42,027	42,123	96	43,296	43,395	99
NGFS	MTA	207846	22260	10001724-0011	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	5,291	5,303	12	5,443	5,515	72
NGFS	MTA	207846	22260	10001724-0011	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	13,636	13,684	48	14,164	14,480	316
NGFS	MTA	207848	22260	10001724-0011	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	13,470	13,507	37	14,283	14,323	40
NGFS	MTA	207848	22260	10001724-0011	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	77,975	78,124	149	82,651	82,809	158
NGFS	MTA	207848	22260	10001724-0011	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	6,205	6,218	13	6,394	6,407	13
NGFS	MTA	207849	22260	10001724-0011	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	690,870	697,602	6,732	717,925	724,877	6,952
NGFS	MTA	207849	22260	10001724-0011	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	124,592	125,820	1,228	102,290	103,290	1,000
NGFS	MTA	207849	22260	10001724-0011	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	44,178	44,598	420	45,830	46,258	428
NGFS	MTA	207849	22260	10001724-0011	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	10,351	10,451	100	10,744	10,844	100
NGFS	MTA	207849	22260	10001724-0011	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	13,882	13,934	52	14,710	14,765	55
NGFS	MTA	207849	22260	10001724-0011	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	4,424	4,464	40	4,593	4,633	40
NGFS	MTA	207849	22260	10001724-0011	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	2,715	2,743	28	2,820	2,848	28
NGFS	MTA	207849	22260	10001724-0011	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	90,742	90,949	207	96,186	96,406	220
NGFS	MTA	207849	22260	10001724-0011	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	7,110	7,128	18	7,326	7,344	18
NGFS	MTA	207849	22260	10001724-0011	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	713	721	8	740	748	8
NGFS	MTA	207850	22260	10001724-0018	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	2,770,069	2,781,274	11,205	2,918,675	2,939,057	20,382
NGFS	MTA	207850	22260	10001724-0018	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	502,646	504,032	1,386	418,213	420,466	2,253
NGFS	MTA	207850	22260	10001724-0018	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	218,739	219,435	696	226,109	227,369	1,260
NGFS	MTA	207850	22260	10001724-0018	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	51,296	51,460	164	53,451	53,743	292
NGFS	MTA	207850	22260	10001724-0018	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	63,921	64,165	244	68,429	68,687	258
NGFS	MTA	207850	22260	10001724-0018	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	21,921	21,989	68	22,843	22,967	124
NGFS	MTA	207850	22260	10001724-0018	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	13,454	13,498	44	14,019	14,099	80
NGFS	MTA	207850	22260	10001724-0018	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	340,172	341,151	979	363,938	364,977	1,039
NGFS	MTA	207850	22260	10001724-0018	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	27,265	27,348	83	28,359	28,445	86
NGFS	MTA	207850	22260	10001724-0018	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	3,534	3,546	12	3,682	3,704	22
NGFS	MTA	207850	22260	10001724-0018	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	7,847	7,871	24	8,339	8,398	59
NGFS	MTA	207851	22260	10001724-0018	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	2,079,264	2,120,630	41,366	2,162,276	2,245,314	83,038
NGFS	MTA	207851	22260	10001724-0018	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	374,301	381,835	7,534	308,295	320,243	11,948
NGFS	MTA	207851	22260	10001724-0018	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	147,147	149,713	2,566	152,251	157,401	5,150
NGFS	MTA	207851	22260	10001724-0018	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	34,545	35,149	604	35,748	36,954	1,206
NGFS	MTA	207851	22260	10001724-0018	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	90,482	90,622	140	95,925	96,073	148

**Technical Adjustments for May 1 Departments
FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24**

GFS Type	Dept Grp	Dept ID	Fund	Project-Activity	Authority	Account - Title	FY 2022-23 May 1 Proposed	FY 2022-23 Updated	Variance FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24 May 1 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Updated	Variance FY 2023-24
NGFS	MTA	207851	22260	10001724-0018	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	14,762	15,022	260	15,272	15,788	516
NGFS	MTA	207851	22260	10001724-0018	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	9,063	9,225	162	9,387	9,695	308
NGFS	MTA	207851	22260	10001724-0018	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	284,586	285,150	564	301,657	302,254	597
NGFS	MTA	207851	22260	10001724-0018	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	24,679	24,727	48	25,422	25,471	49
NGFS	MTA	207851	22260	10001724-0018	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	2,377	2,419	42	2,464	2,542	78
NGFS	MTA	207851	22260	10001724-0018	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	7,488	7,650	162	7,790	8,116	326
NGFS	MTA	205660	22260	10001724-0016	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	31,744	31,825	81	33,642	33,728	86
NGFS	MTA	205660	22260	10001724-0016	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	161,115	161,440	325	170,780	171,125	345
NGFS	MTA	205660	22260	10001724-0016	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	13,038	13,066	28	13,435	13,463	28
NGFS	MTA	207880	22260	10001724-0016	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	1,719,651	1,719,651	-	1,786,001	1,827,606	41,605
NGFS	MTA	207880	22260	10001724-0016	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	302,609	302,609	-	246,429	252,219	5,790
NGFS	MTA	207880	22260	10001724-0016	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	109,689	109,689	-	113,637	115,427	1,790
NGFS	MTA	207880	22260	10001724-0016	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	26,167	26,167	-	27,120	27,727	607
NGFS	MTA	207880	22260	10001724-0016	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	20,419	20,545	126	21,638	21,772	134
NGFS	MTA	207880	22260	10001724-0016	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	11,184	11,184	-	11,590	11,848	258
NGFS	MTA	207880	22260	10001724-0016	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	6,870	6,870	-	7,117	7,273	156
NGFS	MTA	207880	22260	10001724-0016	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	192,878	193,387	509	204,450	204,989	539
NGFS	MTA	207880	22260	10001724-0016	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	14,542	14,585	43	14,981	15,026	45
NGFS	MTA	207880	22260	10001724-0016	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	1,799	1,799	-	1,869	1,912	43
NGFS	MTA	207880	22260	10001724-0016	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	6,702	6,702	-	6,962	7,131	169
NGFS	MTA	207881	22260	10001724-0016	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	872,350	872,350	-	900,365	917,932	17,567
NGFS	MTA	207881	22260	10001724-0016	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	154,607	154,607	-	125,223	127,668	2,445
NGFS	MTA	207881	22260	10001724-0016	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	62,650	62,650	-	64,352	65,247	895
NGFS	MTA	207881	22260	10001724-0016	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	14,743	14,743	-	15,145	15,401	256
NGFS	MTA	207881	22260	10001724-0016	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	6,301	6,301	-	6,472	6,581	109
NGFS	MTA	207881	22260	10001724-0016	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	3,870	3,870	-	3,974	4,040	66
NGFS	MTA	207881	22260	10001724-0016	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	1,014	1,014	-	1,044	1,062	18
NGFS	MTA	207881	22260	10001724-0016	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	3,400	3,400	-	3,510	3,582	72
NGFS	MTA	207882	22260	10001724-0016	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	573,692	573,692	-	592,116	603,668	11,552
NGFS	MTA	207882	22260	10001724-0016	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	101,676	101,676	-	82,352	83,960	1,608
NGFS	MTA	207882	22260	10001724-0016	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	43,046	43,046	-	44,190	44,906	716
NGFS	MTA	207882	22260	10001724-0016	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	10,069	10,069	-	10,333	10,501	168
NGFS	MTA	207882	22260	10001724-0016	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	4,304	4,304	-	4,416	4,488	72
NGFS	MTA	207882	22260	10001724-0016	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	2,643	2,643	-	2,711	2,755	44
NGFS	MTA	207882	22260	10001724-0016	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	692	692	-	712	724	12
NGFS	MTA	207882	22260	10001724-0016	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	2,236	2,236	-	2,308	2,356	48
NGFS	MTA	207883	22260	10001724-0016	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	1,450,795	1,450,795	-	1,505,450	1,539,722	34,272
NGFS	MTA	207883	22260	10001724-0016	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	256,456	256,456	-	208,727	213,508	4,781
NGFS	MTA	207883	22260	10001724-0016	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	90,513	90,513	-	93,869	95,800	1,931
NGFS	MTA	207883	22260	10001724-0016	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	21,261	21,261	-	22,045	22,544	499
NGFS	MTA	207883	22260	10001724-0016	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	18,290	18,388	98	19,383	19,486	103

**Technical Adjustments for May 1 Departments
FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24**

GFS Type	Dept Grp	Dept ID	Fund	Project-Activity	Authority	Account - Title	FY 2022-23 May 1 Proposed	FY 2022-23 Updated	Variance FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24 May 1 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Updated	Variance FY 2023-24
NGFS	MTA	207883	22260	10001724-0016	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	9,086	9,086	-	9,420	9,633	213
NGFS	MTA	207883	22260	10001724-0016	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	5,582	5,582	-	5,784	5,914	130
NGFS	MTA	207883	22260	10001724-0016	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	168,496	168,888	392	178,604	179,020	416
NGFS	MTA	207883	22260	10001724-0016	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	12,734	12,767	33	13,118	13,152	34
NGFS	MTA	207883	22260	10001724-0016	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	1,461	1,461	-	1,520	1,555	35
NGFS	MTA	207883	22260	10001724-0016	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	5,654	5,654	-	5,868	6,009	141
NGFS	MTA	207884	22260	10001724-0021	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	3,574,494	3,574,494	-	3,718,260	3,806,073	87,813
NGFS	MTA	207884	22260	10001724-0021	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	626,467	626,467	-	511,412	523,634	12,222
NGFS	MTA	207884	22260	10001724-0021	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	261,142	261,142	-	269,896	274,550	4,654
NGFS	MTA	207884	22260	10001724-0021	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	61,593	61,593	-	63,656	64,935	1,279
NGFS	MTA	207884	22260	10001724-0021	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	44,513	44,811	298	47,172	47,488	316
NGFS	MTA	207884	22260	10001724-0021	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	26,326	26,326	-	27,203	27,749	546
NGFS	MTA	207884	22260	10001724-0021	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	16,170	16,170	-	16,703	17,035	332
NGFS	MTA	207884	22260	10001724-0021	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	420,333	421,531	1,198	445,549	446,820	1,271
NGFS	MTA	207884	22260	10001724-0021	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	31,689	31,791	102	32,646	32,751	105
NGFS	MTA	207884	22260	10001724-0021	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	4,235	4,235	-	4,389	4,480	91
NGFS	MTA	207884	22260	10001724-0021	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	13,931	13,931	-	14,493	14,854	361
NGFS	MTA	205645	22260	10001724-0009	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	754,601	755,164	563	804,745	805,342	597
NGFS	MTA	205645	22260	10001724-0009	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	1,437,206	1,439,469	2,263	1,532,854	1,535,252	2,398
NGFS	MTA	205645	22260	10001724-0009	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	138,512	138,704	192	143,564	143,761	197
NGFS	MTA	205649	22260	10001724-0009	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	71,802	72,018	216	76,088	76,317	229
NGFS	MTA	205649	22260	10001724-0009	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	444,650	445,518	868	471,326	472,247	921
NGFS	MTA	205649	22260	10001724-0009	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	35,081	35,154	73	36,148	36,224	76
NGFS	MTA	207838	22260	10001724-0013	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	6,568,773	6,570,456	1,683	6,818,823	6,829,621	10,798
NGFS	MTA	207838	22260	10001724-0013	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	1,190,607	1,190,914	307	977,198	978,752	1,554
NGFS	MTA	207838	22260	10001724-0013	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	544,084	544,189	105	559,538	560,209	671
NGFS	MTA	207838	22260	10001724-0013	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	127,388	127,413	25	130,992	131,149	157
NGFS	MTA	207838	22260	10001724-0013	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	202,023	202,444	421	214,121	214,568	447
NGFS	MTA	207838	22260	10001724-0013	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	54,407	54,417	10	55,989	56,055	66
NGFS	MTA	207838	22260	10001724-0013	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	33,417	33,424	7	34,368	34,411	43
NGFS	MTA	207838	22260	10001724-0013	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	895,107	896,802	1,695	948,796	950,593	1,797
NGFS	MTA	207838	22260	10001724-0013	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	74,517	74,660	143	76,782	76,930	148
NGFS	MTA	207838	22260	10001724-0013	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	8,779	8,781	2	9,055	9,065	10
NGFS	MTA	207838	22260	10001724-0013	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	5,800	5,800	-	6,139	6,175	36
NGFS	MTA	207839	22260	10001724-0013	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	5,123,031	5,127,223	4,192	5,315,494	5,319,820	4,326
NGFS	MTA	207839	22260	10001724-0013	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	927,838	928,600	762	760,757	761,379	622
NGFS	MTA	207839	22260	10001724-0013	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	468,730	468,990	260	480,531	480,799	268
NGFS	MTA	207839	22260	10001724-0013	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	109,997	110,059	62	112,774	112,836	62
NGFS	MTA	207839	22260	10001724-0013	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	164,624	164,931	307	174,488	174,814	326
NGFS	MTA	207839	22260	10001724-0013	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	46,981	47,007	26	48,199	48,227	28
NGFS	MTA	207839	22260	10001724-0013	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	28,855	28,871	16	29,591	29,607	16

**Technical Adjustments for May 1 Departments
FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24**

GFS Type	Dept Grp	Dept ID	Fund	Project-Activity	Authority	Account - Title	FY 2022-23 May 1 Proposed	FY 2022-23 Updated	Variance FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24 May 1 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Updated	Variance FY 2023-24
NGFS	MTA	207839	22260	10001724-0013	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	676,861	678,096	1,235	717,458	718,767	1,309
NGFS	MTA	207839	22260	10001724-0013	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	57,234	57,338	104	58,974	59,082	108
NGFS	MTA	207839	22260	10001724-0013	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	7,582	7,586	4	7,793	7,797	4
NGFS	MTA	207840	22260	10001724-0013	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	18,330,800	18,364,336	33,536	19,033,343	19,097,017	63,674
NGFS	MTA	207840	22260	10001724-0013	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	3,318,794	3,324,890	6,096	2,724,005	2,733,074	9,069
NGFS	MTA	207840	22260	10001724-0013	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	1,246,435	1,248,515	2,080	1,289,798	1,293,290	3,492
NGFS	MTA	207840	22260	10001724-0013	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	292,122	292,618	496	302,276	303,194	918
NGFS	MTA	207840	22260	10001724-0013	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	521,600	522,826	1,226	552,821	554,121	1,300
NGFS	MTA	207840	22260	10001724-0013	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	124,757	124,965	208	129,188	129,593	405
NGFS	MTA	207840	22260	10001724-0013	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	76,640	76,768	128	79,310	79,550	240
NGFS	MTA	207840	22260	10001724-0013	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	2,443,487	2,448,420	4,933	2,590,056	2,595,285	5,229
NGFS	MTA	207840	22260	10001724-0013	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	201,420	201,838	418	207,546	207,977	431
NGFS	MTA	207840	22260	10001724-0013	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	20,126	20,158	32	20,895	20,955	60
NGFS	MTA	207840	22260	10001724-0013	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	10,314	10,314	-	11,090	11,150	60
NGFS	MTA	207843	22260	10001724-0012	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	5,604,645	5,619,673	15,028	5,835,491	5,979,263	143,772
NGFS	MTA	207843	22260	10001724-0012	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	1,003,474	1,006,138	2,664	825,063	845,470	20,407
NGFS	MTA	207843	22260	10001724-0012	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	414,252	414,252	-	428,456	435,821	7,365
NGFS	MTA	207843	22260	10001724-0012	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	97,243	97,459	216	100,569	102,662	2,093
NGFS	MTA	207843	22260	10001724-0012	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	92,367	92,880	513	97,884	98,428	544
NGFS	MTA	207843	22260	10001724-0012	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	41,537	41,631	94	42,983	43,874	891
NGFS	MTA	207843	22260	10001724-0012	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	25,530	25,586	56	26,375	26,935	560
NGFS	MTA	207843	22260	10001724-0012	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	806,142	808,208	2,066	854,504	856,694	2,190
NGFS	MTA	207843	22260	10001724-0012	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	61,170	61,346	176	63,018	63,199	181
NGFS	MTA	207843	22260	10001724-0012	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	6,684	6,700	16	6,933	7,068	135
NGFS	MTA	207843	22260	10001724-0012	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	19,809	19,867	58	20,643	21,218	575
NGFS	MTA	207845	22260	10001724-0012	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	4,470,458	4,470,458	-	4,658,833	4,747,477	88,644
NGFS	MTA	207845	22260	10001724-0012	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	802,803	802,803	-	661,356	674,016	12,660
NGFS	MTA	207845	22260	10001724-0012	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	357,162	357,162	-	368,780	373,905	5,125
NGFS	MTA	207845	22260	10001724-0012	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	83,717	83,717	-	86,431	87,723	1,292
NGFS	MTA	207845	22260	10001724-0012	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	76,469	76,924	455	81,036	81,518	482
NGFS	MTA	207845	22260	10001724-0012	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	35,759	35,759	-	36,940	37,488	548
NGFS	MTA	207845	22260	10001724-0012	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	21,976	21,976	-	22,668	23,015	347
NGFS	MTA	207845	22260	10001724-0012	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	656,270	658,099	1,829	695,641	697,580	1,939
NGFS	MTA	207845	22260	10001724-0012	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	49,864	50,019	155	51,371	51,531	160
NGFS	MTA	207845	22260	10001724-0012	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	5,757	5,757	-	5,960	6,041	81
NGFS	MTA	207845	22260	10001724-0012	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	14,635	14,635	-	15,279	15,633	354
NGFS	MTA	207862	22260	10001724-0009	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	4,562,078	4,571,974	9,896	7,061,076	7,127,461	66,385
NGFS	MTA	207862	22260	10001724-0009	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	819,767	821,521	1,754	1,002,166	1,011,471	9,305
NGFS	MTA	207862	22260	10001724-0009	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	270,442	270,682	240	424,425	427,105	2,680
NGFS	MTA	207862	22260	10001724-0009	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	66,499	66,643	144	102,741	103,707	966
NGFS	MTA	207862	22260	10001724-0009	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	109,104	109,368	264	165,810	166,090	280

**Technical Adjustments for May 1 Departments
FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24**

GFS Type	Dept Grp	Dept ID	Fund	Project-Activity	Authority	Account - Title	FY 2022-23 May 1 Proposed	FY 2022-23 Updated	Variance FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24 May 1 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Updated	Variance FY 2023-24
NGFS	MTA	207862	22260	10001724-0009	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	28,414	28,476	62	43,898	44,312	414
NGFS	MTA	207862	22260	10001724-0009	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	17,453	17,489	36	26,949	27,202	253
NGFS	MTA	207862	22260	10001724-0009	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	526,090	527,149	1,059	872,974	874,096	1,122
NGFS	MTA	207862	22260	10001724-0009	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	42,744	42,834	90	68,169	68,261	92
NGFS	MTA	207862	22260	10001724-0009	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	4,586	4,596	10	7,091	7,156	65
NGFS	MTA	207862	22260	10001724-0009	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	7,071	7,105	34	11,617	11,817	200
NGFS	MTA	207863	22260	10001724-0009	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	1,367,601	1,375,115	7,514	1,418,759	1,432,978	14,219
NGFS	MTA	207863	22260	10001724-0009	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	247,156	248,488	1,332	202,420	204,398	1,978
NGFS	MTA	207863	22260	10001724-0009	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	25,745	25,853	108	26,482	26,689	207
NGFS	MTA	207863	22260	10001724-0009	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	20,787	20,869	82	22,028	22,116	88
NGFS	MTA	207863	22260	10001724-0009	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	11,002	11,049	47	11,313	11,401	88
NGFS	MTA	207863	22260	10001724-0009	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	6,752	6,780	28	6,947	7,000	53
NGFS	MTA	207863	22260	10001724-0009	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	168,303	168,634	331	178,400	178,751	351
NGFS	MTA	207863	22260	10001724-0009	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	12,879	12,907	28	13,268	13,297	29
NGFS	MTA	207863	22260	10001724-0009	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	1,773	1,781	8	1,823	1,837	14
NGFS	MTA	207863	22260	10001724-0009	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	3,900	3,929	29	4,052	4,107	55
NGFS	MTA	207866	22260	10001724-0014	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	805,151	805,151	-	843,112	861,232	18,120
NGFS	MTA	207866	22260	10001724-0014	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	147,594	147,594	-	121,958	124,566	2,608
NGFS	MTA	207866	22260	10001724-0014	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	103,533	103,533	-	105,889	107,017	1,128
NGFS	MTA	207866	22260	10001724-0014	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	24,216	24,216	-	24,763	25,027	264
NGFS	MTA	207866	22260	10001724-0014	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	15,144	15,290	146	16,049	16,203	154
NGFS	MTA	207866	22260	10001724-0014	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	10,344	10,344	-	10,584	10,696	112
NGFS	MTA	207866	22260	10001724-0014	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	6,355	6,355	-	6,494	6,566	72
NGFS	MTA	207866	22260	10001724-0014	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	131,677	132,261	584	139,576	140,195	619
NGFS	MTA	207866	22260	10001724-0014	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	9,969	10,019	50	10,271	10,322	51
NGFS	MTA	207866	22260	10001724-0014	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	1,667	1,667	-	1,708	1,724	16
NGFS	MTA	207866	22260	10001724-0014	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	2,716	2,716	-	2,850	2,922	72
NGFS	MTA	207868	22260	10001724-0014	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	13,633,384	13,656,827	23,443	14,145,073	14,419,519	274,446
NGFS	MTA	207868	22260	10001724-0014	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	2,459,485	2,463,684	4,199	2,013,253	2,052,329	39,076
NGFS	MTA	207868	22260	10001724-0014	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	1,041,580	1,042,105	525	1,073,186	1,088,478	15,292
NGFS	MTA	207868	22260	10001724-0014	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	244,062	244,403	341	251,424	255,419	3,995
NGFS	MTA	207868	22260	10001724-0014	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	255,684	256,542	858	270,979	271,888	909
NGFS	MTA	207868	22260	10001724-0014	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	104,260	104,404	144	107,457	109,153	1,696
NGFS	MTA	207868	22260	10001724-0014	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	64,064	64,155	91	65,943	67,017	1,074
NGFS	MTA	207868	22260	10001724-0014	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	1,870,948	1,874,397	3,449	1,983,186	1,986,843	3,657
NGFS	MTA	207868	22260	10001724-0014	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	144,205	144,498	293	148,559	148,860	301
NGFS	MTA	207868	22260	10001724-0014	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	16,786	16,812	26	17,340	17,597	257
NGFS	MTA	207868	22260	10001724-0014	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	50,829	50,887	58	52,740	53,804	1,064
NGFS	MTA	207869	22260	10001724-0014	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	4,375,792	4,406,868	31,076	4,555,608	4,615,547	59,939
NGFS	MTA	207869	22260	10001724-0014	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	787,411	793,041	5,630	648,813	657,371	8,558
NGFS	MTA	207869	22260	10001724-0014	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	323,571	325,041	1,470	334,668	337,691	3,023

**Technical Adjustments for May 1 Departments
FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24**

GFS Type	Dept Grp	Dept ID	Fund	Project-Activity	Authority	Account - Title	FY 2022-23 May 1 Proposed	FY 2022-23 Updated	Variance FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24 May 1 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Updated	Variance FY 2023-24
NGFS	MTA	207869	22260	10001724-0014	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	75,832	76,290	458	78,423	79,291	868
NGFS	MTA	207869	22260	10001724-0014	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	96,907	97,280	373	102,706	103,101	395
NGFS	MTA	207869	22260	10001724-0014	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	32,398	32,585	187	33,519	33,880	361
NGFS	MTA	207869	22260	10001724-0014	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	19,888	20,014	126	20,578	20,815	237
NGFS	MTA	207869	22260	10001724-0014	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	621,327	622,826	1,499	658,599	660,188	1,589
NGFS	MTA	207869	22260	10001724-0014	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	48,593	48,720	127	50,065	50,196	131
NGFS	MTA	207869	22260	10001724-0014	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	5,225	5,261	36	5,407	5,468	61
NGFS	MTA	207869	22260	10001724-0014	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	9,700	9,729	29	10,166	10,302	136
NGFS	MTA	207870	22260	10001724-0014	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	102,177	102,177	-	105,786	108,051	2,265
NGFS	MTA	207870	22260	10001724-0014	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	18,602	18,602	-	15,224	15,550	326
NGFS	MTA	207870	22260	10001724-0014	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	21,707	21,707	-	21,931	22,072	141
NGFS	MTA	207870	22260	10001724-0014	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	5,077	5,077	-	5,129	5,162	33
NGFS	MTA	207870	22260	10001724-0014	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	1,822	1,826	4	1,931	1,935	4
NGFS	MTA	207870	22260	10001724-0014	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	2,170	2,170	-	2,193	2,207	14
NGFS	MTA	207870	22260	10001724-0014	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	1,332	1,332	-	1,345	1,354	9
NGFS	MTA	207870	22260	10001724-0014	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	15,239	15,255	16	16,153	16,170	17
NGFS	MTA	207870	22260	10001724-0014	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	1,163	1,164	1	1,198	1,199	1
NGFS	MTA	207870	22260	10001724-0014	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	350	350	-	354	356	2
NGFS	MTA	207870	22260	10001724-0014	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	398	398	-	412	421	9
NGFS	MTA	207873	22260	10001724-0014	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	447,676	447,676	-	462,112	471,172	9,060
NGFS	MTA	207873	22260	10001724-0014	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	81,471	81,471	-	66,482	67,786	1,304
NGFS	MTA	207873	22260	10001724-0014	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	31,416	31,416	-	32,312	32,876	564
NGFS	MTA	207873	22260	10001724-0014	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	7,348	7,348	-	7,555	7,687	132
NGFS	MTA	207873	22260	10001724-0014	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	3,138	3,138	-	3,230	3,286	56
NGFS	MTA	207873	22260	10001724-0014	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	1,930	1,930	-	1,982	2,018	36
NGFS	MTA	207873	22260	10001724-0014	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	65,472	65,473	1	69,400	69,401	1
NGFS	MTA	207873	22260	10001724-0014	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	505	505	-	521	529	8
NGFS	MTA	207873	22260	10001724-0014	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	1,745	1,745	-	1,801	1,837	36
NGFS	MTA	207877	22260	10001724-0010	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	2,477,582	2,477,582	-	2,569,927	2,590,312	20,385
NGFS	MTA	207877	22260	10001724-0010	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	451,068	451,068	-	369,837	372,771	2,934
NGFS	MTA	207877	22260	10001724-0010	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	258,969	258,969	-	264,704	265,973	1,269
NGFS	MTA	207877	22260	10001724-0010	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	60,566	60,566	-	61,907	62,204	297
NGFS	MTA	207877	22260	10001724-0010	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	47,237	47,392	155	50,058	50,222	164
NGFS	MTA	207877	22260	10001724-0010	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	25,873	25,873	-	26,448	26,574	126
NGFS	MTA	207877	22260	10001724-0010	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	15,898	15,898	-	16,238	16,319	81
NGFS	MTA	207877	22260	10001724-0010	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	346,826	347,447	621	367,633	368,292	659
NGFS	MTA	207877	22260	10001724-0010	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	26,816	26,869	53	27,629	27,683	54
NGFS	MTA	207877	22260	10001724-0010	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	4,169	4,169	-	4,269	4,287	18
NGFS	MTA	207877	22260	10001724-0010	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	4,421	4,421	-	4,611	4,692	81
NGFS	MTA	207878	22260	10001724-0010	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	1,147,369	1,147,369	-	1,191,250	1,216,165	24,915
NGFS	MTA	207878	22260	10001724-0010	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	208,888	208,888	-	171,431	175,017	3,586

**Technical Adjustments for May 1 Departments
FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24**

GFS Type	Dept Grp	Dept ID	Fund	Project-Activity	Authority	Account - Title	FY 2022-23 May 1 Proposed	FY 2022-23 Updated	Variance FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24 May 1 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Updated	Variance FY 2023-24
NGFS	MTA	207878	22260	10001724-0010	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	71,133	71,133	-	73,857	75,408	1,551
NGFS	MTA	207878	22260	10001724-0010	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	16,638	16,638	-	17,270	17,633	363
NGFS	MTA	207878	22260	10001724-0010	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	19,175	19,260	85	20,321	20,411	90
NGFS	MTA	207878	22260	10001724-0010	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	7,104	7,104	-	7,382	7,536	154
NGFS	MTA	207878	22260	10001724-0010	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	4,369	4,369	-	4,528	4,627	99
NGFS	MTA	207878	22260	10001724-0010	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	172,054	172,396	342	182,376	182,739	363
NGFS	MTA	207878	22260	10001724-0010	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	13,036	13,065	29	13,429	13,459	30
NGFS	MTA	207878	22260	10001724-0010	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	1,143	1,143	-	1,191	1,213	22
NGFS	MTA	207878	22260	10001724-0010	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	4,471	4,471	-	4,641	4,740	99
NGFS	MTA	210672	22260	10001724-0014	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	5,343,309	5,343,309	-	5,544,612	5,651,748	107,136
NGFS	MTA	210672	22260	10001724-0014	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	962,409	962,409	-	787,197	802,453	15,256
NGFS	MTA	210672	22260	10001724-0014	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	356,069	356,069	-	368,567	375,227	6,660
NGFS	MTA	210672	22260	10001724-0014	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	83,287	83,287	-	86,181	87,741	1,560
NGFS	MTA	210672	22260	10001724-0014	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	81,667	82,027	360	86,546	86,927	381
NGFS	MTA	210672	22260	10001724-0014	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	35,577	35,577	-	36,833	37,497	664
NGFS	MTA	210672	22260	10001724-0014	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	21,866	21,866	-	22,601	23,021	420
NGFS	MTA	210672	22260	10001724-0014	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	731,926	733,372	1,446	775,837	777,369	1,532
NGFS	MTA	210672	22260	10001724-0014	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	55,461	55,583	122	57,135	57,261	126
NGFS	MTA	210672	22260	10001724-0014	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	5,723	5,723	-	5,942	6,042	100
NGFS	MTA	210672	22260	10001724-0014	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	20,822	20,822	-	21,604	22,036	432
NGFS	MTA	210673	22260	10001724-0014	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	822,409	822,409	-	848,816	860,141	11,325
NGFS	MTA	210673	22260	10001724-0014	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	149,727	149,727	-	122,152	123,782	1,630
NGFS	MTA	210673	22260	10001724-0014	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	50,987	50,987	-	52,627	53,332	705
NGFS	MTA	210673	22260	10001724-0014	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	11,926	11,926	-	12,306	12,471	165
NGFS	MTA	210673	22260	10001724-0014	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	5,094	5,094	-	5,259	5,329	70
NGFS	MTA	210673	22260	10001724-0014	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	3,130	3,130	-	3,227	3,272	45
NGFS	MTA	210673	22260	10001724-0014	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	820	820	-	848	858	10
NGFS	MTA	210673	22260	10001724-0014	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	3,206	3,206	-	3,308	3,353	45
NGFS	MTA	208650	22260	10001719-0023	10000	520190 - Department Overhead	153,173,670	154,103,064	929,394	159,131,458	160,366,475	1,235,017
NGFS	MTA	208655	22265	10001719-0023	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	1	47,577	47,576	-	111,924	111,924
NGFS	MTA	208655	22265	10001719-0023	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	(14,738)	(6,905)	7,833	(15,940)	(955)	14,985
NGFS	MTA	208655	22265	10001719-0023	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	(16,995)	(14,692)	2,303	(17,688)	(13,275)	4,413
NGFS	MTA	208655	22265	10001719-0023	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	8	701	693	(19)	1,606	1,625
NGFS	MTA	208655	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	172,511	177,755	5,244	170,077	175,813	5,736
NGFS	MTA	208655	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	5	298	293	8	701	693
NGFS	MTA	208655	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	7	183	176	7	432	425
NGFS	MTA	208655	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	(42,192)	(21,112)	21,080	(96,245)	(73,183)	23,062
NGFS	MTA	208655	22265	10001719-0023	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	3,234	5,020	1,786	(902)	998	1,900
NGFS	MTA	208655	22265	10001719-0023	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	(20)	28	48	6	115	109
NGFS	MTA	208655	22265	10001719-0023	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	(5,099)	(4,926)	173	(5,283)	(4,864)	419
NGFS	MTA	208656	22870	10001719-0001	10000	492001 - CTI Fr 1G-General Fund	108,510,000	108,530,000	20,000	116,640,000	116,760,000	120,000

**Technical Adjustments for May 1 Departments
FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24**

GFS Type	Dept Grp	Dept ID	Fund	Project-Activity	Authority	Account - Title	FY 2022-23 May 1 Proposed	FY 2022-23 Updated	Variance FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24 May 1 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Updated	Variance FY 2023-24
NGFS	MTA	208656	22870	10001719-0001	10000	591340 - OTO To 5M-MTA Transit Fund	189,381,312	188,904,691	(476,621)	161,278,094	160,598,854	(679,240)
NGFS	MTA	208656	22870	10001723-0001	10000	520190 - Department Overhead	34,295,000	34,499,873	204,873	35,635,089	35,899,919	264,830
NGFS	MTA	208656	22870	10001723-0001	10000	581210 - DT Technology Infrastructure	1,537,879	1,569,070	31,191	1,674,407	1,723,597	49,190
NGFS	MTA	208657	22260	10001719-0001	10000	492001 - CTI Fr 1G-General Fund	305,910,000	305,980,000	70,000	328,600,000	328,930,000	330,000
NGFS	MTA	208657	22260	10001719-0001	10000	493001 - OTI Fr 1G-General Fund	64,150,000	64,140,000	(10,000)	66,040,000	66,040,000	-
NGFS	MTA	208657	22260	10001719-0001	10000	493032 - OTI Fr 5N-MTA SM&Sustainat	189,381,312	188,904,691	(476,621)	161,278,094	160,598,854	(679,240)
NGFS	MTA	208657	22260	10001719-0023	10000	519990 - Other Fringe Benefits	8,560,319	5,381,277	(3,179,042)	11,698,746	2,089,252	(9,609,494)
NGFS	MTA	208657	22260	10001719-0023	10000	579990 - Allocated Chrgs-Spec Sources	(172,532,319)	(172,545,045)	(12,726)	(184,505,630)	(184,543,505)	(37,875)
NGFS	MTA	208657	22260	10001719-0024	10000	495025 - ITI Fr 5M-MTA Transit Funds	7,851,000	7,847,729	(3,271)	10,226,000	10,221,967	(4,033)
NGFS	MTA	208657	22265	10001719-0023	10000	520100 - Overhead Recovery	(187,481,396)	(188,602,937)	(1,121,541)	(194,804,422)	(196,266,294)	(1,461,872)
NGFS	MTA	208657	22265	10001719-0023	10000	581073 - Sr-DPW-General Administratio	39,520	44,087	4,567	41,063	45,630	4,567
NGFS	MTA	208657	22265	10001719-0023	10000	581130 - GF-Con-Internal Audits	566,551	565,606	(945)	597,987	597,058	(929)
NGFS	MTA	208657	22265	10001719-0023	10000	581210 - DT Technology Infrastructure	12,437,743	12,690,003	252,260	13,541,930	13,939,753	397,823
NGFS	MTA	208657	22265	10001719-0023	10000	581245 - GF-CON-Information System C	3,640,788	3,592,472	(48,316)	3,666,530	3,615,353	(51,177)
NGFS	MTA	208657	22265	10001719-0023	10000	581360 - DT Telecommunications Servic	1,451,452	1,451,452	-	1,451,452	1,467,047	15,595
NGFS	MTA	208657	22265	10001719-0023	10000	581450 - GF-HR-Mgmt Training	150,000	100,000	(50,000)	150,000	100,000	(50,000)
NGFS	MTA	208657	22265	10001719-0023	10000	581870 - GF-City Hall Fellows Program	222,000	230,000	8,000	250,000	230,000	(20,000)
NGFS	MTA	208657	22481	10036279-0001	21331	493009 - OTI Fr 2S/GSF-General Svcs f	7,851,000	7,847,729	(3,271)	10,226,000	10,221,967	(4,033)
NGFS	MTA	208657	22481	10036279-0001	21331	595250 - ITO To 5M-MTA Transit Funds	7,851,000	7,847,729	(3,271)	10,226,000	10,221,967	(4,033)
NGFS	MTA	175645	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	57,082	57,125	43	66,585	66,631	46
NGFS	MTA	175645	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	139,895	140,069	174	164,162	164,346	184
NGFS	MTA	175645	22265	10001719-0023	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	12,828	12,842	14	14,610	14,625	15
NGFS	MTA	207773	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	11,088	11,247	159	11,753	11,921	168
NGFS	MTA	207773	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	8,124	8,763	639	8,612	9,289	677
NGFS	MTA	207773	22265	10001719-0023	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	1,085	1,139	54	1,118	1,174	56
NGFS	MTA	207774	22265	10001719-0023	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	2,344,771	2,352,135	7,364	2,613,004	2,622,680	9,676
NGFS	MTA	207774	22265	10001719-0023	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	419,787	421,092	1,305	368,218	369,563	1,345
NGFS	MTA	207774	22265	10001719-0023	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	138,338	138,568	230	152,330	152,330	-
NGFS	MTA	207774	22265	10001719-0023	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	34,031	34,138	107	37,916	38,057	141
NGFS	MTA	207774	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	76,780	76,807	27	88,438	88,467	29
NGFS	MTA	207774	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	14,540	14,586	46	16,199	16,259	60
NGFS	MTA	207774	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	8,930	8,958	28	9,955	9,992	37
NGFS	MTA	207774	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	202,416	202,527	111	233,135	233,254	119
NGFS	MTA	207774	22265	10001719-0023	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	18,364	18,373	9	20,548	20,558	10
NGFS	MTA	207774	22265	10001719-0023	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	2,347	2,355	8	2,615	2,625	10
NGFS	MTA	207774	22265	10001719-0023	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	6,312	6,338	26	7,202	7,236	34
NGFS	MTA	207775	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	32,672	32,673	1	34,633	34,635	2
NGFS	MTA	207775	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	76,296	76,300	4	80,871	80,876	5
NGFS	MTA	175656	22870	10001728-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	85,023	85,189	166	96,360	96,536	176
NGFS	MTA	175656	22870	10001728-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	234,666	235,335	669	265,275	265,984	709
NGFS	MTA	175656	22870	10001728-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	21,205	21,262	57	23,287	23,345	58

**Technical Adjustments for May 1 Departments
FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24**

GFS Type	Dept Grp	Dept ID	Fund	Project-Activity	Authority	Account - Title	FY 2022-23 May 1 Proposed	FY 2022-23 Updated	Variance FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24 May 1 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Updated	Variance FY 2023-24
NGFS	MTA	175656	22870	10001728-0001	10000	581130 - GF-Con-Internal Audits	20,822	20,787	(35)	21,977	21,943	(34)
NGFS	MTA	175656	22870	10001728-0001	10000	581210 - DT Technology Infrastructure	26,887	17,590	(9,297)	43,275	19,323	(23,952)
NGFS	MTA	175656	22870	10001728-0001	10000	581360 - DT Telecommunications Serv	3,663	3,663	-	3,663	3,703	40
NGFS	MTA	175657	22260	10001727-0023	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	40,705	40,784	79	45,257	45,341	84
NGFS	MTA	175657	22260	10001727-0023	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	94,493	94,812	319	106,012	106,350	338
NGFS	MTA	175657	22260	10001727-0023	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	8,763	8,790	27	9,537	9,565	28
NGFS	MTA	210686	22265	10001719-0023	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	355,505	364,880	9,375	586,965	596,641	9,676
NGFS	MTA	210686	22265	10001719-0023	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	59,391	61,052	1,661	78,962	80,307	1,345
NGFS	MTA	210686	22265	10001719-0023	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	5,154	5,290	136	8,510	8,651	141
NGFS	MTA	210686	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	10,545	10,943	398	16,707	17,052	345
NGFS	MTA	210686	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	2,202	2,260	58	3,635	3,695	60
NGFS	MTA	210686	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	1,352	1,388	36	2,233	2,270	37
NGFS	MTA	210686	22265	10001719-0023	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	(12,246)	(10,648)	1,598	9,244	10,628	1,384
NGFS	MTA	210686	22265	10001719-0023	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	(414)	(280)	134	1,406	1,520	114
NGFS	MTA	210686	22265	10001719-0023	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	356	366	10	588	598	10
NGFS	MTA	210686	22265	10001719-0023	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	(353)	(320)	33	494	528	34
NGFS	PRT	232116	23680	10026769-0001	10000	597095 - General Reserve	4,377,274	4,050,357	(326,917)	3,316,174	2,995,197	(320,977)
NGFS	PRT	210647	23680	10026768-0001	10000	501000 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Budget	(2,611)	-	2,611	(2,611)	-	2,611
NGFS	PRT	210647	23680	10026768-0001	10000	513000 - Retirement - Budget	274,084	-	(274,084)	274,084	-	(274,084)
NGFS	PRT	210647	23680	10026770-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	(7,790)	(7,637)	153	(7,283)	(7,121)	162
NGFS	PRT	210647	23680	10026770-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	(35,345)	(34,728)	617	(34,766)	(34,112)	654
NGFS	PRT	210647	23680	10026770-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	(2,957)	(2,905)	52	(2,811)	(2,757)	54
NGFS	PRT	210651	23680	10026768-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	8,903	8,779	(124)	-	-	-
NGFS	PRT	210651	23680	10026768-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	32,478	32,478	-	44,067	43,932	(135)
NGFS	PRT	210651	23680	10026768-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	35,803	35,304	(499)	-	-	-
NGFS	PRT	210651	23680	10026768-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	98,415	98,415	-	143,082	142,542	(540)
NGFS	PRT	210651	23680	10026768-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	3,038	2,995	(43)	-	-	-
NGFS	PRT	210651	23680	10026768-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	8,887	8,887	-	12,352	12,307	(45)
NGFS	PRT	109743	23680	10026771-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	3,250	3,205	(45)	-	-	-
NGFS	PRT	109743	23680	10026771-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	32,745	32,932	187	38,229	38,377	148
NGFS	PRT	109743	23680	10026771-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	13,070	12,887	(183)	-	-	-
NGFS	PRT	109743	23680	10026771-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	74,683	75,434	751	93,316	93,913	597
NGFS	PRT	109743	23680	10026771-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	1,109	1,093	(16)	-	-	-
NGFS	PRT	109743	23680	10026771-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	7,043	7,107	64	8,424	8,473	49
NGFS	PRT	109747	23680	10026771-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	4,324	4,264	(60)	-	-	-
NGFS	PRT	109747	23680	10026771-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	43,468	43,477	9	50,760	50,704	(56)
NGFS	PRT	109747	23680	10026771-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	17,390	17,148	(242)	-	-	-
NGFS	PRT	109747	23680	10026771-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	91,920	91,954	34	116,259	116,034	(225)
NGFS	PRT	109747	23680	10026771-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	1,475	1,455	(20)	-	-	-
NGFS	PRT	109747	23680	10026771-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	8,686	8,689	3	10,500	10,482	(18)
NGFS	PRT	109748	23680	10026771-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	10,427	10,510	83	11,052	11,140	88

**Technical Adjustments for May 1 Departments
FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24**

GFS Type	Dept Grp	Dept ID	Fund	Project-Activity	Authority	Account - Title	FY 2022-23 May 1 Proposed	FY 2022-23 Updated	Variance FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24 May 1 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Updated	Variance FY 2023-24
NGFS	PRT	109748	23680	10026771-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	23,874	24,207	333	25,307	25,660	353
NGFS	PRT	109748	23680	10026771-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	2,271	2,299	28	2,340	2,369	29
NGFS	PRT	167644	24530	10024236-0003	17321	436760 - Maritime Related	5,390,897	5,390,650	(247)	5,557,242	5,556,972	(270)
NGFS	PRT	167644	24530	10024236-0003	17321	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	0	118,747	118,747	-	-	-
NGFS	PRT	167644	24530	10024236-0003	17321	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	1,102,070	1,102,070	-	1,137,468	1,258,727	121,259
NGFS	PRT	167644	24530	10024236-0003	17321	513000 - Retirement - Budget	168,958	-	(168,958)	168,958	-	(168,958)
NGFS	PRT	167644	24530	10024236-0003	17321	513010 - Retire City Misc	0	21,619	21,619	-	-	-
NGFS	PRT	167644	24530	10024236-0003	17321	513010 - Retire City Misc	199,889	199,889	-	162,911	180,361	17,450
NGFS	PRT	167644	24530	10024236-0003	17321	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	0	7,362	7,362	-	-	-
NGFS	PRT	167644	24530	10024236-0003	17321	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	67,867	67,867	-	70,020	77,538	7,518
NGFS	PRT	167644	24530	10024236-0003	17321	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	0	1,722	1,722	-	-	-
NGFS	PRT	167644	24530	10024236-0003	17321	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	15,981	15,981	-	16,494	18,252	1,758
NGFS	PRT	167644	24530	10024236-0003	17321	515010 - Health Service-City Match	0	3,262	3,262	-	-	-
NGFS	PRT	167644	24530	10024236-0003	17321	515010 - Health Service-City Match	57,337	57,337	-	60,779	64,309	3,530
NGFS	PRT	167644	24530	10024236-0003	17321	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	0	736	736	-	-	-
NGFS	PRT	167644	24530	10024236-0003	17321	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	6,831	6,831	-	7,050	7,801	751
NGFS	PRT	167644	24530	10024236-0003	17321	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	0	452	452	-	-	-
NGFS	PRT	167644	24530	10024236-0003	17321	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	4,196	4,196	-	4,330	4,791	461
NGFS	PRT	167644	24530	10024236-0003	17321	515710 - Dependent Coverage	0	13,116	13,116	-	-	-
NGFS	PRT	167644	24530	10024236-0003	17321	515710 - Dependent Coverage	121,564	121,564	-	128,853	143,050	14,197
NGFS	PRT	167644	24530	10024236-0003	17321	516010 - Dental Coverage	0	1,113	1,113	-	-	-
NGFS	PRT	167644	24530	10024236-0003	17321	516010 - Dental Coverage	11,500	11,500	-	11,847	13,017	1,170
NGFS	PRT	167644	24530	10024236-0003	17321	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	0	119	119	-	-	-
NGFS	PRT	167644	24530	10024236-0003	17321	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	1,103	1,103	-	1,141	1,262	121
NGFS	PRT	167644	24530	10024236-0003	17321	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	0	463	463	-	-	-
NGFS	PRT	167644	24530	10024236-0003	17321	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	3,286	3,286	-	3,397	3,870	473
NGFS	PRT	109751	23680	10026768-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	909	896	(13)	-	-	-
NGFS	PRT	109751	23680	10026768-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	20,516	20,516	-	22,732	22,718	(14)
NGFS	PRT	109751	23680	10026768-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	3,654	3,603	(51)	-	-	-
NGFS	PRT	109751	23680	10026768-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	40,300	40,300	-	46,672	46,617	(55)
NGFS	PRT	109751	23680	10026768-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	310	306	(4)	-	-	-
NGFS	PRT	109751	23680	10026768-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	3,856	3,856	-	4,298	4,294	(4)
NGFS	PRT	109752	23680	10026768-0001	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	1,222,996	1,250,464	27,468	1,361,835	1,390,189	28,354
NGFS	PRT	109752	23680	10026768-0001	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	218,706	223,604	4,898	191,900	195,873	3,973
NGFS	PRT	109752	23680	10026768-0001	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	70,308	71,938	1,630	78,684	80,289	1,605
NGFS	PRT	109752	23680	10026768-0001	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	17,790	18,190	400	19,805	20,215	410
NGFS	PRT	109752	23680	10026768-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	2,697	2,659	(38)	-	-	-
NGFS	PRT	109752	23680	10026768-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	42,672	42,680	8	48,150	48,118	(32)
NGFS	PRT	109752	23680	10026768-0001	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	7,601	7,773	172	8,462	8,636	174
NGFS	PRT	109752	23680	10026768-0001	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	4,668	4,772	104	5,194	5,302	108
NGFS	PRT	109752	23680	10026768-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	10,844	10,693	(151)	-	-	-

**Technical Adjustments for May 1 Departments
FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24**

GFS Type	Dept Grp	Dept ID	Fund	Project-Activity	Authority	Account - Title	FY 2022-23 May 1 Proposed	FY 2022-23 Updated	Variance FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24 May 1 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Updated	Variance FY 2023-24
NGFS	PRT	109752	23680	10026768-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	90,575	90,608	33	107,747	107,618	(129)
NGFS	PRT	109752	23680	10026768-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	920	907	(13)	-	-	-
NGFS	PRT	109752	23680	10026768-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	8,653	8,656	3	9,882	9,871	(11)
NGFS	PRT	109752	23680	10026768-0001	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	1,225	1,255	30	1,366	1,393	27
NGFS	PRT	109752	23680	10026768-0001	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	3,242	3,350	108	3,735	3,846	111
NGFS	PRT	109752	23680	10026768-0001	10000	581870 - GF-City Hall Fellows Program	0	115,000	115,000	-	-	-
NGFS	PRT	109753	23680	10026768-0001	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	1,463,368	1,483,078	19,710	1,631,983	1,652,326	20,343
NGFS	PRT	109753	23680	10026768-0001	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	259,569	263,062	3,493	227,787	230,616	2,829
NGFS	PRT	109753	23680	10026768-0001	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	21,823	22,109	286	24,267	24,563	296
NGFS	PRT	109753	23680	10026768-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	3,283	3,238	(45)	-	-	-
NGFS	PRT	109753	23680	10026768-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	36,071	36,086	15	41,789	41,755	(34)
NGFS	PRT	109753	23680	10026768-0001	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	9,325	9,447	122	10,371	10,497	126
NGFS	PRT	109753	23680	10026768-0001	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	5,726	5,801	75	6,365	6,442	77
NGFS	PRT	109753	23680	10026768-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	13,203	13,019	(184)	-	-	-
NGFS	PRT	109753	23680	10026768-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	99,854	99,914	60	120,143	120,007	(136)
NGFS	PRT	109753	23680	10026768-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	1,120	1,105	(15)	-	-	-
NGFS	PRT	109753	23680	10026768-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	8,970	8,975	5	10,420	10,408	(12)
NGFS	PRT	109753	23680	10026768-0001	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	1,506	1,526	20	1,674	1,694	20
NGFS	PRT	109753	23680	10026768-0001	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	4,372	4,441	69	4,988	5,059	71
NGFS	PRT	109753	23680	10026768-0001	10000	581210 - DT Technology Infrastructure	814,977	823,895	8,918	877,493	891,560	14,067
NGFS	PRT	109753	23680	10026768-0001	10000	581325 - DT Enterprise Tech Contracts	127,717	127,716	(1)	154,588	154,587	(1)
NGFS	PRT	109753	23680	10026768-0001	10000	581360 - DT Telecommunications Serv	322,818	322,818	-	322,818	323,829	1,011
NGFS	PRT	109754	23680	10026768-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	3,272	3,226	(46)	-	-	-
NGFS	PRT	109754	23680	10026768-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	(9,798)	(9,547)	251	(6,844)	(6,627)	217
NGFS	PRT	109754	23680	10026768-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	13,157	12,973	(184)	-	-	-
NGFS	PRT	109754	23680	10026768-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	(48,428)	(47,420)	1,008	(37,088)	(36,219)	869
NGFS	PRT	109754	23680	10026768-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	1,116	1,101	(15)	-	-	-
NGFS	PRT	109754	23680	10026768-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	(3,986)	(3,901)	85	(2,931)	(2,859)	72
NGFS	PRT	109755	23680	10026768-0001	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	1,876,344	1,890,508	14,164	1,938,156	1,978,160	40,004
NGFS	PRT	109755	23680	10026768-0001	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	338,887	341,465	2,578	276,109	281,871	5,762
NGFS	PRT	109755	23680	10026768-0001	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	109,383	110,261	878	112,910	115,390	2,480
NGFS	PRT	109755	23680	10026768-0001	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	27,262	27,462	200	28,157	28,737	580
NGFS	PRT	109755	23680	10026768-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	4,719	4,654	(65)	-	-	-
NGFS	PRT	109755	23680	10026768-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	64,571	64,590	19	68,445	68,465	20
NGFS	PRT	109755	23680	10026768-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	-	-	-	5,110	5,039	(71)
NGFS	PRT	109755	23680	10026768-0001	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	11,650	11,734	84	12,034	12,280	246
NGFS	PRT	109755	23680	10026768-0001	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	7,149	7,203	54	7,387	7,541	154
NGFS	PRT	109755	23680	10026768-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	18,979	18,714	(265)	-	-	-
NGFS	PRT	109755	23680	10026768-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	161,927	162,002	75	171,644	171,723	79
NGFS	PRT	109755	23680	10026768-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	-	-	-	20,548	20,262	(286)
NGFS	PRT	109755	23680	10026768-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	1,610	1,588	(22)	-	-	-

**Technical Adjustments for May 1 Departments
FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24**

GFS Type	Dept Grp	Dept ID	Fund	Project-Activity	Authority	Account - Title	FY 2022-23 May 1 Proposed	FY 2022-23 Updated	Variance FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24 May 1 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Updated	Variance FY 2023-24
NGFS	PRT	109755	23680	10026768-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	14,780	14,787	7	15,227	15,233	6
NGFS	PRT	109755	23680	10026768-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	-	-	-	1,694	1,670	(24)
NGFS	PRT	109755	23680	10026768-0001	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	1,880	1,896	16	1,943	1,981	38
NGFS	PRT	109755	23680	10026768-0001	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	6,017	6,063	46	6,212	6,356	144
NGFS	PRT	109755	23680	10026768-0001	10000	581130 - GF-Con-Internal Audits	363,186	363,840	654	278,730	279,371	641
NGFS	PRT	109755	23680	10026768-0001	10000	581245 - GF-CON-Information System C	274,594	270,950	(3,644)	276,535	272,675	(3,860)
NGFS	PRT	109756	23680	10026768-0001	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	96,029	286,816	190,787	-	-	-
NGFS	PRT	109756	23680	10026768-0001	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	1,361,274	1,361,274	-	1,503,348	1,698,180	194,832
NGFS	PRT	109756	23680	10026768-0001	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	17,483	52,218	34,735	-	-	-
NGFS	PRT	109756	23680	10026768-0001	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	242,280	242,280	-	210,616	238,654	28,038
NGFS	PRT	109756	23680	10026768-0001	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	5,954	17,783	11,829	-	-	-
NGFS	PRT	109756	23680	10026768-0001	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	76,991	76,991	-	85,411	97,491	12,080
NGFS	PRT	109756	23680	10026768-0001	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	1,392	4,158	2,766	-	-	-
NGFS	PRT	109756	23680	10026768-0001	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	19,739	19,739	-	21,797	24,622	2,825
NGFS	PRT	109756	23680	10026768-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	2,675	7,878	5,203	-	-	-
NGFS	PRT	109756	23680	10026768-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	38,712	38,715	3	43,931	49,567	5,636
NGFS	PRT	109756	23680	10026768-0001	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	595	1,777	1,182	-	-	-
NGFS	PRT	109756	23680	10026768-0001	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	8,434	8,434	-	9,313	10,520	1,207
NGFS	PRT	109756	23680	10026768-0001	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	365	1,091	726	-	-	-
NGFS	PRT	109756	23680	10026768-0001	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	5,178	5,178	-	5,720	6,461	741
NGFS	PRT	109756	23680	10026768-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	10,757	31,680	20,923	-	-	-
NGFS	PRT	109756	23680	10026768-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	102,323	102,336	13	120,108	142,771	22,663
NGFS	PRT	109756	23680	10026768-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	913	2,688	1,775	-	-	-
NGFS	PRT	109756	23680	10026768-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	9,321	9,323	2	10,563	12,432	1,869
NGFS	PRT	109756	23680	10026768-0001	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	96	287	191	-	-	-
NGFS	PRT	109756	23680	10026768-0001	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	1,360	1,360	-	1,503	1,698	195
NGFS	PRT	109756	23680	10026768-0001	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	375	1,119	744	-	-	-
NGFS	PRT	109756	23680	10026768-0001	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	3,036	3,036	-	3,519	4,279	760
NGFS	PRT	125644	23680	10026768-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	(244)	(240)	4	(258)	(255)	3
NGFS	PRT	125644	23680	10026768-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	(980)	(967)	13	(1,039)	(1,025)	14
NGFS	PRT	125644	23680	10026768-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	(83)	(82)	1	(86)	(84)	2
NGFS	PRT	109759	23680	10026769-0001	10000	519010 - Fringe Adjustments-Budget	-	(653)	(653)	-	(640)	(640)
NGFS	PRT	109762	23680	10026769-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	25,783	25,424	(359)	-	-	-
NGFS	PRT	109762	23680	10026769-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	(16,160)	(15,398)	762	10,787	11,206	419
NGFS	PRT	109762	23680	10026769-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	103,682	102,237	(1,445)	-	-	-
NGFS	PRT	109762	23680	10026769-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	(114,418)	(111,352)	3,066	(9,027)	(7,342)	1,685
NGFS	PRT	109762	23680	10026769-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	8,797	8,674	(123)	-	-	-
NGFS	PRT	109762	23680	10026769-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	(9,104)	(8,844)	260	(120)	19	139
NGFS	PRT	109763	23680	10026769-0001	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	950,385	959,418	9,033	980,913	999,893	18,980
NGFS	PRT	109763	23680	10026769-0001	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	172,303	173,942	1,639	140,412	143,133	2,721
NGFS	PRT	109763	23680	10026769-0001	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	58,868	59,342	474	60,736	61,726	990

**Technical Adjustments for May 1 Departments
FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24**

GFS Type	Dept Grp	Dept ID	Fund	Project-Activity	Authority	Account - Title	FY 2022-23 May 1 Proposed	FY 2022-23 Updated	Variance FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24 May 1 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Updated	Variance FY 2023-24
NGFS	PRT	109763	23680	10026769-0001	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	13,779	13,914	135	14,221	14,499	278
NGFS	PRT	109763	23680	10026769-0001	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	5,885	5,942	57	6,077	6,198	121
NGFS	PRT	109763	23680	10026769-0001	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	3,613	3,648	35	3,733	3,804	71
NGFS	PRT	109763	23680	10026769-0001	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	948	961	13	983	998	15
NGFS	PRT	109763	23680	10026769-0001	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	3,705	3,741	36	3,826	3,898	72
NGFS	PRT	109764	23680	10026769-0001	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	918,550	961,327	42,777	948,052	992,200	44,148
NGFS	PRT	109764	23680	10026769-0001	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	166,529	170,375	3,846	135,707	137,994	2,287
NGFS	PRT	109764	23680	10026769-0001	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	56,950	59,438	2,488	58,782	61,324	2,542
NGFS	PRT	109764	23680	10026769-0001	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	13,321	13,937	616	13,749	14,385	636
NGFS	PRT	109764	23680	10026769-0001	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	5,691	5,956	265	5,876	6,149	273
NGFS	PRT	109764	23680	10026769-0001	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	3,494	3,655	161	3,608	3,776	168
NGFS	PRT	109764	23680	10026769-0001	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	920	962	42	948	991	43
NGFS	PRT	109764	23680	10026769-0001	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	3,580	3,748	168	3,694	3,869	175
NGFS	PRT	109765	23680	10026769-0001	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	533,749	537,115	3,366	550,890	554,366	3,476
NGFS	PRT	109765	23680	10026769-0001	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	96,447	97,061	614	78,528	79,028	500
NGFS	PRT	109765	23680	10026769-0001	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	33,008	33,218	210	34,045	34,259	214
NGFS	PRT	109765	23680	10026769-0001	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	7,739	7,789	50	7,987	8,037	50
NGFS	PRT	109765	23680	10026769-0001	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	3,307	3,327	20	3,413	3,433	20
NGFS	PRT	109765	23680	10026769-0001	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	2,030	2,044	14	2,096	2,110	14
NGFS	PRT	109765	23680	10026769-0001	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	534	538	4	550	554	4
NGFS	PRT	109777	23680	10026769-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	6,841	6,933	92	7,256	7,353	97
NGFS	PRT	109777	23680	10026769-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	47,350	47,719	369	50,189	50,580	391
NGFS	PRT	109777	23680	10026769-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	3,675	3,707	32	3,788	3,820	32
NGFS	PRT	109785	23680	10026768-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	1,982	1,954	(28)	-	-	-
NGFS	PRT	109785	23680	10026768-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	14,650	14,829	179	17,676	17,836	160
NGFS	PRT	109785	23680	10026768-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	7,970	7,859	(111)	-	-	-
NGFS	PRT	109785	23680	10026768-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	15,400	16,121	721	24,952	25,596	644
NGFS	PRT	109785	23680	10026768-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	676	667	(9)	-	-	-
NGFS	PRT	109785	23680	10026768-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	1,907	1,969	62	2,677	2,731	54
NGFS	PRT	109787	23680	10026768-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	705	695	(10)	-	-	-
NGFS	PRT	109787	23680	10026768-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	8,098	8,098	-	9,347	9,336	(11)
NGFS	PRT	109787	23680	10026768-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	2,833	2,794	(39)	-	-	-
NGFS	PRT	109787	23680	10026768-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	24,844	24,844	-	29,401	29,359	(42)
NGFS	PRT	109787	23680	10026768-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	240	237	(3)	-	-	-
NGFS	PRT	109787	23680	10026768-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	2,246	2,246	-	2,567	2,563	(4)
NGFS	PRT	109789	23680	10026768-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	442	436	(6)	-	-	-
NGFS	PRT	109789	23680	10026768-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	8,184	8,184	-	9,154	9,147	(7)
NGFS	PRT	109789	23680	10026768-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	1,778	1,753	(25)	-	-	-
NGFS	PRT	109789	23680	10026768-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	23,883	23,883	-	27,241	27,214	(27)
NGFS	PRT	109789	23680	10026768-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	151	149	(2)	-	-	-
NGFS	PRT	109789	23680	10026768-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	2,149	2,149	-	2,373	2,371	(2)

**Technical Adjustments for May 1 Departments
FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24**

GFS Type	Dept Grp	Dept ID	Fund	Project-Activity	Authority	Account - Title	FY 2022-23 May 1 Proposed	FY 2022-23 Updated	Variance FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24 May 1 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Updated	Variance FY 2023-24	
NGFS	PRT	109792	23680	10026771-0001	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	2,391,439	2,438,962	47,523	2,800,491	2,900,734	100,243	
NGFS	PRT	109792	23680	10026771-0001	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	420,067	428,487	8,420	387,052	400,998	13,946	
NGFS	PRT	109792	23680	10026771-0001	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	36,357	37,047	690	42,281	43,740	1,459	
NGFS	PRT	109792	23680	10026771-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	14,122	14,013	(109)	8,522	8,522	-	
NGFS	PRT	109792	23680	10026771-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	49,365	49,900	535	60,844	61,292	448	
NGFS	PRT	109792	23680	10026771-0001	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	15,535	15,833	298	18,068	18,687	619	
NGFS	PRT	109792	23680	10026771-0001	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	9,545	9,716	171	11,098	11,479	381	
NGFS	PRT	109792	23680	10026771-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	50,478	50,037	(441)	25,671	25,671	-	
NGFS	PRT	109792	23680	10026771-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	85,924	88,075	2,151	125,344	127,146	1,802	
NGFS	PRT	109792	23680	10026771-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	4,362	4,324	(38)	2,220	2,220	-	
NGFS	PRT	109792	23680	10026771-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	8,487	8,669	182	11,570	11,719	149	
NGFS	PRT	109792	23680	10026771-0001	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	2,511	2,555	44	2,919	3,018	99	
NGFS	PRT	109792	23680	10026771-0001	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	7,088	7,252	164	8,610	8,964	354	
NGFS	PRT	110644	23680	10026771-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	21,616	21,623	7	22,911	22,918	7	
NGFS	PRT	110644	23680	10026771-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	73,350	73,379	29	77,753	77,783	30	
NGFS	PRT	110644	23680	10026771-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	6,416	6,418	2	6,607	6,609	2	
NGFS	PUC	198644	24750	10026777-0001	10000	495045 - ITI Fr 5Q-Cleanpowersf Funds	29,881,078	29,964,409	83,331	30,251,691	30,313,186	61,495	
NGFS	PUC	198644	24750	10026777-0001	10000	501000 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Budget	(4,899)	-	4,899	(4,899)	-	4,899	
NGFS	PUC	198644	24750	10026777-0001	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	4,895,162	4,914,469	19,307	5,185,731	5,208,977	23,246	
NGFS	PUC	198644	24750	10026777-0001	10000	513000 - Retirement - Budget	37,781	-	(37,781)	37,781	-	(37,781)	
NGFS	PUC	198644	24750	10026777-0001	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	863,014	866,445	3,431	719,384	722,643	3,259	
NGFS	PUC	198644	24750	10026777-0001	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	342,654	343,186	532	358,505	359,234	729	
NGFS	PUC	198644	24750	10026777-0001	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	89,452	89,732	280	93,593	93,930	337	
NGFS	PUC	198644	24750	10026777-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	141,532	141,925	393	154,251	154,667	416	
NGFS	PUC	198644	24750	10026777-0001	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	38,224	38,344	120	39,992	40,135	143	
NGFS	PUC	198644	24750	10026777-0001	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	23,477	23,550	73	24,552	24,640	88	
NGFS	PUC	198644	24750	10026777-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	343,523	345,100	1,577	372,446	374,118	1,672	
NGFS	PUC	198644	24750	10026777-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	31,677	31,810	133	33,408	33,546	138	
NGFS	PUC	198644	24750	10026777-0001	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	6,165	6,185	20	6,465	6,487	22	
NGFS	PUC	198644	24750	10026777-0001	10000	519010 - Fringe Adjustments-Budget	-	37,781	37,781	-	37,781	37,781	37,781
NGFS	PUC	198644	24750	10026777-0001	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	12,781	12,851	70	13,711	13,796	85	
NGFS	PUC	198644	24750	10026777-0001	10000	520190 - Department Overhead	5,379,690	5,426,644	46,954	5,440,310	5,468,773	28,463	
NGFS	PUC	198644	24750	10026777-0001	10000	581170 - GF-Risk Management Svcs (A	51,828	55,432	3,604	62,163	57,094	(5,069)	
NGFS	PUC	198644	24750	10026777-0001	10000	581210 - DT Technology Infrastructure	98,100	100,038	1,938	106,706	109,731	3,025	
NGFS	PUC	198644	24750	10026777-0001	10000	581360 - DT Telecommunications Servic	19,054	19,054	-	19,054	19,096	42	
NGFS	PUC	198644	24870	10006358-0002	20543	595328 - ITO To 5Q-CleanpowersSF Fun	29,881,078	29,964,409	83,331	30,251,691	30,313,186	61,495	
NGFS	PUC	198644	24870	10006358-0002	20543	598040 - Designated For General Reser	33,172,884	33,089,553	(83,331)	10,049,815	9,988,320	(61,495)	
NGFS	PUC	229281	20160	10030002-0001	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	17,799,118	17,907,432	108,314	18,429,517	18,556,229	126,712	
NGFS	PUC	229281	20160	10030002-0001	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	3,200,185	3,211,334	11,149	2,612,421	2,621,762	9,341	
NGFS	PUC	229281	20160	10030002-0001	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	1,132,617	1,138,524	5,907	1,170,658	1,176,949	6,291	
NGFS	PUC	229281	20160	10030002-0001	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	269,207	270,772	1,565	278,360	280,190	1,830	

**Technical Adjustments for May 1 Departments
FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24**

GFS Type	Dept Grp	Dept ID	Fund	Project-Activity	Authority	Account - Title	FY 2022-23 May 1 Proposed	FY 2022-23 Updated	Variance FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24 May 1 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Updated	Variance FY 2023-24
NGFS	PUC	229281	20160	10030002-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	479,933	480,573	640	508,763	509,441	678
NGFS	PUC	229281	20160	10030002-0001	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	115,044	115,714	670	118,921	119,706	785
NGFS	PUC	229281	20160	10030002-0001	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	70,619	71,029	410	73,026	73,509	483
NGFS	PUC	229281	20160	10030002-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	1,953,360	1,955,931	2,571	2,070,596	2,073,322	2,726
NGFS	PUC	229281	20160	10030002-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	162,628	162,846	218	167,554	167,779	225
NGFS	PUC	229281	20160	10030002-0001	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	18,544	18,653	109	19,188	19,311	123
NGFS	PUC	229281	20160	10030002-0001	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	62,242	62,648	406	64,438	64,916	478
NGFS	PUC	229281	20160	10030002-0001	10000	581210 - DT Technology Infrastructure	1,555,733	1,684,423	128,690	1,579,696	1,847,620	267,924
NGFS	PUC	229292	20160	10030002-0004	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	280,007	281,042	1,035	296,864	297,961	1,097
NGFS	PUC	229292	20160	10030002-0004	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	1,393,431	1,397,594	4,163	1,477,119	1,481,532	4,413
NGFS	PUC	229292	20160	10030002-0004	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	112,688	113,041	353	116,127	116,491	364
NGFS	PUC	229302	20160	10030002-0001	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	5,193,767	5,260,953	67,186	5,377,901	5,519,825	141,924
NGFS	PUC	229302	20160	10030002-0001	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	921,108	933,008	11,900	748,672	768,410	19,738
NGFS	PUC	229302	20160	10030002-0001	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	76,849	77,821	972	79,508	81,571	2,063
NGFS	PUC	229302	20160	10030002-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	126,249	126,458	209	133,822	134,044	222
NGFS	PUC	229302	20160	10030002-0001	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	32,833	33,259	426	33,977	34,852	875
NGFS	PUC	229302	20160	10030002-0001	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	20,168	20,415	247	20,862	21,399	537
NGFS	PUC	229302	20160	10030002-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	329,232	330,074	842	348,996	349,888	892
NGFS	PUC	229302	20160	10030002-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	29,760	29,831	71	30,660	30,733	73
NGFS	PUC	229302	20160	10030002-0001	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	5,302	5,370	68	5,482	5,627	145
NGFS	PUC	229302	20160	10030002-0001	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	18,087	18,319	232	18,726	19,229	503
NGFS	PUC	295644	20160	10030002-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	114,970	115,067	97	121,866	121,970	104
NGFS	PUC	295644	20160	10030002-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	309,901	310,294	393	328,504	328,921	417
NGFS	PUC	295644	20160	10030002-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	27,874	27,908	34	28,717	28,751	34
NGFS	PUC	229267	20160	10030000-0001	10000	486030 - Exp Rec Fr Admin Svcs (AAO)	1,210,852	1,211,629	777	1,511,521	1,512,416	895
NGFS	PUC	229267	20160	10030000-0001	10000	486380 - Exp Rec Fr Sf Gen Hospital A/	1,433,638	1,433,638	-	1,621,770	1,621,771	1
NGFS	PUC	229267	20160	10030000-0001	10000	486450 - Exp Rec From Mohcd	-	448	448	-	478	478
NGFS	PUC	229267	20160	10030000-0001	10000	486540 - Exp Rec Fr Purchaser (AAO)	3,089	5,331	2,242	3,376	5,709	2,333
NGFS	PUC	229267	20160	10030000-0001	10000	486650 - Exp Rec Fr AcadmyOfScience	279,511	368,511	89,000	313,834	313,834	-
NGFS	PUC	229267	20160	10030000-0001	10000	487110 - Exp Rec Fr Mayor-Cdbg Non-/	2,587	2,139	(448)	2,617	2,139	(478)
NGFS	PUC	229267	20160	10030000-0001	10000	499999 - Beg Fund Balance - Budget Or	24,487,617	25,186,734	699,117	5,683,876	6,716,060	1,032,184
NGFS	PUC	229267	20160	10030000-0001	10000	501000 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Budget	(2,820)	-	2,820	(2,820)	-	2,820
NGFS	PUC	229267	20160	10030000-0001	10000	513000 - Retirement - Budget	179,398	-	(179,398)	179,398	-	(179,398)
NGFS	PUC	229267	20160	10030000-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	56,340	57,179	839	59,723	60,612	889
NGFS	PUC	229267	20160	10030000-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	66,506	69,881	3,375	70,497	74,074	3,577
NGFS	PUC	229267	20160	10030000-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	7,397	7,683	286	7,625	7,920	295
NGFS	PUC	229267	20160	10030000-0001	10000	519010 - Fringe Adjustments-Budget	-	179,398	179,398	-	179,398	179,398
NGFS	PUC	229267	20160	10030000-0001	10000	520190 - Department Overhead	37,251,582	37,573,094	321,512	37,955,674	38,145,082	189,408
NGFS	PUC	229267	20160	10030000-0001	10000	581170 - GF-Risk Management Svcs (A	815,327	870,000	54,673	977,911	896,100	(81,811)
NGFS	PUC	229267	20160	10030000-0001	10000	581360 - DT Telecommunications Servic	879,591	879,591	-	879,591	881,528	1,937
NGFS	PUC	229267	20160	10030000-0001	10000	598040 - Designated For General Reser	-	-	-	81,110	-	(81,110)

**Technical Adjustments for May 1 Departments
FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24**

GFS Type	Dept Grp	Dept ID	Fund	Project-Activity	Authority	Account - Title	FY 2022-23 May 1 Proposed	FY 2022-23 Updated	Variance FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24 May 1 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Updated	Variance FY 2023-24
NGFS	PUC	229268	20160	10030000-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	23,531	23,542	11	24,943	24,955	12
NGFS	PUC	229268	20160	10030000-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	48,700	48,748	48	51,621	51,671	50
NGFS	PUC	229268	20160	10030000-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	4,654	4,658	4	4,795	4,799	4
NGFS	PUC	229269	20160	10030000-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	92,291	92,361	70	101,242	101,316	74
NGFS	PUC	229269	20160	10030000-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	246,428	246,710	282	270,663	270,962	299
NGFS	PUC	229269	20160	10030000-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	22,135	22,159	24	23,627	23,651	24
NGFS	PUC	292649	20160	10030002-0008	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	4,162,582	4,174,563	11,981	4,361,280	4,376,445	15,165
NGFS	PUC	292649	20160	10030002-0008	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	744,613	746,736	2,123	613,935	616,044	2,109
NGFS	PUC	292649	20160	10030002-0008	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	61,876	62,050	174	64,761	64,982	221
NGFS	PUC	292649	20160	10030002-0008	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	130,979	131,159	180	138,744	138,936	192
NGFS	PUC	292649	20160	10030002-0008	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	26,439	26,513	74	27,671	27,765	94
NGFS	PUC	292649	20160	10030002-0008	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	16,235	16,280	45	16,990	17,048	58
NGFS	PUC	292649	20160	10030002-0008	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	336,163	336,890	727	357,356	358,127	771
NGFS	PUC	292649	20160	10030002-0008	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	30,660	30,722	62	31,687	31,751	64
NGFS	PUC	292649	20160	10030002-0008	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	4,262	4,274	12	4,466	4,481	15
NGFS	PUC	292649	20160	10030002-0008	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	11,175	11,217	42	11,197	11,250	53
NGFS	PUC	292657	20160	10030001-0005	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	7,750,152	7,783,344	33,192	8,009,451	8,076,952	67,501
NGFS	PUC	292657	20160	10030001-0005	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	1,402,163	1,408,186	6,023	1,143,577	1,153,300	9,723
NGFS	PUC	292657	20160	10030001-0005	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	509,174	511,254	2,080	525,032	529,222	4,190
NGFS	PUC	292657	20160	10030001-0005	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	120,183	120,682	499	123,947	124,914	967
NGFS	PUC	292657	20160	10030001-0005	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	208,527	208,651	124	221,063	221,194	131
NGFS	PUC	292657	20160	10030001-0005	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	51,369	51,564	195	52,972	53,376	404
NGFS	PUC	292657	20160	10030001-0005	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	31,546	31,658	112	32,516	32,784	268
NGFS	PUC	292657	20160	10030001-0005	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	916,464	916,960	496	971,427	971,953	526
NGFS	PUC	292657	20160	10030001-0005	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	74,079	74,121	42	76,303	76,346	43
NGFS	PUC	292657	20160	10030001-0005	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	8,288	8,316	28	8,556	8,610	54
NGFS	PUC	292657	20160	10030001-0005	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	26,863	26,967	104	27,735	27,995	260
NGFS	PUC	292657	20160	10030001-0005	10000	560290 - Automotive & Other Vehicles	290,282	290,282	-	305,139	610,278	305,139
NGFS	PUC	292657	20160	10030001-0005	10000	581079 - Sr-DPW-Sewer Repair	2,100,000	2,100,000	-	2,100,000	-	(2,100,000)
NGFS	PUC	292657	20160	10030001-0005	10000	581092 - Sr-SAS-Sewer Repair	-	-	-	0	2,100,000	2,100,000
NGFS	PUC	231621	24970	10029992-0004	10000	598040 - Designated For General Reser	18,015,994	17,330,839	(685,155)	46,551,369	45,771,245	(780,124)
NGFS	PUC	298646	24970	10029992-0002	10000	581170 - GF-Risk Management Svcs (A	359,835	384,854	25,019	431,589	396,400	(35,189)
NGFS	PUC	298646	24970	10029992-0014	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	23,005,248	23,127,735	122,487	23,999,068	24,332,038	332,970
NGFS	PUC	298646	24970	10029992-0014	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	4,119,116	4,137,107	17,991	3,381,462	3,423,962	42,500
NGFS	PUC	298646	24970	10029992-0014	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	1,537,208	1,541,728	4,520	1,605,135	1,613,601	8,466
NGFS	PUC	298646	24970	10029992-0014	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	378,974	380,747	1,773	395,980	400,823	4,843
NGFS	PUC	298646	24970	10029992-0014	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	603,647	604,593	946	643,277	644,279	1,002
NGFS	PUC	298646	24970	10029992-0014	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	161,930	162,694	764	169,199	171,263	2,064
NGFS	PUC	298646	24970	10029992-0014	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	99,416	99,875	459	103,905	105,169	1,264
NGFS	PUC	298646	24970	10029992-0014	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	2,352,183	2,355,987	3,804	2,502,751	2,506,783	4,032
NGFS	PUC	298646	24970	10029992-0014	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	196,951	197,274	323	203,726	204,058	332

**Technical Adjustments for May 1 Departments
FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24**

GFS Type	Dept Grp	Dept ID	Fund	Project-Activity	Authority	Account - Title	FY 2022-23 May 1 Proposed	FY 2022-23 Updated	Variance FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24 May 1 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Updated	Variance FY 2023-24
NGFS	PUC	298646	24970	10029992-0014	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	26,134	26,253	119	27,298	27,641	343
NGFS	PUC	298646	24970	10029992-0014	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	71,934	72,398	464	75,162	76,433	1,271
NGFS	PUC	298646	24970	10029992-0014	10000	520190 - Department Overhead	13,397,604	13,552,321	154,717	13,613,124	13,712,042	98,918
NGFS	PUC	298646	24970	10029992-0014	10000	581210 - DT Technology Infrastructure	605,013	537,022	(67,991)	749,912	589,052	(160,860)
NGFS	PUC	298646	24970	10029992-0014	10000	581360 - DT Telecommunications Serv	299,433	299,433	-	299,433	300,092	659
NGFS	PUC	298650	24970	10029985-0006	10000	486650 - Exp Rec Fr AcadmyOfScience	1,799,423	2,057,423	258,000	2,211,024	2,211,024	-
NGFS	PUC	298650	24970	10029985-0006	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	1	-	(1)	-	-	-
NGFS	PUC	298650	24970	10029985-0006	10000	581140 - DT Technology Projects	65,699	-	(65,699)	65,699	-	(65,699)
NGFS	PUC	298650	24970	10029985-0006	10000	581170 - GF-Risk Management Svcs (A	1,692,345	-	(1,692,345)	2,029,814	-	(2,029,814)
NGFS	PUC	298650	24970	10029985-0006	10000	581210 - DT Technology Infrastructure	440,938	314,401	(126,537)	634,967	344,862	(290,105)
NGFS	PUC	298650	24970	10029985-0006	10000	581325 - DT Enterprise Tech Contracts	64,815	-	(64,815)	68,742	-	(68,742)
NGFS	PUC	298650	24970	10029985-0006	10000	581360 - DT Telecommunications Serv	137,235	137,235	-	137,235	137,537	302
NGFS	PUC	298650	24970	10029992-0004	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	10,149,884	10,205,114	55,230	11,026,454	11,136,371	109,917
NGFS	PUC	298650	24970	10029992-0004	10000	513000 - Retirement - Budget	120,000	-	(120,000)	120,000	-	(120,000)
NGFS	PUC	298650	24970	10029992-0004	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	1,796,587	1,805,753	9,166	1,534,516	1,549,163	14,647
NGFS	PUC	298650	24970	10029992-0004	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	676,112	677,830	1,718	722,895	725,381	2,486
NGFS	PUC	298650	24970	10029992-0004	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	178,127	178,927	800	190,739	192,336	1,597
NGFS	PUC	298650	24970	10029992-0004	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	255,755	256,446	691	286,018	286,806	788
NGFS	PUC	298650	24970	10029992-0004	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	76,114	76,458	344	81,503	82,183	680
NGFS	PUC	298650	24970	10029992-0004	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	46,741	46,948	207	50,049	50,464	415
NGFS	PUC	298650	24970	10029992-0004	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	786,519	789,298	2,779	871,719	874,886	3,167
NGFS	PUC	298650	24970	10029992-0004	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	69,033	69,269	236	74,455	74,716	261
NGFS	PUC	298650	24970	10029992-0004	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	12,279	12,331	52	13,162	13,272	110
NGFS	PUC	298650	24970	10029992-0004	10000	519010 - Fringe Adjustments-Budget	-	120,000	120,000	-	120,000	120,000
NGFS	PUC	298650	24970	10029992-0004	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	24,851	25,055	204	27,610	28,022	412
NGFS	PUC	298650	24970	10029992-0004	10000	520190 - Department Overhead	10,469,521	10,564,737	95,216	10,583,666	10,648,300	64,634
NGFS	PUC	298650	24970	10029992-0004	10000	581140 - DT Technology Projects	-	65,699	65,699	-	65,699	65,699
NGFS	PUC	298650	24970	10029992-0004	10000	581170 - GF-Risk Management Svcs (A	-	2,100,000	2,100,000	-	2,598,012	2,598,012
NGFS	PUC	298650	24970	10029992-0004	10000	581325 - DT Enterprise Tech Contracts	-	64,815	64,815	-	68,742	68,742
NGFS	PUC	298650	24970	10029992-0004	10000	581870 - GF-City Hall Fellows Program	0	230,000	230,000	-	-	-
NGFS	PUC	154647	27180	10026772-0003	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	39,077	39,104	27	41,422	41,451	29
NGFS	PUC	154647	27180	10026772-0003	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	91,716	91,825	109	97,217	97,333	116
NGFS	PUC	154647	27180	10026772-0003	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	8,517	8,526	9	8,774	8,784	10
NGFS	PUC	154647	27180	10026772-0003	10000	581170 - GF-Risk Management Svcs (A	93,304	70,000	(23,304)	111,910	70,000	(41,910)
NGFS	PUC	207911	27180	10026772-0008	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	1,082,220	1,102,567	20,347	1,116,977	1,137,980	21,003
NGFS	PUC	207911	27180	10026772-0008	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	192,391	196,027	3,636	155,957	158,908	2,951
NGFS	PUC	207911	27180	10026772-0008	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	75,232	76,445	1,213	77,082	78,282	1,200
NGFS	PUC	207911	27180	10026772-0008	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	18,735	19,031	296	19,225	19,529	304
NGFS	PUC	207911	27180	10026772-0008	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	8,005	8,132	127	8,215	8,344	129
NGFS	PUC	207911	27180	10026772-0008	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	4,915	4,992	77	5,044	5,124	80
NGFS	PUC	207911	27180	10026772-0008	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	1,291	1,313	22	1,326	1,346	20

**Technical Adjustments for May 1 Departments
FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24**

GFS Type	Dept Grp	Dept ID	Fund	Project-Activity	Authority	Account - Title	FY 2022-23 May 1 Proposed	FY 2022-23 Updated	Variance FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24 May 1 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Updated	Variance FY 2023-24
NGFS	PUC	207911	27180	10026772-0008	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	2,680	2,760	80	2,766	2,848	82
NGFS	PUC	232127	27180	10026772-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	43,007	43,045	38	45,588	45,627	39
NGFS	PUC	232127	27180	10026772-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	121,704	121,855	151	129,004	129,164	160
NGFS	PUC	232127	27180	10026772-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	11,083	11,096	13	11,419	11,432	13
NGFS	PUC	232127	27180	10026772-0001	10000	519010 - Fringe Adjustments-Budget	-	502,180	502,180	-	502,180	502,180
NGFS	PUC	232127	27180	10026772-0001	10000	520100 - Overhead Recovery	(129,212,220)	(130,358,500)	(1,146,280)	(131,368,581)	(132,083,959)	(715,378)
NGFS	PUC	232127	27180	10026772-0001	10000	581130 - GF-Con-Internal Audits	1,666,178	105,834	(1,560,344)	1,624,148	66,602	(1,557,546)
NGFS	PUC	232128	27180	10026772-0002	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	26,636	26,650	14	28,235	28,249	14
NGFS	PUC	232128	27180	10026772-0002	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	62,573	62,628	55	66,325	66,384	59
NGFS	PUC	232128	27180	10026772-0002	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	5,828	5,833	5	6,004	6,009	5
NGFS	PUC	292644	27180	10026772-0006	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	7,565,788	7,721,443	155,655	7,953,228	8,113,901	160,673
NGFS	PUC	292644	27180	10026772-0006	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	1,353,313	1,381,139	27,826	1,120,165	1,142,751	22,586
NGFS	PUC	292644	27180	10026772-0006	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	453,877	463,164	9,287	476,836	486,031	9,195
NGFS	PUC	292644	27180	10026772-0006	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	111,584	113,848	2,264	117,197	119,523	2,326
NGFS	PUC	292644	27180	10026772-0006	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	279,063	279,221	158	302,204	302,371	167
NGFS	PUC	292644	27180	10026772-0006	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	47,680	48,651	971	50,080	51,067	987
NGFS	PUC	292644	27180	10026772-0006	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	29,275	29,864	589	30,743	31,355	612
NGFS	PUC	292644	27180	10026772-0006	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	574,432	575,067	635	622,265	622,938	673
NGFS	PUC	292644	27180	10026772-0006	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	55,064	55,118	54	57,952	58,008	56
NGFS	PUC	292644	27180	10026772-0006	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	7,683	7,851	168	8,084	8,237	153
NGFS	PUC	292644	27180	10026772-0006	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	24,554	25,166	612	25,902	26,529	627
NGFS	PUC	292644	27180	10026772-0006	10000	581870 - GF-City Hall Fellows Program	100,000	-	(100,000)	100,000	-	(100,000)
NGFS	PUC	292645	27180	10026772-0007	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	52,274	52,308	34	55,410	55,445	35
NGFS	PUC	292645	27180	10026772-0007	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	138,963	139,097	134	147,304	147,446	142
NGFS	PUC	292645	27180	10026772-0007	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	12,558	12,569	11	12,938	12,949	11
NGFS	PUC	232145	27190	10026778-0005	10002	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	3,966,230	3,983,686	17,456	4,093,547	4,111,565	18,018
NGFS	PUC	232145	27190	10026778-0005	10002	513010 - Retire City Misc	704,086	707,180	3,094	570,489	572,995	2,506
NGFS	PUC	232145	27190	10026778-0005	10002	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	171,951	172,368	417	177,032	177,437	405
NGFS	PUC	232145	27190	10026778-0005	10002	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	57,777	58,031	254	59,622	59,883	261
NGFS	PUC	232145	27190	10026778-0005	10002	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	24,689	24,798	109	25,474	25,585	111
NGFS	PUC	232145	27190	10026778-0005	10002	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	15,160	15,226	66	15,643	15,711	68
NGFS	PUC	232145	27190	10026778-0005	10002	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	3,982	4,000	18	4,115	4,132	17
NGFS	PUC	232145	27190	10026778-0005	10002	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	2,797	2,861	64	2,886	2,952	66
NGFS	PUC	232145	27190	10026778-0005	10002	520100 - Overhead Recovery	(5,357,025)	(5,378,503)	(21,478)	(5,382,320)	(5,403,772)	(21,452)
NGFS	PUC	232146	27190	10026778-0003	10002	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	11,791,383	11,927,363	135,980	12,182,500	12,469,595	287,095
NGFS	PUC	232146	27190	10026778-0003	10002	513010 - Retire City Misc	2,081,189	2,105,281	24,092	1,689,536	1,729,466	39,930
NGFS	PUC	232146	27190	10026778-0003	10002	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	591,068	591,788	720	609,232	610,750	1,518
NGFS	PUC	232146	27190	10026778-0003	10002	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	172,201	174,171	1,970	177,851	182,030	4,179
NGFS	PUC	232146	27190	10026778-0003	10002	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	73,578	74,434	856	76,000	77,771	1,771
NGFS	PUC	232146	27190	10026778-0003	10002	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	45,192	45,686	494	46,669	47,755	1,086
NGFS	PUC	232146	27190	10026778-0003	10002	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	11,882	12,014	132	12,270	12,556	286

**Technical Adjustments for May 1 Departments
FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24**

GFS Type	Dept Grp	Dept ID	Fund	Project-Activity	Authority	Account - Title	FY 2022-23 May 1 Proposed	FY 2022-23 Updated	Variance FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24 May 1 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Updated	Variance FY 2023-24
NGFS	PUC	232146	27190	10026778-0003	10002	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	38,817	39,288	471	40,103	41,113	1,010
NGFS	PUC	232146	27190	10026778-0003	10002	520100 - Overhead Recovery	(16,052,552)	(16,217,267)	(164,715)	(16,149,702)	(16,486,577)	(336,875)
NGFS	PUC	232147	27190	10026778-0004	10002	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	13,072,835	13,193,250	120,415	13,496,512	13,750,730	254,218
NGFS	PUC	232147	27190	10026778-0004	10002	513010 - Retire City Misc	2,336,780	2,358,114	21,334	1,898,848	1,934,207	35,359
NGFS	PUC	232147	27190	10026778-0004	10002	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	736,727	737,087	360	759,198	759,957	759
NGFS	PUC	232147	27190	10026778-0004	10002	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	193,027	194,771	1,744	199,141	202,839	3,698
NGFS	PUC	232147	27190	10026778-0004	10002	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	82,482	83,240	758	85,091	86,660	1,569
NGFS	PUC	232147	27190	10026778-0004	10002	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	50,646	51,083	437	52,263	53,226	963
NGFS	PUC	232147	27190	10026778-0004	10002	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	13,307	13,423	116	13,746	13,998	252
NGFS	PUC	232147	27190	10026778-0004	10002	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	45,244	45,662	418	46,704	47,598	894
NGFS	PUC	232147	27190	10026778-0004	10002	520100 - Overhead Recovery	(18,215,514)	(18,361,096)	(145,582)	(18,321,148)	(18,618,860)	(297,712)
NGFS	PUC	232148	27190	10026778-0002	10002	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	19,190,684	19,470,439	279,755	19,808,926	20,399,763	590,837
NGFS	PUC	232148	27190	10026778-0002	10002	513010 - Retire City Misc	3,411,662	3,461,222	49,560	2,766,454	2,848,621	82,167
NGFS	PUC	232148	27190	10026778-0002	10002	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	1,030,799	1,032,119	1,320	1,061,350	1,064,133	2,783
NGFS	PUC	232148	27190	10026778-0002	10002	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	282,481	286,531	4,050	291,404	300,002	8,598
NGFS	PUC	232148	27190	10026778-0002	10002	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	120,693	122,459	1,766	124,539	128,182	3,643
NGFS	PUC	232148	27190	10026778-0002	10002	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	74,134	75,156	1,022	76,471	78,703	2,232
NGFS	PUC	232148	27190	10026778-0002	10002	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	19,496	19,774	278	20,100	20,697	597
NGFS	PUC	232148	27190	10026778-0002	10002	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	65,780	66,747	967	67,870	69,955	2,085
NGFS	PUC	232148	27190	10026778-0002	10002	520100 - Overhead Recovery	(26,455,934)	(26,794,652)	(338,718)	(26,593,319)	(27,286,261)	(692,942)
NGFS	PUC	276641	27180	10026778-0006	10000	520100 - Overhead Recovery	(15,919,379)	(15,896,599)	22,780	(16,670,601)	(16,581,195)	89,406
NGFS	PUC	276641	27180	10026778-0006	10000	581170 - GF-Risk Management Svcs (A	121,578	130,031	8,453	145,822	130,031	(15,791)
NGFS	PUC	276641	27180	10026778-0006	10000	581210 - DT Technology Infrastructure	309,797	278,564	(31,233)	379,877	305,553	(74,324)
NGFS	PUC	276641	27180	10026778-0006	10000	581360 - DT Telecommunications Serv	321,883	321,883	-	321,883	322,592	709
NGFS	PUC	276641	27190	10026778-0006	10002	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	7,766,235	7,769,037	2,802	8,015,509	8,021,413	5,904
NGFS	PUC	276641	27190	10026778-0006	10002	513010 - Retire City Misc	1,391,773	1,392,270	497	1,130,591	1,131,412	821
NGFS	PUC	276641	27190	10026778-0006	10002	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	116,762	116,803	41	120,365	120,451	86
NGFS	PUC	276641	27190	10026778-0006	10002	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	49,899	49,916	17	51,434	51,471	37
NGFS	PUC	276641	27190	10026778-0006	10002	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	30,629	30,639	10	31,591	31,613	22
NGFS	PUC	276641	27190	10026778-0006	10002	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	8,055	8,057	2	8,303	8,309	6
NGFS	PUC	276641	27190	10026778-0006	10002	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	24,230	24,240	10	25,017	25,038	21
NGFS	PUC	276641	27190	10026778-0006	10002	520100 - Overhead Recovery	(11,176,833)	(11,180,212)	(3,379)	(11,246,186)	(11,253,083)	(6,897)
NGFS	PUC	140644	27180	10026672-0001	10000	499999 - Beg Fund Balance - Budget Or	244,060	-	(244,060)	-	-	-
NGFS	PUC	140644	27180	10026772-0009	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	31,524	31,531	7	35,344	35,351	7
NGFS	PUC	140644	27180	10026772-0009	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	85,975	86,002	27	96,760	96,788	28
NGFS	PUC	140644	27180	10026772-0009	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	7,799	7,801	2	8,526	8,528	2
NGFS	PUC	140644	27180	10026772-0009	10000	598040 - Designated For General Reser	-	-	-	161,103	-	(161,103)
NGFS	PUC	154648	27180	10026775-0003	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	18,642	18,653	11	19,762	19,773	11
NGFS	PUC	154648	27180	10026775-0003	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	39,455	39,499	44	41,820	41,867	47
NGFS	PUC	154648	27180	10026775-0003	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	3,744	3,748	4	3,857	3,861	4
NGFS	PUC	210813	27180	10026772-0014	10000	581130 - GF-Con-Internal Audits	-	1,666,178	1,666,178	-	1,624,148	1,624,148

**Technical Adjustments for May 1 Departments
FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24**

GFS Type	Dept Grp	Dept ID	Fund	Project-Activity	Authority	Account - Title	FY 2022-23 May 1 Proposed	FY 2022-23 Updated	Variance FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24 May 1 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Updated	Variance FY 2023-24
NGFS	PUC	263641	27180	10026772-0004	10000	501000 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Budget	(9,320)	-	9,320	(9,320)	-	9,320
NGFS	PUC	263641	27180	10026772-0004	10000	513000 - Retirement - Budget	502,180	-	(502,180)	502,180	-	(502,180)
NGFS	PUC	263641	27180	10026772-0004	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	7,929	7,934	5	9,359	9,364	5
NGFS	PUC	263641	27180	10026772-0004	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	18,331	18,351	20	22,357	22,378	21
NGFS	PUC	263641	27180	10026772-0004	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	1,719	1,720	1	2,027	2,029	2
NGFS	PUC	267641	27180	10026775-0001	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	6,203,691	6,265,814	62,123	6,463,875	6,639,335	175,460
NGFS	PUC	267641	27180	10026775-0001	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	1,112,092	1,123,309	11,217	912,091	937,108	25,017
NGFS	PUC	267641	27180	10026775-0001	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	364,013	366,720	2,707	378,113	385,765	7,652
NGFS	PUC	267641	27180	10026775-0001	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	90,725	91,607	882	94,488	97,028	2,540
NGFS	PUC	267641	27180	10026775-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	203,358	203,569	211	215,808	216,120	312
NGFS	PUC	267641	27180	10026775-0001	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	38,763	39,142	379	40,381	41,461	1,080
NGFS	PUC	267641	27180	10026775-0001	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	23,793	24,032	239	24,791	25,459	668
NGFS	PUC	267641	27180	10026775-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	516,403	517,251	848	541,150	542,404	1,254
NGFS	PUC	267641	27180	10026775-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	47,054	47,126	72	48,034	48,137	103
NGFS	PUC	267641	27180	10026775-0001	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	6,258	6,324	66	6,518	6,683	165
NGFS	PUC	267641	27180	10026775-0001	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	19,069	19,275	206	19,748	20,375	627
NGFS	PUC	267641	27180	10026775-0001	10000	581120 - GF-Con-Financial Systems	1,494,447	1,540,444	45,997	1,523,732	1,602,355	78,623
NGFS	PUC	267641	27180	10026775-0001	10000	581245 - GF-CON-Information System C	4,186,745	4,131,183	(55,562)	4,216,348	4,157,496	(58,852)
NGFS	PUC	267642	27180	10026775-0002	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	56,694	56,831	137	60,095	60,241	146
NGFS	PUC	267642	27180	10026775-0002	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	149,074	149,627	553	158,019	158,605	586
NGFS	PUC	267642	27180	10026775-0002	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	13,670	13,716	46	14,084	14,132	48
NGFS	PUC	267642	27180	10026775-0002	10000	581870 - GF-City Hall Fellows Program	0	115,000	115,000	-	-	-
NGFS	PUC	267643	27180	10026776-0001	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	14,337,901	14,602,655	264,754	15,393,829	15,685,472	291,643
NGFS	PUC	267643	27180	10026776-0001	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	2,530,333	2,575,958	45,625	2,133,155	2,172,377	39,222
NGFS	PUC	267643	27180	10026776-0001	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	742,750	743,496	746	798,594	799,687	1,093
NGFS	PUC	267643	27180	10026776-0001	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	214,213	218,054	3,841	229,519	233,760	4,241
NGFS	PUC	267643	27180	10026776-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	333,645	334,149	504	369,978	370,525	547
NGFS	PUC	267643	27180	10026776-0001	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	91,536	93,177	1,641	98,092	99,897	1,805
NGFS	PUC	267643	27180	10026776-0001	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	56,197	57,201	1,004	60,230	61,330	1,100
NGFS	PUC	267643	27180	10026776-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	886,788	888,814	2,026	978,386	980,580	2,194
NGFS	PUC	267643	27180	10026776-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	80,131	80,303	172	86,017	86,198	181
NGFS	PUC	267643	27180	10026776-0001	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	14,768	15,031	263	15,835	16,118	283
NGFS	PUC	267643	27180	10026776-0001	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	44,718	45,645	927	47,831	48,846	1,015
NGFS	PUC	267643	27180	10026776-0001	10000	581210 - DT Technology Infrastructure	779,922	814,677	34,755	826,118	893,608	67,490
NGFS	PUC	267643	27180	10026776-0001	10000	581360 - DT Telecommunications Servic	960,080	960,080	-	960,080	962,194	2,114
NGFS	PUC	267651	27180	10026773-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	12,551	12,562	11	13,304	13,316	12
NGFS	PUC	267651	27180	10026773-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	30,894	30,937	43	32,748	32,793	45
NGFS	PUC	267651	27180	10026773-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	2,853	2,857	4	2,939	2,943	4
NGFS	PUC	267652	27180	10026773-0002	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	2,167,591	2,168,870	1,279	2,353,915	2,356,604	2,689
NGFS	PUC	267652	27180	10026773-0002	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	391,607	391,184	(423)	335,449	335,152	(297)
NGFS	PUC	267652	27180	10026773-0002	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	148,328	148,407	79	158,413	158,580	167

**Technical Adjustments for May 1 Departments
FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24**

GFS Type	Dept Grp	Dept ID	Fund	Project-Activity	Authority	Account - Title	FY 2022-23 May 1 Proposed	FY 2022-23 Updated	Variance FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24 May 1 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Updated	Variance FY 2023-24
NGFS	PUC	267652	27180	10026773-0002	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	35,372	35,391	19	38,061	38,100	39
NGFS	PUC	267652	27180	10026773-0002	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	77,122	77,144	22	85,647	85,670	23
NGFS	PUC	267652	27180	10026773-0002	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	15,111	15,119	8	16,265	16,282	17
NGFS	PUC	267652	27180	10026773-0002	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	9,279	9,284	5	9,987	9,997	10
NGFS	PUC	267652	27180	10026773-0002	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	202,908	202,996	88	225,879	225,972	93
NGFS	PUC	267652	27180	10026773-0002	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	18,377	18,384	7	19,871	19,878	7
NGFS	PUC	267652	27180	10026773-0002	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	2,441	2,442	1	2,627	2,630	3
NGFS	PUC	267652	27180	10026773-0002	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	5,229	5,234	5	5,805	5,815	10
NGFS	PUC	267653	27180	10026773-0003	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	183,075	183,135	60	194,068	194,131	63
NGFS	PUC	267653	27180	10026773-0003	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	382,122	382,361	239	405,031	405,285	254
NGFS	PUC	267653	27180	10026773-0003	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	36,289	36,310	21	37,383	37,404	21
NGFS	PUC	267654	27180	10026773-0005	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	3,187,495	3,217,306	29,811	3,291,162	3,353,828	62,666
NGFS	PUC	267654	27180	10026773-0005	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	577,225	572,131	(5,094)	470,439	468,452	(1,987)
NGFS	PUC	267654	27180	10026773-0005	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	197,184	198,648	1,464	203,423	206,519	3,096
NGFS	PUC	267654	27180	10026773-0005	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	46,734	47,176	442	48,243	49,152	909
NGFS	PUC	267654	27180	10026773-0005	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	61,535	61,551	16	65,232	65,249	17
NGFS	PUC	267654	27180	10026773-0005	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	19,970	20,155	185	20,615	21,009	394
NGFS	PUC	267654	27180	10026773-0005	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	12,259	12,375	116	12,664	12,897	233
NGFS	PUC	267654	27180	10026773-0005	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	403,821	403,884	63	428,034	428,101	67
NGFS	PUC	267654	27180	10026773-0005	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	30,365	30,371	6	31,271	31,276	5
NGFS	PUC	267654	27180	10026773-0005	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	3,230	3,255	25	3,329	3,394	65
NGFS	PUC	267654	27180	10026773-0005	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	12,428	12,549	121	12,837	13,074	237
NGFS	PUC	267657	27180	10026773-0007	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	94,585	94,595	10	100,265	100,275	10
NGFS	PUC	267657	27180	10026773-0007	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	193,281	193,321	40	204,869	204,911	42
NGFS	PUC	267657	27180	10026773-0007	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	18,393	18,397	4	18,947	18,950	3
NGFS	PUC	153644	27180	10026772-0012	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	34,608	34,524	(84)	36,684	36,595	(89)
NGFS	PUC	153644	27180	10026772-0012	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	108,226	107,889	(337)	114,719	114,363	(356)
NGFS	PUC	153644	27180	10026772-0012	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	9,619	9,591	(28)	9,910	9,881	(29)
NGFS	PUC	153644	27180	10026772-0012	10000	581870 - GF-City Hall Fellows Program	0	115,000	115,000	-	-	-
NGFS	PUC	292650	27180	10026772-0011	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	28,619	28,744	125	35,907	36,040	133
NGFS	PUC	292650	27180	10026772-0011	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	63,471	63,977	506	82,025	82,561	536
NGFS	PUC	292650	27180	10026772-0011	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	6,088	6,131	43	7,572	7,616	44
NGFS	PUC	292658	27180	10026772-0010	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	67,240	67,306	66	71,274	71,344	70
NGFS	PUC	292658	27180	10026772-0010	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	177,013	177,276	263	187,635	187,914	279
NGFS	PUC	292658	27180	10026772-0010	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	16,103	16,125	22	16,590	16,613	23
NGFS	PUC	232396	25940	10029994-0002	10000	499999 - Beg Fund Balance - Budget Or	67,176,011	68,433,218	1,257,207	15,085,699	16,849,235	1,763,536
NGFS	PUC	232396	25940	10029994-0010	10000	486450 - Exp Rec From Mohcd	-	8,490	8,490	-	4,621	4,621
NGFS	PUC	232396	25940	10029994-0010	10000	486630 - Exp Rec Fr Rec & Park (AAO)	6,699,978	6,699,977	(1)	7,595,937	7,595,937	-
NGFS	PUC	232396	25940	10029994-0010	10000	486650 - Exp Rec Fr AcadmyOfScience	182,978	237,978	55,000	201,377	201,377	-
NGFS	PUC	232396	25940	10029994-0010	10000	487110 - Exp Rec Fr Mayor-Cdbg Non-f	13,676	5,186	(8,490)	9,807	5,186	(4,621)
NGFS	PUC	232396	25940	10029994-0010	10000	501000 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Budget	(5,106)	-	5,106	(5,106)	-	5,106

**Technical Adjustments for May 1 Departments
FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24**

GFS Type	Dept Grp	Dept ID	Fund	Project-Activity	Authority	Account - Title	FY 2022-23 May 1 Proposed	FY 2022-23 Updated	Variance FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24 May 1 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Updated	Variance FY 2023-24
NGFS	PUC	232396	25940	10029994-0010	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	2,497,605	2,510,635	13,030	2,581,742	2,609,187	27,445
NGFS	PUC	232396	25940	10029994-0010	10000	513000 - Retirement - Budget	115,536	-	(115,536)	115,536	-	(115,536)
NGFS	PUC	232396	25940	10029994-0010	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	443,318	445,628	2,310	359,893	363,713	3,820
NGFS	PUC	232396	25940	10029994-0010	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	45,444	45,634	190	46,661	47,061	400
NGFS	PUC	232396	25940	10029994-0010	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	61,400	61,443	43	65,084	65,129	45
NGFS	PUC	232396	25940	10029994-0010	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	19,419	19,499	80	19,937	20,107	170
NGFS	PUC	232396	25940	10029994-0010	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	11,925	11,970	45	12,244	12,349	105
NGFS	PUC	232396	25940	10029994-0010	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	158,619	158,792	173	168,137	168,320	183
NGFS	PUC	232396	25940	10029994-0010	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	14,507	14,522	15	14,945	14,961	16
NGFS	PUC	232396	25940	10029994-0010	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	3,135	3,145	10	3,222	3,247	25
NGFS	PUC	232396	25940	10029994-0010	10000	519010 - Fringe Adjustments-Budget	11	115,536	115,525	-	115,536	115,536
NGFS	PUC	232396	25940	10029994-0010	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	5,743	5,788	45	5,944	6,039	95
NGFS	PUC	232396	25940	10029994-0010	10000	520190 - Department Overhead	62,718,362	63,140,408	422,046	63,780,345	64,047,698	267,353
NGFS	PUC	232396	25940	10029994-0010	10000	581170 - GF-Risk Management Svcs (A	1,355,804	1,498,735	142,931	1,626,275	1,798,482	172,207
NGFS	PUC	232396	25940	10029994-0010	10000	581210 - DT Technology Infrastructure	2,079,224	2,255,554	176,330	2,106,270	2,474,086	367,816
NGFS	PUC	232396	25940	10029994-0010	10000	581350 - GF-Emergency Communication	57,434	60,375	2,941	57,434	60,375	2,941
NGFS	PUC	232396	25940	10029994-0010	10000	581360 - DT Telecommunications Servic	1,340,635	1,340,635	-	1,340,635	1,343,587	2,952
NGFS	PUC	232396	25950	10025208-0001	17682	500010 - Facilities Maintenance-Budget	2,993,544	2,966,038	(27,506)	3,123,544	3,096,038	(27,506)
NGFS	PUC	232396	25950	10025208-0001	17682	581930 - GF-Sheriff	1,317,456	1,344,962	27,506	1,317,456	1,344,962	27,506
NGFS	PUC	292656	25940	10029995-0036	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	8,706,748	8,716,123	9,375	9,143,271	9,152,947	9,676
NGFS	PUC	292656	25940	10029995-0036	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	1,560,144	1,561,805	1,661	1,291,608	1,292,953	1,345
NGFS	PUC	292656	25940	10029995-0036	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	132,353	132,489	136	138,664	138,805	141
NGFS	PUC	292656	25940	10029995-0036	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	302,344	302,475	131	324,567	324,705	138
NGFS	PUC	292656	25940	10029995-0036	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	56,551	56,609	58	59,251	59,311	60
NGFS	PUC	292656	25940	10029995-0036	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	34,726	34,762	36	36,380	36,417	37
NGFS	PUC	292656	25940	10029995-0036	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	765,538	766,062	524	824,257	824,813	556
NGFS	PUC	292656	25940	10029995-0036	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	69,893	69,938	45	73,088	73,133	45
NGFS	PUC	292656	25940	10029995-0036	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	9,134	9,144	10	9,562	9,572	10
NGFS	PUC	292656	25940	10029995-0036	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	24,211	24,244	33	25,531	25,565	34
NGFS	PUC	292656	25940	10029995-0036	10000	581091 - Sr-SAS-Street Repair	-	49,772	49,772	-	68,685	68,685
NGFS	PUC	292656	25940	10029995-0036	10000	581092 - Sr-SAS-Sewer Repair	49,772	-	(49,772)	68,685	-	(68,685)
NGFS	PUC	232403	25940	10029997-0020	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	-	1	1	-	-	-
NGFS	PUC	232403	25940	10029998-0006	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	6,303,504	6,364,371	60,867	6,521,797	6,603,855	82,058
NGFS	PUC	232403	25940	10029998-0006	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	1,138,834	1,148,588	9,754	930,029	940,420	10,391
NGFS	PUC	232403	25940	10029998-0006	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	418,246	421,632	3,386	431,485	436,151	4,666
NGFS	PUC	232403	25940	10029998-0006	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	99,271	100,162	891	102,430	103,623	1,193
NGFS	PUC	232403	25940	10029998-0006	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	153,265	153,437	172	162,452	162,634	182
NGFS	PUC	232403	25940	10029998-0006	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	42,413	42,781	368	43,778	44,272	494
NGFS	PUC	232403	25940	10029998-0006	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	26,048	26,287	239	26,876	27,196	320
NGFS	PUC	232403	25940	10029998-0006	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	775,657	776,346	689	822,183	822,913	730
NGFS	PUC	232403	25940	10029998-0006	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	62,368	62,427	59	64,255	64,316	61

**Technical Adjustments for May 1 Departments
FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24**

GFS Type	Dept Grp	Dept ID	Fund	Project-Activity	Authority	Account - Title	FY 2022-23 May 1 Proposed	FY 2022-23 Updated	Variance FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24 May 1 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Updated	Variance FY 2023-24
NGFS	PUC	232403	25940	10029998-0006	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	6,845	6,910	65	7,063	7,152	89
NGFS	PUC	232403	25940	10029998-0006	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	12,378	12,489	111	12,837	13,028	191
NGFS	PUC	232404	25940	10029998-0006	10000	486690 - Exp Rec Fr Human Services A	57,562	-	(57,562)	57,562	-	(57,562)
NGFS	PUC	232404	25940	10029998-0006	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	120,268	120,365	97	126,433	126,535	102
NGFS	PUC	232404	25940	10029998-0006	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	260,743	261,131	388	277,853	278,264	411
NGFS	PUC	232404	25940	10029998-0006	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	24,507	24,540	33	25,310	25,344	34
NGFS	PUC	232405	25940	10029998-0016	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	96,008	96,060	52	101,782	101,837	55
NGFS	PUC	232405	25940	10029998-0016	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	355,950	356,159	209	377,317	377,538	221
NGFS	PUC	232405	25940	10029998-0016	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	30,057	30,075	18	30,967	30,985	18
NGFS	PUC	232405	25940	10029998-0016	10000	581390 - GF-Fire	332,495	322,495	(10,000)	332,495	322,495	(10,000)
NGFS	PUC	232406	25940	10029998-0006	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	687,319	701,978	14,659	728,583	759,507	30,924
NGFS	PUC	232406	25940	10029998-0006	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	115,167	117,765	2,598	96,942	101,243	4,301
NGFS	PUC	232406	25940	10029998-0006	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	31,160	31,280	120	33,236	33,489	253
NGFS	PUC	232406	25940	10029998-0006	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	10,059	10,271	212	10,656	11,106	450
NGFS	PUC	232406	25940	10029998-0006	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	22,792	22,935	143	24,159	24,311	152
NGFS	PUC	232406	25940	10029998-0006	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	4,298	4,390	92	4,554	4,745	191
NGFS	PUC	232406	25940	10029998-0006	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	2,640	2,693	53	2,796	2,913	117
NGFS	PUC	232406	25940	10029998-0006	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	50,316	50,893	577	53,338	53,949	611
NGFS	PUC	232406	25940	10029998-0006	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	4,698	4,747	49	4,841	4,891	50
NGFS	PUC	232406	25940	10029998-0006	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	694	708	14	737	767	30
NGFS	PUC	232406	25940	10029998-0006	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	2,167	2,219	52	2,312	2,420	108
NGFS	PUC	232411	25940	10029998-0006	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	7,389,210	7,467,186	77,976	7,750,921	7,914,809	163,888
NGFS	PUC	232411	25940	10029998-0006	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	1,326,657	1,340,691	14,034	1,096,198	1,119,444	23,246
NGFS	PUC	232411	25940	10029998-0006	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	531,207	533,814	2,607	552,773	558,218	5,445
NGFS	PUC	232411	25940	10029998-0006	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	126,136	127,295	1,159	131,393	133,793	2,400
NGFS	PUC	232411	25940	10029998-0006	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	152,131	153,635	1,504	161,285	162,879	1,594
NGFS	PUC	232411	25940	10029998-0006	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	53,889	54,377	488	56,133	57,172	1,039
NGFS	PUC	232411	25940	10029998-0006	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	33,080	33,373	293	34,485	35,098	613
NGFS	PUC	232411	25940	10029998-0006	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	910,889	916,935	6,046	965,502	971,911	6,409
NGFS	PUC	232411	25940	10029998-0006	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	68,456	68,969	513	70,499	71,028	529
NGFS	PUC	232411	25940	10029998-0006	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	8,674	8,768	94	9,073	9,213	140
NGFS	PUC	232411	25940	10029998-0006	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	26,672	26,985	313	28,017	28,647	630
NGFS	PUC	232411	25940	10029998-0008	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	857,717	866,750	9,033	890,958	909,938	18,980
NGFS	PUC	232411	25940	10029998-0008	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	155,432	157,071	1,639	127,467	130,188	2,721
NGFS	PUC	232411	25940	10029998-0008	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	65,049	65,523	474	67,082	68,072	990
NGFS	PUC	232411	25940	10029998-0008	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	15,224	15,359	135	15,706	15,984	278
NGFS	PUC	232411	25940	10029998-0008	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	15,869	15,938	69	16,823	16,896	73
NGFS	PUC	232411	25940	10029998-0008	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	6,503	6,560	57	6,710	6,831	121
NGFS	PUC	232411	25940	10029998-0008	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	3,992	4,027	35	4,123	4,194	71
NGFS	PUC	232411	25940	10029998-0008	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	107,565	107,841	276	114,014	114,307	293
NGFS	PUC	232411	25940	10029998-0008	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	8,003	8,027	24	8,242	8,266	24

**Technical Adjustments for May 1 Departments
FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24**

GFS Type	Dept Grp	Dept ID	Fund	Project-Activity	Authority	Account - Title	FY 2022-23 May 1 Proposed	FY 2022-23 Updated	Variance FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24 May 1 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Updated	Variance FY 2023-24
NGFS	PUC	232411	25940	10029998-0008	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	1,047	1,060	13	1,085	1,100	15
NGFS	PUC	232411	25940	10029998-0008	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	3,344	3,380	36	3,475	3,547	72
NGFS	PUC	232415	25940	10029996-0004	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	51,644	51,681	37	54,745	54,784	39
NGFS	PUC	232415	25940	10029996-0004	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	105,004	105,151	147	111,299	111,455	156
NGFS	PUC	232415	25940	10029996-0004	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	10,030	10,042	12	10,332	10,345	13
NGFS	PUC	232415	25940	10029996-0004	10000	581140 - DT Technology Projects	-	20,000	20,000	-	20,000	20,000
NGFS	PUC	232416	25940	10029996-0004	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	3,864,365	3,907,778	43,413	4,029,774	4,121,325	91,551
NGFS	PUC	232416	25940	10029996-0004	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	688,206	695,900	7,694	564,088	576,821	12,733
NGFS	PUC	232416	25940	10029996-0004	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	213,000	213,600	600	221,803	223,068	1,265
NGFS	PUC	232416	25940	10029996-0004	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	57,925	58,555	630	60,315	61,652	1,337
NGFS	PUC	232416	25940	10029996-0004	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	103,683	103,835	152	110,877	111,037	160
NGFS	PUC	232416	25940	10029996-0004	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	24,752	25,024	272	25,776	26,340	564
NGFS	PUC	232416	25940	10029996-0004	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	15,198	15,355	157	15,831	16,176	345
NGFS	PUC	232416	25940	10029996-0004	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	276,024	276,632	608	295,294	295,939	645
NGFS	PUC	232416	25940	10029996-0004	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	24,856	24,908	52	25,843	25,896	53
NGFS	PUC	232416	25940	10029996-0004	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	3,997	4,039	42	4,160	4,252	92
NGFS	PUC	232416	25940	10029996-0004	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	13,477	13,628	151	14,051	14,373	322
NGFS	PUC	232417	25940	10029996-0004	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	2,343,916	2,357,379	13,463	2,425,255	2,453,612	28,357
NGFS	PUC	232417	25940	10029996-0004	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	422,918	422,705	(213)	345,081	346,341	1,260
NGFS	PUC	232417	25940	10029996-0004	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	176,523	176,839	316	181,370	182,038	668
NGFS	PUC	232417	25940	10029996-0004	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	41,932	42,130	198	43,111	43,522	411
NGFS	PUC	232417	25940	10029996-0004	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	66,276	66,349	73	70,253	70,331	78
NGFS	PUC	232417	25940	10029996-0004	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	17,917	18,001	84	18,422	18,598	176
NGFS	PUC	232417	25940	10029996-0004	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	10,998	11,050	52	11,315	11,422	107
NGFS	PUC	232417	25940	10029996-0004	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	242,646	242,940	294	257,204	257,516	312
NGFS	PUC	232417	25940	10029996-0004	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	20,171	20,196	25	20,777	20,803	26
NGFS	PUC	232417	25940	10029996-0004	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	2,890	2,902	12	2,973	3,003	30
NGFS	PUC	232417	25940	10029996-0004	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	8,573	8,625	52	8,872	8,977	105
NGFS	PUC	232418	25940	10029996-0004	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	3,307,798	3,317,173	9,375	3,667,313	3,676,989	9,676
NGFS	PUC	232418	25940	10029996-0004	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	592,469	594,130	1,661	517,259	518,604	1,345
NGFS	PUC	232418	25940	10029996-0004	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	50,134	50,270	136	55,338	55,479	141
NGFS	PUC	232418	25940	10029996-0004	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	97,098	97,313	215	109,742	109,970	228
NGFS	PUC	232418	25940	10029996-0004	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	21,424	21,482	58	23,648	23,708	60
NGFS	PUC	232418	25940	10029996-0004	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	13,150	13,186	36	14,516	14,553	37
NGFS	PUC	232418	25940	10029996-0004	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	246,877	247,743	866	280,593	281,511	918
NGFS	PUC	232418	25940	10029996-0004	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	22,464	22,538	74	24,787	24,863	76
NGFS	PUC	232418	25940	10029996-0004	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	3,460	3,470	10	3,815	3,825	10
NGFS	PUC	232418	25940	10029996-0004	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	10,653	10,686	33	11,881	11,915	34
NGFS	PUC	232421	25940	10029997-0002	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	74,277	74,369	92	78,736	78,833	97
NGFS	PUC	232421	25940	10029997-0002	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	154,387	154,757	370	163,646	164,038	392
NGFS	PUC	232421	25940	10029997-0002	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	14,669	14,700	31	15,111	15,144	33

**Technical Adjustments for May 1 Departments
FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24**

GFS Type	Dept Grp	Dept ID	Fund	Project-Activity	Authority	Account - Title	FY 2022-23 May 1 Proposed	FY 2022-23 Updated	Variance FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24 May 1 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Updated	Variance FY 2023-24
NGFS	PUC	232422	25940	10029997-0020	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	6,111,278	6,144,759	33,481	6,374,319	6,444,679	70,360
NGFS	PUC	232422	25940	10029997-0020	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	1,104,748	1,110,135	5,387	909,553	918,885	9,332
NGFS	PUC	232422	25940	10029997-0020	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	413,664	415,007	1,343	430,098	432,905	2,807
NGFS	PUC	232422	25940	10029997-0020	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	98,498	98,997	499	102,465	103,494	1,029
NGFS	PUC	232422	25940	10029997-0020	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	167,872	168,666	794	177,972	178,814	842
NGFS	PUC	232422	25940	10029997-0020	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	42,096	42,305	209	43,778	44,224	446
NGFS	PUC	232422	25940	10029997-0020	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	25,829	25,957	128	26,890	27,154	264
NGFS	PUC	232422	25940	10029997-0020	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	783,075	786,269	3,194	830,036	833,422	3,386
NGFS	PUC	232422	25940	10029997-0020	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	62,244	62,515	271	64,110	64,389	279
NGFS	PUC	232422	25940	10029997-0020	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	6,770	6,812	42	7,067	7,126	59
NGFS	PUC	232422	25940	10029997-0020	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	19,612	19,746	134	20,499	20,768	269
NGFS	PUC	232423	25940	10029997-0002	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	2,681,664	2,710,939	29,275	2,782,465	2,834,152	51,687
NGFS	PUC	232423	25940	10029997-0002	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	477,233	482,419	5,186	389,989	397,177	7,188
NGFS	PUC	232423	25940	10029997-0002	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	41,361	41,785	424	42,889	43,641	752
NGFS	PUC	232423	25940	10029997-0002	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	76,538	76,682	144	81,129	81,281	152
NGFS	PUC	232423	25940	10029997-0002	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	17,672	17,856	184	18,329	18,648	319
NGFS	PUC	232423	25940	10029997-0002	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	10,854	10,963	109	11,255	11,451	196
NGFS	PUC	232423	25940	10029997-0002	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	199,275	199,852	577	211,239	211,850	611
NGFS	PUC	232423	25940	10029997-0002	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	18,033	18,082	49	18,578	18,629	51
NGFS	PUC	232423	25940	10029997-0002	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	2,851	2,881	30	2,958	3,011	53
NGFS	PUC	232423	25940	10029997-0002	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	9,206	9,308	102	9,554	9,737	183
NGFS	PUC	232424	25940	10029997-0020	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	7,722,622	7,784,802	62,180	7,970,649	8,080,172	109,523
NGFS	PUC	232424	25940	10029997-0020	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	1,390,601	1,398,574	7,973	1,131,179	1,143,292	12,113
NGFS	PUC	232424	25940	10029997-0020	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	521,579	524,789	3,210	536,774	541,710	4,936
NGFS	PUC	232424	25940	10029997-0020	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	123,772	124,675	903	127,422	129,007	1,585
NGFS	PUC	232424	25940	10029997-0020	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	52,876	53,262	386	54,447	55,125	678
NGFS	PUC	232424	25940	10029997-0020	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	32,476	32,711	235	33,431	33,847	416
NGFS	PUC	232424	25940	10029997-0020	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	8,534	8,597	63	8,783	8,890	107
NGFS	PUC	232424	25940	10029997-0020	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	26,522	26,724	202	27,371	27,753	382
NGFS	PUC	232425	25940	10029996-0004	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	7,731,658	7,735,024	3,366	8,001,217	8,004,693	3,476
NGFS	PUC	232425	25940	10029996-0004	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	1,388,885	1,389,499	614	1,132,487	1,132,987	500
NGFS	PUC	232425	25940	10029996-0004	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	504,130	504,340	210	520,415	520,629	214
NGFS	PUC	232425	25940	10029996-0004	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	119,666	119,716	50	123,570	123,620	50
NGFS	PUC	232425	25940	10029996-0004	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	159,923	160,165	242	169,547	169,803	256
NGFS	PUC	232425	25940	10029996-0004	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	51,139	51,159	20	52,782	52,802	20
NGFS	PUC	232425	25940	10029996-0004	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	31,385	31,399	14	32,405	32,419	14
NGFS	PUC	232425	25940	10029996-0004	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	826,273	827,243	970	875,892	876,920	1,028
NGFS	PUC	232425	25940	10029996-0004	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	66,649	66,731	82	68,680	68,764	84
NGFS	PUC	232425	25940	10029996-0004	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	8,241	8,245	4	8,520	8,524	4
NGFS	PUC	292648	25940	10029995-0040	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	1,401,735	1,405,485	3,750	1,456,876	1,464,817	7,941
NGFS	PUC	292648	25940	10029995-0040	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	245,425	246,089	664	200,209	201,313	1,104

**Technical Adjustments for May 1 Departments
FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24**

GFS Type	Dept Grp	Dept ID	Fund	Project-Activity	Authority	Account - Title	FY 2022-23 May 1 Proposed	FY 2022-23 Updated	Variance FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24 May 1 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Updated	Variance FY 2023-24
NGFS	PUC	292648	25940	10029995-0040	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	20,328	20,382	54	21,125	21,240	115
NGFS	PUC	292648	25940	10029995-0040	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	32,721	32,820	99	34,685	34,789	104
NGFS	PUC	292648	25940	10029995-0040	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	8,688	8,712	24	9,027	9,076	49
NGFS	PUC	292648	25940	10029995-0040	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	5,335	5,349	14	5,542	5,572	30
NGFS	PUC	292648	25940	10029995-0040	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	91,827	92,223	396	97,339	97,758	419
NGFS	PUC	292648	25940	10029995-0040	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	8,266	8,300	34	8,517	8,551	34
NGFS	PUC	292648	25940	10029995-0040	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	1,401	1,405	4	1,460	1,468	8
NGFS	PUC	292648	25940	10029995-0040	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	2,836	2,849	13	2,965	2,993	28
NGFS	PUC	295647	25940	10029995-0002	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	1,992,272	1,999,946	7,674	2,057,944	2,074,078	16,134
NGFS	PUC	295647	25940	10029995-0002	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	359,369	356,831	(2,538)	292,706	290,924	(1,782)
NGFS	PUC	295647	25940	10029995-0002	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	138,179	138,653	474	141,882	142,884	1,002
NGFS	PUC	295647	25940	10029995-0002	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	33,699	33,813	114	34,635	34,869	234
NGFS	PUC	295647	25940	10029995-0002	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	51,781	51,801	20	54,889	54,911	22
NGFS	PUC	295647	25940	10029995-0002	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	14,398	14,446	48	14,801	14,903	102
NGFS	PUC	295647	25940	10029995-0002	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	8,842	8,872	30	9,090	9,150	60
NGFS	PUC	295647	25940	10029995-0002	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	197,913	197,995	82	209,783	209,870	87
NGFS	PUC	295647	25940	10029995-0002	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	16,446	16,453	7	16,940	16,947	7
NGFS	PUC	295647	25940	10029995-0002	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	2,326	2,332	6	2,390	2,408	18
NGFS	PUC	295647	25940	10029995-0002	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	4,930	4,960	30	5,095	5,155	60
NGFS	RET	232318	31330	10026788-0001	10000	470199 - Emp Retirement Contributions	40,112,326	39,993,270	(119,056)	41,315,844	41,234,718	(81,126)
NGFS	RET	232318	31330	10026788-0001	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	5,192,438	5,043,434	(149,004)	5,761,482	5,607,678	(153,804)
NGFS	RET	232318	31330	10026788-0001	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	932,134	905,014	(27,120)	816,116	793,976	(22,140)
NGFS	RET	232318	31330	10026788-0001	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	346,982	337,742	(9,240)	380,024	370,496	(9,528)
NGFS	RET	232318	31330	10026788-0001	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	85,431	83,271	(2,160)	93,834	91,602	(2,232)
NGFS	RET	232318	31330	10026788-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	219,709	222,264	2,555	243,645	246,228	2,583
NGFS	RET	232318	31330	10026788-0001	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	36,492	35,580	(912)	40,106	39,146	(960)
NGFS	RET	232318	31330	10026788-0001	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	22,405	21,841	(564)	24,613	24,025	(588)
NGFS	RET	232318	31330	10026788-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	416,111	424,733	8,622	483,397	491,981	8,584
NGFS	RET	232318	31330	10026788-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	40,555	41,089	534	45,283	45,788	505
NGFS	RET	232318	31330	10026788-0001	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	5,904	5,748	(156)	6,478	6,322	(156)
NGFS	RET	232318	31330	10026788-0001	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	15,012	14,436	(576)	16,898	16,298	(600)
NGFS	RET	232318	31330	10026788-0001	10000	527000 - Prof & Specialized Svcs-Bdgt	855,000	855,442	442	855,000	855,380	380
NGFS	RET	232319	31330	10026788-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	99,105	99,381	276	116,753	117,045	292
NGFS	RET	232319	31330	10026788-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	275,117	276,226	1,109	326,176	327,352	1,176
NGFS	RET	232319	31330	10026788-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	25,411	25,505	94	29,229	29,326	97
NGFS	RET	232320	31330	10026788-0001	10000	501000 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Budget	(19,351)	-	19,351	(19,351)	-	19,351
NGFS	RET	232320	31330	10026788-0001	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	6,839,164	6,961,944	122,780	7,204,923	7,360,093	155,170
NGFS	RET	232320	31330	10026788-0001	10000	513000 - Retirement - Budget	86,735	-	(86,735)	86,735	-	(86,735)
NGFS	RET	232320	31330	10026788-0001	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	1,219,090	1,240,522	21,432	1,010,133	1,031,456	21,323
NGFS	RET	232320	31330	10026788-0001	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	356,503	361,268	4,765	371,786	377,902	6,116
NGFS	RET	232320	31330	10026788-0001	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	99,166	100,945	1,779	104,465	106,717	2,252

**Technical Adjustments for May 1 Departments
FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24**

GFS Type	Dept Grp	Dept ID	Fund	Project-Activity	Authority	Account - Title	FY 2022-23 May 1 Proposed	FY 2022-23 Updated	Variance FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24 May 1 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Updated	Variance FY 2023-24
NGFS	RET	232320	31330	10026788-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	192,400	193,722	1,322	208,010	209,440	1,430
NGFS	RET	232320	31330	10026788-0001	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	42,373	43,132	759	44,644	45,603	959
NGFS	RET	232320	31330	10026788-0001	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	26,012	26,482	470	27,408	28,000	592
NGFS	RET	232320	31330	10026788-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	490,152	495,466	5,314	530,116	535,867	5,751
NGFS	RET	232320	31330	10026788-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	44,859	45,310	451	47,152	47,627	475
NGFS	RET	232320	31330	10026788-0001	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	6,839	6,966	127	7,206	7,361	155
NGFS	RET	232320	31330	10026788-0001	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	16,628	17,084	456	17,561	18,133	572
NGFS	RET	232320	31330	10026788-0001	10000	581120 - GF-Con-Financial Systems	69,188	71,317	2,129	70,544	74,184	3,640
NGFS	RET	232320	31330	10026788-0001	10000	581130 - GF-Con-Internal Audits	86,559	86,117	(442)	89,894	89,514	(380)
NGFS	RET	232320	31330	10026788-0001	10000	581210 - DT Technology Infrastructure	366,309	331,968	(34,341)	391,660	358,564	(33,096)
NGFS	RET	232320	31330	10026788-0001	10000	581245 - GF-CON-Information System C	193,831	191,258	(2,573)	195,201	192,476	(2,725)
NGFS	RET	232320	31330	10026788-0001	10000	581325 - DT Enterprise Tech Contracts	40,903	40,904	1	53,642	53,642	-
NGFS	RET	232320	31330	10026788-0001	10000	581360 - DT Telecommunications Servic	54,219	54,219	-	54,219	54,634	415
NGFS	RET	232320	31330	10026788-0001	10000	598040 - Designated For General Reser	328,114	328,113	(1)	-	-	-
NGFS	RNT	232325	10850	10026789-0001	10000	499999 - Beg Fund Balance - Budget Or	3,285,311	4,299,789	1,014,478	2,439,966	2,410,136	(29,830)
NGFS	RNT	232325	10850	10026789-0001	10000	501000 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Budget	(577)	-	577	(577)	-	577
NGFS	RNT	232325	10850	10026789-0001	10000	501010 - Perm Salaries-Misc-Regular	7,338,394	7,362,789	24,395	7,585,726	7,610,743	25,017
NGFS	RNT	232325	10850	10026789-0001	10000	513000 - Retirement - Budget	21,918	-	(21,918)	21,918	-	(21,918)
NGFS	RNT	232325	10850	10026789-0001	10000	513010 - Retire City Misc	1,310,212	1,314,608	4,396	1,065,816	1,069,369	3,553
NGFS	RNT	232325	10850	10026789-0001	10000	514010 - Social Security (OASDI & HI)	375,852	376,783	931	387,860	388,811	951
NGFS	RNT	232325	10850	10026789-0001	10000	514020 - Social Sec-Medicare(HI Only)	108,396	108,750	354	111,982	112,345	363
NGFS	RNT	232325	10850	10026789-0001	10000	515010 - Health Service-City Match	217,409	217,971	562	230,465	231,070	605
NGFS	RNT	232325	10850	10026789-0001	10000	515020 - Retiree Health-Match-Prop B	46,198	46,349	151	47,741	47,896	155
NGFS	RNT	232325	10850	10026789-0001	10000	515030 - RetireeHlthCare-CityMatchProj	28,368	28,461	93	29,309	29,404	95
NGFS	RNT	232325	10850	10026789-0001	10000	515710 - Dependent Coverage	537,101	539,359	2,258	569,315	571,745	2,430
NGFS	RNT	232325	10850	10026789-0001	10000	516010 - Dental Coverage	48,721	48,913	192	50,193	50,393	200
NGFS	RNT	232325	10850	10026789-0001	10000	517010 - Unemployment Insurance	7,481	7,506	25	7,726	7,751	25
NGFS	RNT	232325	10850	10026789-0001	10000	519010 - Fringe Adjustments-Budget	-	(2,029)	(2,029)	-	59	59
NGFS	RNT	232325	10850	10026789-0001	10000	519120 - Long Term Disability Insurance	24,541	24,633	92	25,364	25,458	94
NGFS	RNT	232325	10850	10026789-0001	10000	581130 - GF-Con-Internal Audits	30,499	32,528	2,029	28,811	28,752	(59)
NGFS	RNT	232325	10850	10026789-0001	10000	581210 - DT Technology Infrastructure	112,515	114,885	2,370	122,667	126,452	3,785
NGFS	RNT	232325	10850	10026789-0001	10000	581360 - DT Telecommunications Servic	11,538	11,538	-	11,538	11,713	175
NGFS	RNT	232325	10850	10026789-0001	10000	581470 - GF-HR-Client Svc-Recrut-Assc	91,874	91,874	-	91,874	45,937	(45,937)
NGFS	RNT	232325	10850	10026789-0001	10000	591060 - OTO To 1G-General Fund	0	1,000,000	1,000,000	-	-	-

OEWD BUDGET UPDATE

Presented by
Kate Sofis
Executive Director, OEWD

June 15, 2022



SAN FRANCISCO
OFFICE OF ECONOMIC &
WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

OEWD VISION

A thriving and resilient economy

The Office of Economic and Workforce Development strives to create a **thriving and resilient economy**, where barriers to economic and workforce opportunities are removed, and **prosperity is shared equitably** by all.



EQUITY IS


BIPOC

WOMEN

LGBTQIA

DISABLED

LOW-INCOME



OEWD HIGHLIGHTS

Designed and operationalized over **20 COVID Relief and Recovery Programs**

Assisted **21,634 workers** through employment and relief programs, including **5,572 job seekers** enrolled in workforce services and training


Deployed **\$36.1m** in **COVID relief grants and loans** to **3,023 small businesses**

Through the Dream Keeper Initiative, partnered with **24 Black-led and centered organizations** and deployed **\$2.3m in direct payments** for entrepreneurship and job training participation



SAN FRANCISCO
OFFICE OF ECONOMIC &
WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

OEWD ORGANIZATION




ECONOMIC RECOVERY PRIORITIES



BUDGET OVERVIEW & BASELINE INVESTMENTS

Division	FY 2021-2022	FY 2022-2023	Change from FY 2021-2022	FY 2023-2024	Change from FY 2022-2023
Economic Development	\$69.4m	\$89m	\$19.6m	\$56.7m	(\$32.3m)
Film SF	\$1.2m	\$1.23m	\$25k	\$1.23m	—
Office of Small Business	\$3.5m	\$3.7m	\$144k	\$3.7m	—
Joint Development	\$17.5m	\$15.2m	(\$2.3m)	\$15.2m	—
Workforce Development	\$61m	\$47.5m	(\$13.4m)	\$43.3m	(\$4.2m)
TOTAL	\$152.6m	\$156.6m	\$4m	\$120.1m	(\$36.5m)



JOB & TRAINING FAIRS



INCREASING ENROLLMENT OF TARGETED POPULATIONS



ENTREPRENEURSHIP TRAINING

NEW INVESTMENT:

\$10M SMALL BUSINESS

\$8M Grants

- Rent Relief
- SF Shines
- Vandalism Relief
- Training Grants

\$2M Loan Leverage

- Unlocks \$6m in working capital
- 0% interest loans
- ~\$100k loan amounts

5 New FTE to Support Small Business

- (1) 9775 – Vacancy Mitigation Specialist
- (4) 9774 – Small Business Outreach Specialists

NEW INVESTMENT:

\$27.9 MID-MARKET/TENDERLOIN

\$25.4M Safety Ambassadors

- \$16.9m FY 22-23
- \$8.5m FY 23-24

\$2.5M Mid-Market Activations

- \$2m FY 22-23
- \$.5m FY 23-24



NEW INVESTMENT: \$10M ECONOMIC CORE

\$2M Welcome Ambassadors

- \$2m FY 22-23

\$8M Street Vibrancy and Ground Floor Activations


- \$6m FY 22-23
- \$2m FY 23-24

2 NEW FTE TO SUPPORT ECONOMIC RECOVERY

- (1) 0931 – Director of Economic Recovery Initiatives
- (1) 9775 – Economic Recovery Specialist



EQUITABLE RECOVERY CANNOT HAPPEN WITHOUT THE CORE



The first graduating class of the National Coalition of 100 Black Women's (NCBW) Hospitality Equity program.

June 15, 2022



THANK YOU

www.oewd.org



(415) 554-6969



oewd@sfgov.org



SAN FRANCISCO

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC &
WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

An aerial night view of the San Francisco skyline. The image shows numerous illuminated skyscrapers, including the Transamerica Pyramid and the Salesforce Tower. In the background, the Golden Gate Bridge is visible, spanning the water. The foreground features a large, modern building with a glass facade and a central courtyard area with greenery and a small structure. The text "PLANNING DEPARTMENT" is overlaid in white, and "FY2022-2024 BUDGET" is overlaid in orange and white.


PLANNING DEPARTMENT FY2022-2024 BUDGET

Rich Hillis
Planning Director, June 15, 2022




San Francisco
Planning

FY22-24 Planning **Budget Overview**

- 
- Volume Trend
 - Housing Trend
 - Revenue
 - Expenditures
 - Vacancies

Volume Trend

Planning Case & Permit Volume




2021 Housing Report Highlights **Authorization**

2,093 net units authorized for construction

4,633 net units added to housing stock, 33% over 10-year average

1,495 affordable units



2021 Housing Report Highlights **Projects Filed**

420 projects proposing 7,817 units filed with the Planning Department

6 projects (including Stonestown) propose 5,200+ of these units

Year	▼ Projects Filed	Units Filed
2017	612	5,421
2018	576	5,034
2019	535	3,462
2020	483	2,621
2021	420	7,817
TOTAL	2,626	24,355


Revenue Budget **FY22-24**

Revenues (All Funds)	FY21-22 Adopted Budget	FY22-23 Proposed Budget	FY23-24 Proposed Budget
Charges for Services	\$44,619,578	\$42,429,282	\$42,484,883
Grants & Special Revenues	\$3,145,000	\$3,938,537	\$745,000
Development Impact Fees	\$3,943,797	\$1,201,000	\$801,000
Expenditure Recovery	\$3,010,524	\$3,119,000	\$3,103,444
General Fund Support	\$7,258,681	\$13,201,365	\$9,993,443
Total Revenues	\$61,977,580	\$63,889,184	\$57,127,770

Expenditure Budget **FY22-24**

Expenditures	FY21-22 Adopted Budget	FY22-23 Proposed Budget	FY23-24 Proposed Budget
Salaries & Fringe	\$39,970,299	\$40,184,948	\$40,750,318
Overhead	\$689,271	\$401,241	\$401,241
Non-Personnel Services	\$3,982,473	\$3,543,060	\$3,578,060
Materials & Supplies	\$490,495	\$473,935	\$473,935
Capital & Equipment	\$0	\$0	\$0
Projects	\$8,337,980	\$10,440,954	\$2,847,553
Services of Other Departments	\$8,507,062	\$8,845,046	\$9,076,663
Total Expenditures	\$61,977,580	\$63,889,184	\$57,127,770

Staffing & Vacancies



Vacancies 3 Years

Job Classification	FY19-20	FY20-21	FY21-22
0923 Mgr. II	-	-	1
0931 Mgr. III	-	1	-
1042 IS Engr. -Journey	-	-	1
1053 IS Bus. Analyst Sr.	-	-	2
1094 IT Ops. Support Admin. IV	-	-	1
1232 Training Ofcr.	1	1	1
1241 HR Analyst	1	1	1
1312 Public Info. Ofcr.	1	2	-
1406 Sr. Clerk	1	-	-
1634 Pr. Acct. Clerk	-	-	1
1823 Sr. Admin. Analyst	-	1	-
1827 Admin. Svcs. Mgr.	1	1	-
1842 Mgt. Asst.	1	1	-
5275 Planner Tech.	-	2	2
5277 Planner I	2	-	-
5278 Planner II	8	11	8
5291 Planner III	7	11	12
5293 Planner IV	2	5	3
5298 Planner III - Env'tl. Rvw.	2	1	1
9775 Sr. Cmty. Dev. Spec. II	-	-	1
Total Vacancies	27	38	35

THANK YOU


QUESTIONS?



San Francisco
Planning

Rich Hillis
Director
San Francisco Planning

rich.hillis@sfgov.org
www.sfplanning.org





2022-23 & 2023-24 Proposed Budget



Presented to the Budget and Appropriations Committee
Assessor-Recorder Joaquín Torres
June 15, 2022

Our impact

- ❑ \$4 billion in revenue generated annually:
 - \$3.7 billion in property tax revenue
 - Stable source of revenue that supports credit rating & bonding capacity
 - \$352 million in average transfer tax revenue
 - Exceeding annual budget projections by an average of \$113 million each year
 - \$72 million in additional revenue from our proactive transfer tax audit program



Source: Office of the Controller, City and County of San Francisco

Access & engagement

- ❑ Participating in community events
 - Public affairs team participated in over **165 events** engaging with **thousands of community members**, especially immigrant and underserved communities to raise awareness of our services.
- ❑ Hosting workshops to educate and assist property owners and residents
 - Assessor-Recorder 101 & Property Tax Education - Prop 13, Supplemental Tax, Tax Savings, New Property Tax Laws: Prop 19
 - Family Wealth Series – Asset Building - Personal Finance for 1st time Homeowners, Building Intergenerational Wealth, Estate Planning 101
 - Estate Planning Program - 1:1 legal counseling; workshops; 100 free/low-cost estate plans
- ❑ Ensuring collaboration and language access
 - Provided multi-lingual translation
 - Ensured in-person and online options
 - Collaborated with community-based organizations that are working within communities in the city

SAN FRANCISCO ASSESSOR
JOAQUÍN TORRES
PRESENTS:

*Financial
Foundations for
Homeowners*
DIGITAL FAMILY WEALTH SERIES

TUESDAYS, JULY 2021
1 PM - 2 PM on Zoom

JULY 6 - PROP 19 PROPERTY TAX BENEFITS
JULY 13 - PERSONAL FINANCE for FIRST-TIME BUYERS
JULY 20 - PROPERTY TAX 101
JULY 27 - ESTATE PLANNING 101

PLAN YOUR FUTURE TODAY
FREE to very low-cost Estate Plans for San Francisco
Southeast and Western Addition Households*

Estate Plan Services

- Includes 1-1 legal counseling
- Financial workshops
- Complete estate plan:
documents include a will,
living trust, healthcare
directive, and power of
attorney.

Presented by
HERA
housing and
economic
rights advocates

&
San Francisco
Assessor-Recorder
Joaquín Torres

*Estate plans: Free for low-income households,
\$400 for moderate-income households located in
Southeast neighborhoods and the Western Addition

Sign up today! (510) 271-8443, ext. 300
inquiries@heraca.org

www.heraca.org

Access & engagement

❑ In Person

- Community events
- Office Hours (in community and City Hall), Email, Phone, Mail
 - Our public service team fields 25k customer service requests annually. We serve 2,260 customers with limited English proficiency.
 - Provide information in multiple languages through our own staff and language line and document translation.

❑ Website, social and traditional media, monthly e-newsletters, videos

- We leverage multi-media platforms to share property assessment data, job and contract opportunities, recorded document images, exemption and exclusion resources/FAQs/forms, and educational presentations.

❑ Community Portal

- With the launch of our new property assessment system, taxpayers may login to request customer service, submit statements, make updates to their contact information, and more.



**估值官郭華健
來到你的社區**

估值官辦公室誠邀邀請您來到您社區的公共圖書館與估值官郭華健會面，一起討論十九號提案對您的物業稅和家庭財務狀況的影響。

12月1日，上午10點 - 上午11點
灣景區 Linda Brooks-Burton 公共圖書館
5075 3rd St, San Francisco, CA 94124

12月1日，上午10點 - 上午11點
1月4日，上午11點 - 下午12點
2月2日，時間待定

灣景區公共圖書館
• BERNAL HEIGHTS 公共圖書館
• EXCELSIOR 公共圖書館

1月4日，上午11點 - 下午12點
Bernal Heights 公共圖書館
500 Cortland Ave, San Francisco, CA 94110

2月2日，時間待定
Excelsior 公共圖書館
4400 Mission St, San Francisco, CA 94112

JOAQUÍN TORRES 郭華健
ASSESSOR 估值官

聯絡: assessor@sfgov.org 回復: www.sfassessor.org/events

Focus on racial equity

- ❑ Focus on **estate planning services** and other public programming as part of office outreach and community engagement strategy
- ❑ **AB1466 implementation**
 - 1.5 FTE to support the identification and redaction of racially offensive language from recorded documents
 - Raising awareness and action through art and civic discourse programming



Focus on racial equity

- ❑ Implementing Racial Equity Action Plan
- ❑ New racial equity consultant shared with TTX and CON
- ❑ Promoting staff diversity:
 - New participation in job fairs to facilitate diverse recruitment
 - Increasing internship opportunities for diverse candidates
 - Appraiser trainee program to create new pipeline and opportunities: 6 trainees currently in program
 - Equity professional development program to prioritize opportunities for staff of color




Driving through workload challenges

In the coming year, our staff will process thousands of cases...
... while defending City revenues on large increases in assessment appeals

- Appeals filed with the AAB increased by 69% in 20-21 and 4% in 21-22 thus far
- Cases represent \$558 million in revenue at risk to City


... implementing new systems, policy, and legislation.

- Proposition 19: implement new rules for parent-to-child & intercounty transfers
- Phase 2 of SMART project scheduled to go live in December 2022



Property assessment system

- ❑ Allow for more efficient, accurate, & secure collection and processing of annual property tax revenues
- ❑ **Phase 2** for real property, change in ownership, and possessory interest will go live in **late 2022** and requires resources to:
 - Secure project staff to ensure timely go-live
 - Ensure proper data transfer between legacy system and new system
 - Plan and execute large, complex user acceptance testing process
 - Train and communicate system updates to internal, departmental, and public users
- ❑ **Phase 1** for business personal property went live in **January 2021**
- ❑ ASR continues to partner with TTX/CON to integrate with their billing/collections system
- ❑ Our 22-23 budget includes the final year of funding (\$2.08 million) for project implementation
 - Ongoing staffing, licensing, & maintenance costs not yet reflected in 23-24 budget



Total Proposed Budget and FTE


	2021-22 Approved	2022-23 Mayor	2023-24 Mayor	Change from FY22	Change from FY23
Total Budget (\$ in millions)	\$36.2	\$36.2	\$34.2	(\$0.0)	(\$2.0)
Operating Positions	187.0	188.6	189.0	1.6	0.4
Non-Operating Positions	21.0	21.0	17.0	-	(4.0)
Temporary - Miscellaneous	0.6	0.7	0.7	0.1	(0.0)
Unfunded Positions (Attrition Savings)	(23.5)	(18.0)	(18.5)	5.5	(0.6)
Total FTE	185.2	192.3	188.1	7.1	(4.1)

Total FY 22-23 budget is \$36.2M, a
\$0 change from FY 21-22.
The FY 23-24 budget
decreases by \$2M.

Summary of FTE Changes

	Change from FY22	Change from FY23
New FTE	1.6	0.4
Annualized FTE		
Temp salaries	0.1	(0.0)
Attrition	5.5	(0.6)
Deleted positions		(4.0)
	7.1	(4.1)

Proposed Budget Organizational Chart




Includes proposed FY 22-23 Budgeted positions, vacancies and the number of FTE that must be held vacant for attrition savings.

Staffing – Current Year Vacancies


- ❑ ASR currently has 185 funded positions and 9 vacancies (4.9% vacancy rate)
- ❑ Why are positions vacant?
 - Some positions are held vacant for attrition savings.
 - Project positions - difficult to fill IT positions, need to hire based on project cycle
 - Operations positions - staff on leave to project, exam process
- ❑ When will they be filled?
 - 8 positions will be filled by June 30th

	2022	2021	2020
Total Budgeted Positions	208.6	208.6	215.7
Attrition Savings	(23.5)	(26.0)	(19.8)
<u>Total Funded FTEs</u>	<u>185.2</u>	<u>182.7</u>	<u>195.9</u>
Total Filled FTEs	176.0	173.0	183.3
Vacant Total	9.1	9.7	12.8



Staffing – Attrition Trends

- ❑ Current year general fund attrition budget is \$3.7 million, ~23.5 FTE
- ❑ Over the last 5 years, we have met our attrition target leaving very little salary surplus at year end.
- ❑ We have reduced budgeted attrition in FY 22-23 to:
 - Address impending workload challenges brought on by Prop 19 and the growing number of assessment appeals



Thank you!



Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector

Budget Presentation

June 15, 2022



Mission

The Office of the San Francisco Treasurer & Tax Collector serves as the banker, tax collector, collection agent, and investment officer for the City and County of San Francisco. Our mission is to collect and safeguard the City's money and use our expertise to assist low-income San Francisco families build economic security and mobility.

Vision

We are committed to providing excellent services for taxpayers, customers, and our community. By promoting diversity, equity, and inclusion, we are a stronger, smarter, and more informed government agency.

Numbers - Fiscal Year to Date



95,870 Registered
Businesses



\$3 Billion Online Payments



\$6.3 Billion Revenue
Collected



14.7 Million
Online Transactions



\$14 Billion Funds Invested



754,00 Online
Interactions with 99%
of tax filings online



1,136,000 Individual
Communications delivered




77,000 - 311
calls/tickets

First Year Free

November 1, 2021 – April 30, 2022


811 First Year Free Enrollments




320
\$71,408
TTX



133
\$54,972
DPH




12
\$19,758
DBI



5
\$6,356
ENT




4
\$2,569
DPW



2
\$2,576
CPC

Total Waived: \$157,639

Proposed FY22-23 Budget- \$46.7M



Budget Comparison



Proposed

**Authorized FTE
(ASO)**

FY21-22

FY22-23

FY23-24

226.50

233.22

233.90

Budgeted FTE

202.13

208.64

209.43

**General Fund
Support**

\$25.93M

\$24.28M

\$24.74M

TTX Budget

\$44.96M

\$46.77M

\$46.76M




Staffing - Vacancies

- Average vacancy rate 20% over the last 3 years, attrition has been used to meet prior year budget targets
- Current vacancy count is 50 FTEs, 22% budgeted FTE
 - 48% (24 FTE) is due to budgeted attrition
 - 52% (26 FTE) is due to hiring slowdowns:
 - 1) Majority of our positions are class based permanent positions;
 - 2) Reviewed all minimum qualifications for greater equity;
 - 3) Short staffed in TTX - HR;
 - 4) Staggered hires to provide promotive opportunities;
 - 5) Shelter In Place limited hiring and many staff served as DSWs



Organization Chart





Vacancy Impact

- Revenue: Half of the 50 positions are revenue generating with specific metrics for collection of taxes, fees and/or audits
- Promotive opportunities
- Racial Equity

Future Plans

- TTX is hiring an additional FTE in our HR to quickly fill positions.
- Contracted with consultants to further deepen racial equity work focused on hiring and key positions that have been traditionally homogeneous
- Budgeting to reduce attrition, which was used in the past to manage budget cut requests
- Continue to adjust attrition budget to support full implementation of taxes that are no longer deferred - Cannabis, Vacancy and full auditing of Commercial Rents Tax



Priorities for the Future


- Complete Implementation of new taxes – Commercial Vacancy , Overpaid Executive , and Cannabis
- Facilitate citywide small business relief efforts, including First Year Free, installment plans, and fee waiver programs
- Transition entire city to new banking partners
- Prioritize Programs Centered Around Equity, Including:
 - Continue to identify and eliminate fines and fees that disproportionality impact low-income people of color
 - Grow and Interconnect Kindergarten to College
 - Continue Implementation of Racial Equity Action Plan



Questions?

Respectfully Submitted by the
Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector

Controller's Office Proposed Budget FY 2022-23 and 2023-24




CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Office of the Controller

June 15, 2022

Proposed FY 2022-23 Budget



Controller's Office Budget Snapshot

	FY 2021-22 Approved	FY 2022-23 Proposed	FY 2023-24 Proposed
Total Budget	\$76.9M	\$82.5M +\$5.6M	\$82.5M +\$0.0M
General Fund Support	\$11.8M	\$12.2M +\$0.4M	\$12.7M +\$0.5M
Funded Positions (FTEs)	251	252	253
Off-Budget Positions (FTEs)	48	59	61

FY2019 to FY2022 Staffing: Filled vs Vacancies

Fiscal Year	Authorized FTEs	Attrition Savings FTEs	Total Net Funded FTEs	Permanent FTEs Filled	Temp Filled	Total Vacant FTEs	Vacant FTE %
2022	323	-23	300	245	41	14	5%
2021	319	-22	297	246	31	20	7%
2020	327	-20	307	255	34	18	6%

Key Initiatives

Government Operations Recovery Project

- Critical citywide shared projects with DHR and City Administrator
- Catch up & build new processes: Hiring, contracting, financial pain points
- Three new positions in Controller's Office – finance & system work

System replacement & modernization

- Post go-live support & refinement of the City's new budget system
- Improving usability & adoption of the City's financial system
- Refreshing public transparency tools

Key Initiatives

Refuse rate administration

- New CON rate monitoring & setting responsibility given Prop F (June 2022)
- Two new non-General Fund positions requested

Racial equity action planning & implementation

- Citywide: Contractor reporting project; other ORE support projects
- Departmental: Internal training; recruitment changes; focus on pipeline jobs

Recovering from the emergency

- Completing hand-offs of COVID projects; ongoing FEMA claiming work
- Complete hiring project to fully restaff the department


Thank you!


Questions or comments?

Appendix

- **FY 2021-22 Organizational Chart**
- **Controller Reports Samples**
- **Key Performance Measures**

FY 2021-22 Organizational Chart





Key Performance Measures


Provide High-Quality Financial Services	2018-19 Actual	2019-20 Actual	2020-21 Actual	2021-22 Target	2022-23 Target
Number of days to complete the City's comprehensive financial report (CAFR) for the previous fiscal year	268	183	241	150	150
City receives certificate of achievement for excellence in financial reporting from Government Finance Officers Association	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Number of findings of material weakness in annual City audit	0	0	2	0	0
Percent of payroll transactions not requiring correction	98.8%	99.3%	98.7%	99.0%	99.0%
Provide High-Quality Financial Systems	2018-19 Actual	2019-20 Actual	2020-21 Actual	2021-22 Target	2022-23 Target
Percent of scheduled time that financial systems are available for departmental use	100%	100%	99.9%	99.9%	99.9%
Percent of scheduled time that human capital systems are available for departmental use	100%	100%	99.9%	99.9%	99.9%
Safeguard the City's Long-Term Financial Health	2018-19 Actual	2019-20 Actual	2020-21 Actual	2021-22 Target	2022-23 Target
Percentage by which actual revenues vary from mid-year estimates	4.2%	11.1%	-3.6%	1.5%	1.5%
Percentage by which actual General Fund revenues vary from prior year revised budget estimates	5.0%	6.5%	-4.4%	2.0%	2.0%
Stabilization reserve balance as a percentage of General Fund revenues	9.2%	10.0%	10.0%	6.9%	3.5%
Ratings of the City's General Obligation Bonds from Moody's	AAA	AAA	AAA	AAA	AAA

Key Performance Measures

Ensure Government is Accountable to City Residents	2018-19 Actual	2019-20 Actual	2020-21 Actual	2021-22 Target	2022-23 Target
Percent of audit recommendations implemented within 2 years after report issuance.	90%	92%	94%	85%	85%
Percent of auditee ratings that are good or excellent	83%	97%	69%	85%	85%
Percent of client ratings for technical assistance projects that are good or excellent	100%	N/A	N/A	95%	95%
Support Informed Policy Decisions	2018-19 Actual	2019-20 Actual	2020-21 Actual	2021-22 Target	2022-23 Target
Percentage of OEA economic impact reports completed by the hearing date	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Completion rate of ballot analysis by the hearing date	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of Data Academy Training Participants	1,436	1,269	0	N/A	N/A

GEN

General City Responsibility



CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Office of the Controller

June 15, 2022

OVERVIEW

General City Responsibility (GEN) contains revenues and expenditures that are allocated for use across multiple City departments.

It is not an operating department and has no salary, travel, or materials and supplies budgets.

The main revenues and expenditures in GEN were described in detail in the Controller's Revenue Letter presentation:

- Revenues include property, business, hotel, transfer, and other local taxes.
- Largest expenditures are voter-mandated baseline transfers to support operations outside the General Fund, such as the MTA, libraries, and schools.

GEN is also where debt service on General Obligation bonds is budgeted. The Board of Supervisors will approve the property tax rate resolution in September.

(\$ millions)	FY 21-22	FY 22-23	FY 23-24
General Fund			
Regular Revenues	5,427	6,183	6,441
Expenditures			
Financial Baselines	1,620	1,763	1,850
Retiree Health	87	103	107
Real Estate, IT, Audits, Utilities	39	43	45
CBO CODB	22	21	21
Debt Service Funds	379	386	305

Office of the City Attorney **Budget Presentation**

FISCAL YEARS 2022-23 & 2023-24





City Attorney's Mission & Work





**ADVICE &
COUNSEL**



**LEGISLATION &
CONTRACTS**



**DEFENSIVE
LITIGATION**



**AFFIRMATIVE
LITIGATION**



**PUBLIC
INTEGRITY &
INVESTIGATIONS**

Office Teams

Airport

Complex & Affirmative
Litigation

Executive

Health & Human Services

Litigation

Tax

Accounting & Finance

Child and Family Services/
Conservatorship

Construction & Public
Contracting

Finance & Real Estate

Public Integrity &
Investigations

Port

Transportation

Administrative Services

Claims

Energy &
Telecommunications

Government

Labor

Public Utilities

Workers' Compensation

Human Resources

Code Enforcement

Ethics & Elections

Government Litigation

Land Use

Retirement

Information Technology




Budget




Growth Over Time (1/1/2014 – 1/31/2021)

CITY WORKFORCE




CITY ATTORNEY'S
OFFICE WORKFORCE




Budget Overview

FY 2022-23



TOTAL: \$103,517,975

FY 2023-24



TOTAL: \$104,883,204

Budget Changes

	2021-22 Original Budget	2022-23 Proposed Budget	Change from 2021-2022 Original Budget	Percent Change
Total Budget	\$98,679,267	\$103,517,975	\$4,838,708	4.9%

	2022-23 Proposed Budget	2023-24 Proposed Budget	Change from 2022-2023 Proposed Budget	Percent Change
Total Budget	\$103,517,975	\$104,883,204	\$1,365,229	1.3%

Adjustments to Budget

Adjustment Description	FY 2022-23 Change From 2021-22	FY 2023-24 Change From 2022-23
Salary (COLA and Attrition adjustments)	3,381,088	2,102,455
Mandatory Fringe Benefits	(265,035)	(1,393,013)
8 New Positions (Salary & Fringe)	2,121,982	570,236
2 New Govt Operations Recovery Project Positions (Salary and Fringe)	-	-
Diversity, Equity and Inclusion	100,000	-
Other Non Personnel Services	145,163	-
Materials & Supplies	15,500	-
Services of Other Department	(659,990)	85,551
Summary of Changes	4,838,708	1,365,229

Proposed New Initiatives



**WORKERS' RIGHTS
TEAM**



**GUN VIOLENCE
RESTRAINING ORDERS
(GVRO)**

Funded Vacancies

FY 2019-20



FY 2020-21




FY 2021-22



Controller's Vacancy Report Data

Fiscal Year	Total Net Funded FTEs	Total Filled FTEs	Vacant Total	Vacant FTE %
FY 2019-20	315.2	295.1	20.1	6.4%
FY 2020-21	314.8	292.0	22.8	7.2%
FY 2021-22	316.3	311.9	4.4	1.4%

Office Organization Chart (June 2022)





San Francisco City Attorney's Office

FISCAL YEARS 2022-23 & 2023-24

San Francisco Health Service System FYE 2023 and 2024 Proposed Budget

Budget and Appropriations Committee Presentation
June 15, 2022



San Francisco Health Service System

Mission: Dedicated to preserving and improving sustainable, quality health benefits and enhancing the well-being of employees, retirees and their families


SFHSS Accountabilities

- 124,069 covered lives.
- Serving employees, retirees & families of CCSF, SFUSD, SFCCD and Courts
- Impact on CCSF budget:
 - High quality and affordable health benefits
 - Manage \$1B spend for health benefits
 - Saved \$4M per year with lower rate increases compared to California's largest 10 counties over the last 5 years. Strategies for achieving the savings included member wellness and health engagement programs.
 - General Fund annual budget \$13.5 M and 48 FTEs administering overall benefits including wellness and mental health programs.

San Francisco Health Service System Divisions

- Administration
 - Policy development, support Health Service Board, plan selection and performance management
- Member Services
 - Resolve 58,000 inquiries, manage 13,000 annual enrollments
- Finance & Contract
 - Rates & Benefits, Annual 10 County Contribution Survey, contract solicitation compliance, vendor performance, funding administration and program integrity
- Enterprise Analytics
 - Implement new technology strategies, ensure systems and data security, performs administrative analysis and data management
- Well-Being/Employee Assistance Program (EAP)
 - Develop and maintain whole-person well-being programs, manage city-wide 24/7 EAP for 30,000+ CCSF employees

Organization Chart and Staffing – General Fund



- Total FTE budget is 48 FTEs net of 5.5 attrition
- Currently 6.5 vacancies primarily to maintain budget attrition target of 5.5 FTEs. Recruiting 1 employee assistance counselor.
- Attrition target increased in FYE 2022 by 2 FTEs. The vacancies and the pandemic disruption have delayed compliance (Dependent Eligibility Verification Audit (DEVA)) and wellness projects.
- For the past 3 years, staffing is close to budget, net of attrition.

Mayor Changes in the General Fund Budget

- Moved funding for 2 positions to General Fund from Healthcare Sustainability Fund (HSF) to preserve HSF - \$500K
- Updated wage increases based on collective bargaining agreements \$200K
- Updated estimate of external audit fees - \$29K
- Update lease expense based on expiration of the current lease in FYE 2024

Budget with Mayor Changes

	FYE 2023				FYE 2024		
	Original Bud	Myr Update	Change		Original Bud	Myr Update	Change
Positions							
General Fund before attrition	52.71	54.70	2.00		52.72	54.71	2.00
Attrition	(5.52)	(5.50)	0.02		(5.50)	(5.48)	0.02
Net GF	47.19	49.20	2.02		47.22	49.23	2.01
Sources							
Charges for Services	9,131	9,131	-		9,131	9,131	-
Other Revenues	450,000	450,000	-		445,000	445,000	-
Expenditure Recovery	12,347,820	13,092,365	744,545		12,388,596	13,378,566	989,970
Total Sources	12,806,951	13,551,496	744,545		12,842,727	13,832,697	989,970
Uses - Operating Expenditures							
Salaries	5,859,750	6,353,817	494,067		6,019,471	6,586,477	567,006
Benefits	2,642,267	2,862,833	220,566		2,518,316	2,748,113	229,797
Non Personnel Services	2,285,150	2,314,006	28,856		2,268,873	2,301,450	32,577
Material and Supplies	61,362	61,362	-		68,481	68,481	-
Services of Other Depts	1,958,422	1,959,478	1,056		1,967,586	2,128,176	160,590
Total Uses	12,806,951	13,551,496	744,545		12,842,727	13,832,697	989,970



San Francisco Office of the City Administrator

Carmen Chu, City Administrator

FY2022-24 Budget Overview

Budget and Appropriations Committee

June 15, 2021


Major Programs under the CAO

- City Administrator's Office
- Department of Public Works*
- Department of Technology

- 311 Customer Service Center
- Animal Care & Control
- Civic Engagement & Immigrant Affairs
- COIT
- Community Challenge Grants
- Contract Administration
- Contract Monitoring Division
- Convention Facilities
- County Clerk
- DataSF
- Digital Services
- Entertainment Commission
- Fleet Management
- Grants for the Arts
- Mayor's Office on Disability
- Medical Examiner
- Office of Labor Standards Enforcement
- Office of Cannabis
- Permit Center
- Real Estate Division
- Resilience & Capital Planning
- Risk Management
- Reprographics & Mail Services
- Transgender Initiatives
- Treasure Island

Budget Overview

	FY21-22	FY22-23	FY23-24
Uses	555m	604m	593m
FTE	962	984	993



Largest cost drivers:


- Debt costs
- COLAs from labor union MOUs
- Increased convention levels
- Insurance costs
- Fuel prices
- PUC power rates

Focus on the Foundation

Providing more centralized support to improve program effectiveness and prioritize scarce public resources

- ADM has a central role in citywide process improvement through its internal service programs that set citywide policies on procurement, vehicles, real estate, insurance, resiliency, capital planning, information technology, data governance, and digital services.
- There are also 25 divisions within ADM which would be more effective and benefit from more centralized support for project management, strategic planning, and process improvement in addition to the budget, accounting, and HR functions currently covered.
- New positions requested to manage analytical projects with department-wide and citywide scope with the end goal of improving complex processes and systems that affect numerous stakeholders.

Growth of ADM Programs Relative to Central Office



Focus on the Foundation

Create structure for more cross-division and cross-department collaboration and focus on processes that have a significant impact on City operations at large

- Builds on the realignment instituted this past year to improve support and collaboration for the numerous divisions and initiatives of the City Administrator; major portfolios incl: Capital Planning & Infrastructure Management, Contracting & Grants, Technology & Communications, Direct Public Services & Access.
- Resource Government Operations Recovery Initiative, a project of the City Administrator, Controller's Office, and Department of Human Resources to address operational challenges and backlogs in citywide hiring, contracting and the financial systems that support our work.
 - New positions to identify rule and procedural changes and design business process improvements for more efficient contracting.

Focus on the Foundation

Support our human resources to meet our service goals


- Adequately staff the HR team, which serves ADM, DT and PW (partial year), in order to address the backlog in hiring, improve employee labor relations, and reduce the overtime worked.
- For many years, HR has been under resourced despite the fact that the team currently serves 27 different divisions with approximately 270 different budgeted job classifications.

Staffing


Increase in vacancy levels driven by:

- Hiring freeze in FY21
- Increased exits in FY22
- Late kick-offs for large new budget initiatives
- Internal and external obstacles

Exits and Hires FY20-FY22



Net Vacancies FY20-FY22



Staffing


Impact of increased vacancies

- Staff burnout and low morale.
- Difficulty maintaining performance levels.
- Hesitancy to take on new initiatives and workloads.

Plans to fill

- HR investments to increase hiring rate and help keep employees here longer.
- Fill all positions as quickly as possible, only holding enough vacant in order to stay within budget given increased attrition targets.

Staffing



Thank you!

FY22 Division Highlights

- Digital Services built an online tool for the **Accessible Business Entrance** program to help property owners make entrances accessible. 82% of applications are being processed automatically without staff intervention.
- 311 Customer Service Center supported "Shine On SF" initiative by expanding use of Connected Worker app to 7 Community Benefit Districts (CBDs) and **routing street cleaning and graffiti cases** to the CBDs to help speed response time and resolution.
- The Permit Center now receives and answers general inquiries for the Planning Department's Permit Information Desk, completing the first step in creating **consolidated permitting customer service**.

FY22 Division Highlights

- DataSF published 27 datasets on the **Open Data** Portal, including the first live, real-time dataset, on calls for Police service since January 2016.
- The Committee on Information Technology, Digital Services, the Mayor's Office on Disability, and Office of Civic Engagement and Immigrant Affairs collaborated to produce a **Digital Accessibility and Inclusion Standard** to make web content and services accessible to all residents.
- The Office of Transgender Initiatives launched the **Transgender 101 training** module for all City employees to strengthen the City's commitment to inclusion.

FY22 Division Highlights

- The Entertainment Commission began implementing the **Small Business Recovery Act**, increasing flexibility and lowering regulatory barriers for entertainment uses.
- The Office of Contract Administration worked with the Contract Monitoring Division and Office of Labor Standards and Enforcement to develop a contract management system to **digitize the Chapter 21 contracting workflow** and allow detailed tracking and reporting.
- The Contract Monitoring Division oversaw the implementation of the new 14B legislation increasing Local Business Enterprise (LBE) certification thresholds, ensuring greater prime contractor accountability, and **helping LBEs build capacity** in order to bid and perform work on City contracts.

FY22 Division Highlights

- Mayor's Office on Disability led the dissemination of a training curriculum aimed at **improving access and awareness** of the needs of kids with disabilities and their families who wish to participate in Summer Together, summer camp and after-school programs.
- The Office of the Chief Medical Examiner has significantly **decreased their turnaround time**, now completing final Death Certificates within 90 days for 85% of their cases; they also achieved provisional accreditation from the National Association of Medical Examiners (NAME).
- **Conventions returned** to the Moscone Convention Center, generating 52.2m in direct economic impact.

FY22 Division Highlights

- The Office of Cannabis **received 7.4m in grant awards**, including 4.5m from the Governor's Office of Business and Economic Development for Local Equity Grants.
- The Office of Civic Engagement & Immigrant Affairs conducted a first **Language Access Community Survey** of residents who speak primary languages other than English. The survey was conducted in 11 languages with over 2,000 responses.
- The Office of Resiliency & Capital Planning continued to refine its submission process to **integrate racial equity in capital budget decision-making**.

FY22 Division Highlights


- This year, the Office of Labor Standards Enforcement collected over **100 million dollars in restitution for San Francisco workers** while settling the two largest cases in program history, including a settlement with Doordash for over 5 million dollars.
- The Real Estate Division successfully negotiated the purchase of 1236 Carroll Ave. for the **new Fire Training Facility**.
- ReproMail started offering **print services to Permit Center customers** at the newly opened 49SVN Print Center.
- Risk Management conducted **insurance & indemnity requirement reviews** for over 400 contracts, grants, leases, licenses & permits for 70 city departments & business units supporting critical projects.

FY22 Division Highlights

- **Daily ferry service** between Treasure Island and the San Francisco Ferry Terminal began in March upon completion of the new ferry terminals by Treasure Island Community Development.
- Fleet Management established a program to **rent out underutilized vehicles** to supplant rentals from a vendor at premium prices.
- County Clerk issued fee-waived birth, death, and marriage records to victims of California Wildfires to **replace vital documents lost in the fires.**

FY22 Division Highlights

- Animal Care & Control **found fur-ever homes for 1,233 animals** by leveraging virtual adoption program and exposure to 75k followers across all social media platforms. Including domestic and wildlife partners, we placed 2,934 animals.
- Community Challenge Grants received 29 applications for 2.4m in **neighborhood beautification projects** for this year's funding cycle.
- Grants for the Arts created a new grant application that is streamlined and less cumbersome, making the application **easier for small, under-resourced arts organizations** to apply.



Photograph courtesy of Gordon Mak



Department of Technology


FY 22/23 BOS Budget & Appropriations Committee

June 2022

Supporting the delivery of high-quality public services in the City & County of San Francisco.



DT Organization





Budget Chair Questions

Staffing and Vacancies

Year	# of Vacancies
FY 2021-2022	32*
FY 2020-2021	37
FY 2019-2020	34

Year FY 2021-2022 Vacancies*	
Avg # of months vacant	15
# vacant for a year or less	36
# vacant for over a year	21

**Attrition is used for staff augmentation until the position is filled*

How have these vacancies affected DT projects?

DT project are time sensitive; vacancies delay projects and reduce ROI

Increased use of contractors and project costs

Increased overtime to cover critical 24/7 operations

Why are these positions still vacant?

Difficulty recruiting; issues are salary and telework

Internal process requires multiple approvals, lose candidates during hiring

Difficulty finding qualified network and cyber engineers

DT Strategies for Filling Vacancies

Attracting and retaining talented employees

Creating equitable job opportunities and promoting career development

1. Quickly hire qualified candidates before they choose other employers
2. Use attrition to fund staff augmentation during recruitment
(agreement with Local 21)
1. DT's new RE Manager will implement recruitment accelerators
2. Address salary inversion for long-term employees
3. Utilize a recruiter when hiring specialists and senior engineers
4. Continue the DT Internship program (college and high school) which recruited 4 junior engineers
5. Create new apprentice program to train junior engineers (like CON accountant program)





Budget Overview


(\$ in Millions)

Funding Type		FY21-22		FY22-23		FY23-24
Operating	\$	136.6	\$	144.5	\$	155.8
COIT	\$	2.2	\$	5.3	\$	4.7
Capital	\$	14.2	\$	3.9	\$	1.7
Grand Total	\$	153.0	\$	153.8	\$	162.2




Budget Uses by Expenditure Type

Allocation of Cost Categories for FY 22-23



DT Initiatives FY22/23

- ❖ Citywide technology operations for:
 - Connectivity and communications infrastructure
 - First responder radio network
 - SFGovTV public meeting broadcast and virtual public meetings
 - Desktop productivity support – in office and telework
- ❖ Infrastructure Modernization:
 - Data Center Resiliency to expand COOP and DR
 - Software Defined Networks Deployed
 - Cloud Center of Excellence for efficiency and cost effectiveness
 - VoIP for DPW, SFPD, Sheriff to reduce telecom risk
- ❖ Build JUSTIS Data Center of Excellence for 8 justice agencies
- ❖ Government operations recovery: contracting management system
- ❖ Operationalize the Office of Cyber Security to establish DR standards, evaluate risk, support small depts and add cyber assistance program for CBOs
- ❖ Engineer and build the Fire Department modern network for 50 stations
- ❖ Continue to connect affordable housing residents to free City internet service



Fiber to Housing

Free City Internet Service

- ❖ 6,500+ Housing Units
- ❖ 39 Community Rooms
- ❖ 9 Rec Centers
- ❖ 4 Chinatown SROs
- ❖ Market Street Wi-Fi upgraded
- ❖ City as Internet Service Provider Established

Potrero Housing Complex
397 Units, 145 students
Wi-Fi Service: 25-50 Mbps



Sunnydale Housing Complex
563 Units, 268 students
Wi-Fi Service: 25-50 Mbps



Connected Government Systems, Services & Communities

Shared data and systems eliminate silos and build partnership opportunities



Demonstrate the Business Value of Technology *(lower cost, added capacity and increased performance)*



Deliver a High-Performing Organization *(recruiting and building a diverse tech workforce)*



Enable an Insights-Driven Business *(Intelligent data systems & measurable outcomes –JUSTIS Center of Excellence)*



Optimize Tech Stack and Services *(efficiency and economy with enterprise systems)*



Embed Cybersecurity and Privacy in the City *(accelerate DR and risk mgt for departments and business partners)*



Evaluate and Experiment with Emerging Tech *(Leverage city broadband fiber and connectivity for the Digital City)*



Inspire and Innovate with Technology *(showcase the “art of the possible”)*

THANK YOU!

Questions & Comments




SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF
TECHNOLOGY

Appendix A

DT Organization Chart for FY 23



DT Organization





DT Organization

City Chief Information Officer (0964)

SFGovTV

*(Virtual/Broadcast BOS & Commissions,
Media Programs, Press, Social Media)*

1.00 0941
1.00 1766
11.00 1767
1.00 1769
1.00 1781

Public Safety Systems & Broadband

*(POL/FIR Radio, Inside Telcom Wiring, Alarms,
Wireless and Broadband Fiber Networks)*

1.00 0923
1.00 0954
1.00 1842
5.00 7257
2.00 7273
9.00 7308
14.00 7338
12.00 7362
7.00 7368
2.50 8234
2.00 8236
2.00 0932 Vacant
1.00 0933 Vacant
1.00 5364 Vacant
1.00 7273 Vacant

Client Support Services

*(Service Desk, 24x7 NOC, Desktop
Systems, IT Training)*


1.00 0953
1.00 1033
4.00 1043
1.00 1044
1.00 1053
1.00 1054
9.00 1092
5.00 1093
4.00 1094
1.00 1406
2.00 1092 Vacant
1.00 1093 Vacant
1.00 1094 Vacant

Admin Services


*(Accounting, Budget, Contracts, Billing,
HR, Asset Mgt, Facilities, Racial Equity)*

1.00 0923	5.00 1823
1.00 0931	5.00 1824
2.00 0932	1.00 1825
1.00 0953	1.00 1934
1.00 1053	1.00 1938
1.00 1054	1.00 1950
1.00 1070	1.00 0932 Vacant
1.00 1452	1.00 0954 Vacant
1.00 1454	1.00 1054 Vacant
2.00 1632	1.00 1452 Vacant
1.00 1634	1.00 1652 Vacant
1.00 1652	1.00 1822 Vacant
2.00 1654	

DT Organization




Level of Effort in Program Areas



DT: A Catalyst for Innovation & Opportunities

Internet infrastructure
will accelerate
communication and
connectivity in our
Digital City



San Francisco Human Rights Commission

JUNE 15, 2022 BUDGET PRESENTATION

San Francisco Human Rights Commission



Office of Racial
Equity



Community
Engagement



Operations



Civil Rights
Division



Dream Keeper
Initiative



Finance



Office of
SHARP



Economic
Rights



Communications

Departmental Highlights

San Francisco Human Rights Commission

Dream Keeper Initiative

hired staff , coordinated with departments and launched initiative


Opportunities for All

Expansion of programming, recieved funding from the State


Organizational Development

Presentations are tools that can be used as lectures

FY22-23 Proposed Operating Budget





FY22-23 Proposed Program Budget



Staffing and Vacancies


San Francisco Human Rights Commission








	FY2021-2022
	Original Budget
Total Budget	\$14,543,732
Total FTE	37.81

FY2022-2023		FY2023-2024	
Proposed Budget	Change from 21-22	Proposed Budget	Change from 22-23
14,819,632	\$275,900	14,946,433	\$126,801
39.46	1.65	41.44	1.97







SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC WORKS

Budget Overview

JUNE 15, 2022

8 Bureaus



Building Design
and Construction



Infrastructure Design
and Construction



Street-Use and
Mapping



Building Repair



Urban Forestry



Street Environmental
Services




Street and
Sewer Repair




General
Administration


Public Works: Current Structure



Public Works: After Proposition B



Sanitation and Streets



Budget Snapshot by Bureau – All Funds

Bureau <i>\$ in millions</i>	Approved Budget	Proposed Budget	\$ Change	Proposed Budget	\$ Change
	FY 2021-22	FY 2022-23	FY 2021-22	FY 2023-24	FY 2022-23

Public Works

General Administration	\$1.2	\$24.7	\$23.5	\$25.7	\$1.0
Building Design and Construction	\$20.7	\$29.7	\$9.0	\$32.8	\$3.1
Infrastructure Design and Construction	\$134.5	\$177.9	\$43.4	\$137.9	(\$40.0)
Operations	\$201.1	\$55.8	(145.3)	\$2.7	(\$53.1)
Commission	-	\$0.4	\$0.4	\$0.4	(\$0.0)
Public Works Total	\$357.5	\$288.5	(\$69.0)	\$199.5	(\$89.0)

Sanitation and Streets

General Administration	-	\$6.9	\$6.9	\$6.4	(\$0.5)
Operations	-	\$150.8	\$150.8	\$206.9	\$56.1
Commission	-	\$0.5	\$0.5	\$0.4	(\$0.0)
Sanitation and Streets Total	-	\$158.2	\$158.2	\$213.7	\$55.5
Grand Total	\$357.5	\$446.7	\$89.2	\$413.3	(33.4)




Full-Time Equivalent Positions (FTE) by Divisions – All Funds

Division/Bureau	FY 2021-22			FY 2022-23				FY 2023-24			
	Operating Positions	Project Positions	Total Positions	Operating Positions	Project Positions	Total Positions	Change	Operating Positions	Project Positions	Total Positions	Change
<u>Public Works</u>											
General Administration	78.0	6.0	84.0	183.5	5.0	188.5	104.5	196.0	5.0	201.0	12.5
Building Design and Construction	69.0	236.0	305.0	38.0	240.0	278.0	(27.1)	38.0	241.0	279.0	1.1
Infrastructure Design and Construction	162.0	352.0	514.0	152.1	352.8	504.9	(9.1)	154.0	353.0	507.0	2.1
Operations	751.0	32.0	783.0	182.0	8.0	190.0	(593.0)	-	-	-	(190.0)
Commission	-	-	-	7.0	-	7.0	7.0	7.0	-	7.0	-
Public Works Total	1,060.0	626.0	1,686.0	562.7	605.7	1,168.4	(517.6)	395.0	599.0	994.0	(174.4)
<u>Sanitation and Streets</u>											
General Administration	-	-	-	1.6	-	1.6	1.6	2.0	-	2.0	0.4
Operations	-	-	-	552.0	30.0	582.0	582.0	736.0	40.0	776.0	194.0
Commission	-	-	-	7.0	-	7.0	7.0	7.0	-	7.0	-
Sanitation and Streets Total	-	-	-	560.6	30.0	590.6	590.6	745.0	40.0	785.0	194.5
Grand Total	1,060.0	626.0	1,686.0	1,118.2	635.7	1,759.0	72.9	1,135.0	639.0	1,779.0	20.1

Proposition B Administrative Costs

- FY 2022-23 budget includes the spin-off Operations bureaus on October 1 for the creation of the Sanitation and Streets Department.
- Six-month process with significant analysis, collaboration, and review by various stakeholders.
- Additional costs include: \$7.2M for FY 2022-23; \$6.0 for FY 2023-24 and each year going forward
 - New commission staff (commissioners, commission secretaries, department head, etc.)
 - New positions for human resources services (recruitment, payroll, health & safety, etc.)
 - New positions for shared administrative services (accounting, budget, IT, performance, etc.)
 - Non-labor costs (tenant improvements; commission operating costs; additional rent; etc.)
- Positions and appropriate classification levels recommended by City Administrator Prop. B Implementation Team and reviewed and approved by the Prop. B Executive Committee, the Controller's Office and Human Resources.
- Additional Prop. B costs for Public Works are in line with the Controller's Office costing letter on August 10, 2020. Recommended by Prop B Implementation Team

Proposition B Administrative Costs – Human Resources



Capital Programs

Project Category <i>\$ in millions</i>	Approved Budget	Proposed Budget	\$ Change	Proposed Budget	\$ Change
	FY 2021-22	FY 2022-23	FY 2021-22	FY 2023-24	FY 2022-23
Street Resurfacing	\$35.1	\$71.2	\$36.1	\$42.5	(\$28.7)
Critical Enhancements and Discrete Projects	\$8.4	\$9.5	\$1.1	\$0.0	(\$9.5)
Curb Ramp Program	\$4.5	\$6.5	\$2.0	\$4.3	(\$2.2)
Facility Renewal	\$0.8	\$3.1	\$2.3	\$0.5	(\$2.6)
Right-of-Way Renewal	\$4.2	\$4.6	\$0.4	\$7.1	\$2.5
Tree Establishment	\$3.0	\$2.4	(\$0.6)	\$0.4	(\$2.0)
Routine Maintenance	\$1.7	\$2.0	\$0.3	\$2.1	\$0.1
Total	\$57.7	\$99.3	\$41.6	\$56.9	(\$42.4)

* All sources, including General Fund, COPs, RMRA and other sources.

Capital Programs



Street Resurfacing / Paving Program

- On track to resurface FY21-22 goal of 500 blocks.
- Current citywide Pavement Condition Index score is 74.
- No General Fund support in FY23-24. FY22-23 goal is to resurface 500 blocks with funding support from \$30.0M in Certificates of Participation (COPs) and an estimated \$41.2M from other sources.



Curb Ramp Program

- \$3.5M in General Fund for 100 curb ramp repair and expansion projects
- \$3.0M in COPs for curb ramps with subsidewalk basements.



Right-of-Way Renewal

- General Fund allocation for pothole repairs, sidewalk repair, and street structure and plaza inspection and repair

Other Projects

- \$5.0M for Innes Avenue improvements
- \$2.4M for street tree planting and establishment
- \$2.1M for Sunset Boulevard recycled water project
- \$2.0M for Buchanan Mall improvements and upgrades

Department Initiatives and Enhancements

Initiative	Initiative Description	FY 22-23 Budget	FY23-24 Budget
Cleaning Expansion	Additional funding is to expand Public Work's regular cleaning operations	\$ 3.9	\$ 3.3
Expanded Street Inspection and Enforcement	Expanded enforcement and inspection of Shared Spaces and illegal vending	\$ 2.2	\$ 2.8
SoMa Tree Nursery	Staffing to manage the new SoMa Tree Nursery	\$ 0.3	\$ 0.4
Median Maintenance	Staff for a new nighttime median maintenance crew	\$ 1.2	\$ 1.5
Housing Project Delivery Staff	Funding for additional project-delivery staff	\$ 1.0	\$ 1.3
Better Market Street Staff	Staff dedicated to the Better Market Street project	\$ 0.4	\$ 0.5
ESER 2020 Staff	Staff to support the ESER 2020 bond program	\$ 0.8	\$ 1.1
	Grand Total	\$ 9.8	\$ 10.9


Positions and Vacancies

Vacancies

- Vacancies are currently at an all-time high of 21.7%
- Right before pandemic vacancies were 10.9%
- Several factors are driving the vacancy rate

Attrition

- Increase attrition by more than \$1.0M in FY23 budget
- FY 23 budgeted positions are 1,759 FTEs
- 636 FTEs are project funded, not eligible for attrition savings
- 1,123 positions are on budget; 84 positions are held vacant because of attrition savings (7.5%)



Source: Controller's Office Department Vacant FTE Dashboard.

Departmental Impact

- Focused hiring on department priorities and front-line staff, including Operations, construction managers and street inspectors, to ensure safety and street cleanliness and to keep critical capital and infrastructure improvement projects moving forward
- Increased use of overtime, which leads to staff burnout, especially in the administrative sections
- Slowed hiring in administration sections (budget, accounting, IT, etc.)

Corrective Actions

- Budget includes new Public Works Human Resources Bureau
- 41 FTE for talent acquisition, labor relations, payroll, health & safety;
- Reducing GSA HR work-order over first six (6) months of FY23 for transition
- Hiring of Public Works HR Bureau staff underway



Thank you



Office of the Mayor & Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Proposed Budget, Budget & Finance Committee

June 15, 2022



MOHCD - Overview

- MOHCD supports San Franciscans with affordable housing opportunities and essential services to build strong communities
- The overall budget for FY 2021-22 is \$258 million and includes approximately 119 positions.
- Policy Priorities for FY22-23:
 - *Racial Equity*
 - *Anti-displacement & housing stabilization*
 - *Housing opportunities for vulnerable communities*
 - *Increase our capacity to realize our mission*



MOHCD – FY21-22 Key Accomplishments

- Distributed more than \$200M across 370 grants to CBOs
- Coordinated with more than a dozen CBOs to provide \$21M of direct rental assistance to more than 3,000 vulnerable households
- Over the last two years, celebrated 10 groundbreakings and 12 grand openings for a total of nearly 2,600 new affordable housing units
- Conducted 112 housing lotteries, in which 107,473 applications were submitted for 486 affordable homes
- Partnered with SFHA and DT to bring wireless internet to HOPE SF communities



MOHCD FY 22-23 Proposed Budget

Total proposed budget of approximately \$205.1M, a decrease of \$52.8M from FY 21-22.

Major decreases include elimination of one-time items:

- \$32M GF Rent Relief
- \$23.0M HOPE SF investment
- \$18.7M Federal COVID grant
- \$17.6M Housing Trust Fund advance
- \$10M MOHCD Innovation Fund
- \$4.7M grants to non-profits



MOHCD FY 22-23 Proposed Budget

Total proposed budget of approximately \$205.1M, a decrease of \$52.8M from FY 21-22.

Major increases include:

- \$16.2M housing developer subsidy from TIDA housing developer
- \$11M for community center & gym at Sunnydale HOPE SF
- \$10M for capital improvements in existing non-profit affordable housing
- \$8M LOSP subsidies due to new buildings entering the program
- \$4M for additional Senior Operating Subsidies



MOHCD FY 22-23 Proposed Budget

Total proposed budget of approximately \$205.1M, a decrease of \$52.8M from FY 21-22.

Major increases include:

- \$2.8M Housing Trust Fund per Charter, in part funding the continuation of three expiring limited duration positions and three new positions, and expansion of Digital Services workorder
- \$2.4M for additional CBO grants
- \$1.8M SOMA Stabilization contribution from 706 Mission



MOHCD FY 23-24 Proposed Budget

Total proposed budget of approximately \$164.6M, a decrease of \$40.5M from FY 22-23.

Major decreases include elimination of one-time items:

- \$11M for community center & gym at Sunnydale HOPE SF
- \$10M for capital improvements in existing non-profit affordable housing
- \$8.9M for developer funding for TIDA affordable housing
- \$4M for additional Senior Operating Subsidies
- \$2.4M in grants to CBOs
- \$1.5M SOMA Stabilization contribution from 706 Mission



MOHCD Staffing

- MOHCD has experienced an unusual amount of staff turnover.
- 117 positions in FY21-22, many of which are off-budget
- Since January 2021, we've had 22 departures and 38 new hires.
- 13 current vacancies – 11% vacancy rate
 - 3 vacant since before 2022 – primarily lack of qualified candidates for specialized roles
 - 10 vacancies occurred since January 2022
- Current vacancy rate is approximately twice the pre-pandemic rate.



MOHCD Staffing

- Vacancies have indeed been challenging, but we've primarily handled by expediting hiring and working more and harder!
- In general, we do not plan for attrition – we manage by modulating through our off-budget position budgeting





Office of the Mayor



Proposed Budget


- Mayor's Office proposed budget is \$10.2M in FY 2022-23 and \$10.4M in FY 2023-24
- Supports 42 FTE in administrative, policy, communications, and budget functions
- Increase primarily due to changes in salary and benefits due to new MOU, and increases to citywide work orders


Spending Category	FY 22	FY 23	FY 24
Salaries & Benefits	7.7	8.1	8.3
Non-Personnel, Projects, and Materials & Supplies	1.4	1.4	1.4
Work Orders	0.6	0.7	0.7
Total	9.7	10.2	10.4

(\$ in millions)



Mayor's Office Staffing







City & County of San Francisco
Ethics Commission


Public service that builds public trust.

FY23 Departmental Budget Presentation

BOS Budget and Appropriations Committee

June 15, 2022

Gayathri Thaikkendiyil,
Deputy Director & Chief Operating Officer



Overview of Proposed June 1 Budget

ETH Budget	FY22	FY23	FY24
Operating Budget	\$6,551,078	\$7,139,993	\$6,949,134
Election Campaign Fund Contribution	\$0	\$446,860	\$446,860
Authorized Positions	33	34	32
Budgeted FTEs*	30.5	31.43	30.28

* With reductions in Salary and Fringe due to attrition savings

Distribution of Operating Budget

ETH Budget	FY22	FY23	FY24
Salaries & Fringe	86.6%	86.3%	85.9%
Non-Personnel Services	4.2%	4.1%	3.7%
Materials & Supplies	0.9%	1.3%	1%
Services of Other Departments	8.3%	8.3%	9.5%

- Strong laws, well implemented, with timely and effective oversight and accountability to enhance the impact of core Commission programs.
- Heightened awareness of the laws through organization-wide focus on practical tools and information, essential outreach, and accessible public disclosure to enhance understanding, promote improved compliance, and foster equitable and meaningful public engagement.
- Strive for excellence through continuous improvement, transparency, and accountability for Commission's work. Implement program and business process improvements and re-calibrate services as needed to maximize impact.

Proposed Budget

Ethics Commission

Position Related Changes

Reclassification of three positions to support more complex nature of work required to enable critical public disclosure functions and policy and legislative work.

- 1042 IS Engineer position to 1043 Senior IS Engineer position
- 1823 Senior Policy and Legislative Affairs Counsel position to 1824 Policy and Legislative Affairs Manager position
- 1822 Policy Analyst position to 1823 Senior Policy Analyst position

New 1454 Executive Secretary position to support the operations of the five-member Ethics Commission.

FY23	FY24
+\$76k	+\$50k
+\$129k	+\$165k

Proposed Budget

Ethics Commission

Non-Position Related Changes

Essential technology and professional services such as software licenses, systems consulting services, and technology equipment to maintain core business functions.

Services of Other Departments

- Department of Technology services to provision software tools to support Staff’s work and electronic filing of public disclosures.
- New work order with the Office of Contract Administration to provide contracting assistance.

FY23

FY24

+\$96k


+\$83k

+\$13k

+\$69k

Current Organization Chart

Ethics Commission



Snapshot of Ethics Commission's Vacancies

	FY19 (as of 06/30/19)	FY20 (as of 06/30/20)	FY21 (as of 06/30/21)	FY22 (as of 06/13/22)
Position Authority	24	24	25	33
Vacant FTE Total*	2.26	2.94	0.78	9
Vacancy FTE %*	9.6%	12.5%	3.3%	27%
Planned Attrition	\$200,347	\$209,489	\$330,982	\$237,870
Actual Attrition	\$865,179	\$832,904	\$863,556	\$1,888,796

* Prior years' vacancy data from SF Reports & Analytics

- Filled six vacancies in FY22.
- Current FY22 vacancies have been open for an average of six months.
- Vacancies have caused delays in the Commission's work across program areas.

Factors driving FY22 vacancies

- Eight new positions were authorized in FY22, of which two were filled and five are in active recruitment.
- Attrition led to three additional vacancies during the fiscal year.
- Commission is fully dependent on DHR to conduct its recruitment through a work order. DHR shifted its resources to priority work related to COVID-19 response which also impacted the Commission's hiring timelines.
- Recruitment initiations for a couple of positions are on hold pending impact of FY23 budget decisions.

Plan to address current vacancies

- Continue to pro-actively work on recruitment as a top priority in FY23 to fill remaining positions at the earliest.
- Continue to work closely with DHR to expedite the recruitment process.

Department of Elections Proposed Budget FY 2022 – 2023 and FY 2023 – 2024

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Budget and Appropriations Committee Hearing
June 15, 2022

This presentation contains an overview of the Department of Elections' budget proposals for FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24, as well as information pertinent to the questions provided by Budget Chair Hillary Ronen:

1. Department's Mission and Election Schedule

2. Budget

3. Revenue

4. Staffing and Vacancies



Department's Mission and Election Schedule

The mission of the Department of Elections is to provide equitable access to voting and election-related services and to conduct all public elections in the City and County of San Francisco in a manner that is free, fair, and functional.

As in all years, the Department's budget proposals for the next two fiscal years are driven by the number of elections scheduled in each year.

In FY 2022-23, the Department will conduct one election:

★ the November 8, 2022 Consolidated General Election.

In FY 2023-24, the Department will conduct two elections:

★ the November 7, 2023 Municipal Election and


★ the March 5, 2024 Consolidated Presidential Primary Election.



Budget

The Department's proposed budget for FY 2022-23 is **\$23.4 million** and is **44.9% lower** than its FY 2021-22 budget, mainly due to holding one election as opposed to four elections in FY 2021-22.

For FY 2023-24, the Department's proposed budget is **\$30.8 million** and is **31.3% higher** than its FY 2022-23 proposed budget, mainly due to holding two elections as opposed to one election in FY 2022-23.





Budget

The Department's budget proposals for the next two fiscal years include funding necessary to provide accessible multilingual voter outreach programs and maintain convenient and equitable election services, including universal vote-by-mail program and in-person voting options.

The budget proposals also seek funding for a number of fixed and variable operating costs, such as salaries of permanent and temporary employees, printing, mailing, and translation costs of election materials and ballots, payments to poll workers and polling place providers, system fees under contractual obligations, and equipment maintenance.




Revenue


The Department's projected revenue and revenue recoveries in FY 2022-23 total **\$589,291** and **\$153,653** for FY 2023-24. The Department expects to receive these revenues from candidate filing and paid ballot argument fee collections and reimbursements to recoup the costs associated with administering district and agency elections.



FY 2022-2023




FY 2023-2024





Staffing and Vacancies

The Department has 39 budgeted permanent FTE positions. Of those, three positions are currently vacant. Two positions have been used for attrition savings for the last three years and the other position became vacant earlier this year. All other budgeted positions have been filled through a combination of PCS, PEX, and TEX appointments. Over the next two years, the Department plans to fill most of its positions with PCS appointments.



Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure

FY 2022-23 Budget



OCII Mission and Strategic Goals

Within Mission Bay, Transbay & Shipyard/Candlestick

- Invest in these communities by accelerating delivery of and access to new housing
- Create new public infrastructure and open spaces
- Maximize opportunities for local business and workers
- Implement wind down of activities under State Redevelopment Dissolution Law

Mission Bay, Transbay, & Shipyard /Candlestick to provide:

- 22,000 new housing units, approximately 30% affordable
- 379 acres parks and open space
- 13 million sq. ft. commercial space

OCII FY 22-23 Major Initiatives – Projects



Transbay Block 3 Park

Infrastructure & Community

- Complete Mission Bay Park P3
- Design Transbay Blk 3 and Under-ramp Parks and issue \$99.7M bond to fund construction
- Complete Shipyard Artists' Building
101 Renovations



Mission Bay Block 9 Supportive Housing

Housing

- Advance 829 housing units
 - Complete - 140 supportive housing units (MBS Block 9)
 - Fund - 524 units (TBY 2W, TBY 2E, TBY 4)
 - Pre-develop - 165 units (MBS 12W, MBS 4E)

Budget: FY22-23 Uses


Primary Uses are Affordable Housing and Infrastructure & Other Non-Housing.

Uses	Amount (M)	Percent
<u>Direct Program Spending</u>		
Affordable Housing	\$360.5	50.3%
Infrastructure & Parks	\$201.7	28.1%
Community Development & Workforce	\$2.2	0.3%
Direct Programmatic Subtotal	\$564.3	78.7%
<u>Indirect Program Spending</u>		
Project Management & Operations	\$19.0	2.7%
Debt	\$96.7	13.5%
Pass-through to TJPA	\$36.8	5.1%
Other	\$0.4	0.1%
Indirect Programmatic Subtotal	\$152.9	21.3%
Total	\$717.3	100.0%

No change in position count from last year (55 FTE).

OCII Budget: YOY Uses Comparison

Changes due to an increase in infrastructure and affordable housing loans.



Organizational Chart

Commission on CII

Executive Director

Oversight Board

- 1.0 FTE Commission Secretary

- 1.0 FTE Executive Director
- 1.0 FTE Executive Assistant

General Counsel

- 1.0 FTE General Counsel
- 1.0 FTE Deputy General Counsel

Major Approved Development Project Areas

- 1.0 FTE Deputy Director (1.0 vacant)
- 1.0 FTE Senior Engineer (1.0 vacant)
- 1.0 FTE Senior Project Manager
- 3.0 FTE Project Manager (1.0 vacant)
- 2.0 FTE Asst Project Manager (1.0 vacant)
- 4.0 FTE DS (2.0 vacant)
- 1.0 FTE Mgmt Assistant II
- 1.0 FTE Asst. DS
- 1.0 FTE Planning Manager
- 1.0 FTE Housing Construction Specialist
- 2.0 FTE Associate Planner

Affordable Housing

- 1.0 FTE Housing Program Manager
- 2.0 FTE Senior DS (1.0 vacant)
- 3.0 FTE DS (2.0 vacant)
- 1.0 FTE Asst. DS

Development Services

- 1.0 FTE Development Services Manager (1.0 vacant)
- 2.0 FTE Senior DS (1.0 vacant)
- 1.0 FTE DS (1.0 vacant)

Community Development & Workforce

- 1.0 FTE Contract Compliance Supervisor (1.0 vacant)
- 1.0 FTE Contract Compliance Specialist III
- 2.0 FTE Contract Compliance Specialist II

Finance & Administration

- 1.0 FTE Deputy Director
- 1.0 FTE Human Resources Manager
- 1.0 FTE Principal Personnel Analyst
- 1.0 FTE Senior Programmer Analyst
- 1.0 FTE Contract and Fiscal Services Manager
- 1.0 FTE Accountant IV
- 1.0 FTE Accountant III
- 1.0 FTE Accountant II
- 1.0 FTE Senior Financial Analyst
- 1.0 FTE Staff Associate IV
- 1.0 FTE Staff Associate II (1.0 vacant)
- 1.0 FTE Mgmt Assistant II
- 1.0 FTE Record Specialist II
- 1.0 FTE Administrative Secretary
- 1.0 FTE Senior Office Assistant (1.0 vacant)
- 1.0 FTE Financial Systems Accountant (1.0 vacant)

DS = Development Specialist

Vacancies as of May 25, 2022

Staffing

Vacancy Type	Project Area	Position	Vacant as of	Plan to fill in next 2 fiscal years?
ACTIVE RECUITMENT				
	Affordable Housing	Development Specialist	Jul-21	Yes
PLANNED RECRUITMENT				
	Development Services	Deputy Director Programs	Mar-22	Yes
	Development Services	Senior Engineer	Dec-16	Yes
	Development Services	Developer Services Manager	Dec-20	Yes
	Community Development & Workforce	Contract Compliance Supervisor	Apr-22	Yes
	Affordable Housing	Development Specialist	Jul-16	Yes
	Finance and Admin	Financial Systems Accountant	Feb-22	Yes
VACANT DUE TO DEVELOPMENT PHASE OF PROJECTS				
	Affordable Housing	Senior Development Specialist	Jan-22	Yes
	Affordable Housing	Development Specialist	Dec-21	Yes
	HPS/CP	Project Manager	Jun-18	Yes
	HPS/CP	Development Specialist	Sep-19	Yes
	Finance and Admin	Senior Office Assistant	Apr-21	No
HELD FOR FUTURE NEEDS				
	Development Services	Senior Development Specialist	Oct-21	No
	HPS/CP	Asst Project Manager	Pre 2015	No
	TBY	Development Specialist	Dec-20	No
	Finance and Admin	Staff Associate II	Mar-19	No

Staffing

OCII has 16 vacancies, as of May 25, 2022, an increase from 6 in FY 19-20.

	FY 19-20	FY 20-21	FY 21-22	FY 22-23
Planned Attrition Rate	5.5%	5.5%	9.1%	7.3%
Actual Attrition Rate	10.9%	16.4%	29.1%	tbd
Actual Vacancies	6	9	16	tbd

The actual versus planned attrition rates are due to

- (1) Development status of projects,
- (2) Attritions and promotions, and
- (3) Challenges posed by COVID-19 to recruitment of new staff, as well as general competition for talent.

Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure





Board of Supervisors

Proposed Budget
FY 2022-23 & FY 2023-24

June 15, 2022

FY 2021-22 Highlights



Hybrid Meetings

- June 15, 2021
Board meetings
- March 7, 2022
Committee meetings with
in-person public comment




Redistricting Task Force

45 meetings (3-19 hours per mtg)

- Clerking
- Administration & Support
- Meeting Logistics & Technology
- Public input
- Outreach Contract Management
- Language Access

Organizational Chart



Staffing & Vacancies

FY 2021-22

88 full-time positions (23 PCS, 65 Exempt) + 59 Commissioners

- 86 filled
- 2 vacant – Legislative Assistants
- 2 additional temporary positions to manage workload

Attrition Savings from FY19-20 to FY21-22

	FY19-20	FY20-21	FY21-22 (projected)
Budgeted	\$101,626	\$248,574	\$263,110
Actual	\$602,066	\$295,055	\$112,381
Attrition % to total salary budget	6.3%	3.0%	1.0%

Budgeted positions & Vacancies by Division

Division	# of positions	# of vacancies
Supervisors	55	2
Clerk of the Board	24	0
Assessment Appeals Board	4	0
Youth Commission	3	0
Sunshine Ordinance Task Force	1	0
LAFCo	1	0
Total	88	2

Proposed Budget

Expenditure Category	FY 2021-22 Current	FY 2022-23 Proposed	<i>Change from FY 2021-22</i>	FY 2023-24 Proposed	<i>Change from FY 2022-23</i>
Salaries	\$11,173,106	\$11,934,537	\$761,431	\$12,351,062	\$416,525
Benefits	\$4,658,657	\$4,590,102	(\$68,555)	\$4,333,686	(\$256,416)
Non-Personnel Svcs.	\$4,281,686	\$3,859,221	(\$422,465)	\$3,859,580	\$359
Materials & Supplies	\$96,916	\$226,916	\$130,000	\$176,916	(\$50,000)
City Services	\$368,241	\$419,318	\$51,077	\$444,928	\$25,610
Total	\$20,578,606	\$21,030,094	\$451,488	\$21,166,172	\$136,078

Revenue Category	FY 2021-22 Current	FY 2022-23 Proposed	<i>Change from FY 2021-22</i>	FY 2023-24 Proposed	<i>Change from FY 2022-23</i>
Planning Appeals	\$40,000	\$40,000	-	\$40,000	-
Assessment Appeals	\$179,310	\$253,140	\$73,830	\$286,150	\$33,010
Outreach Fund	\$18,000	\$18,000	-	\$18,000	-
Expense Recovery	\$261,996	\$161,996	(\$100,000)	\$161,996	-
Total	\$499,306	\$473,136	(\$26,170)	\$506,146	\$33,010

Items for Consideration

Budget and Legislative Analyst Contract

- On May 24, 2022, Supervisor Preston introduced a Motion directing the Clerk of the Board to initiate the process to amend the budget and legislative analyst contract to allocate up to \$1.1 M per year to expand its work under the existing scope of work for the Board of Supervisors to exercise its power of inquiry and oversight role more fully.
- \$1.1 M would allow 4-6 medium to large audits per year
- If the Committee supports it, appropriate funding should be added to the Department's budget.

New Positions Removed from the Mayor's Budget

The following new positions were removed from the budget:

Job Class	FY2022-23	FY2023-24
1492 Assistant Clerk	\$146,349	\$187,572
1222 Sr. Payroll & Personnel Clerk	\$113,084	\$145,228
8173 Legal Assistant (SOTF)	\$131,975	\$169,335
Total	\$391,408	\$502,135

Looking Ahead

Legislative Management Innovation

- New Systems Functionalities
 - Boards and Commissions management
 - Legislative drafting tool/submission/approval management
 - Mobile access
 - Outreach and communication
 - eComment to the legislative file
- City Departments and Commissions input and feedback
- Development of system requirements
- An RFP to be issued in FY 2022-23

Questions?

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH FY 2022-24 BUDGET

June 2022

Agenda

2

1. Organizational and Budget Overview
2. Key Initiatives in the Upcoming Budget
3. Staffing and Vacancies



Budget & Organizational Overview

Our Mission and Vision

4

□ **OUR MISSION**

- To protect and promote the health and well-being of all in San Franciscans.

□ **OUR VISION**

- Making San Francisco the healthiest place on earth.

□ **WHAT WE DO**

- Assess and research the health of the community
- Develop and enforce health policy
- Prevent disease and injury
- Educate the public and train health care providers
- Provide quality, comprehensive, and culturally proficient health services
- Ensure equitable access to all

DPH: An Integrated Health Department



Two primary roles and two major divisions to fulfill its mission:



Population Health:
Protecting the health of the population




San Francisco
Health Network

SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH

San Francisco Health Network: Promoting the health of our patients

DPH's Budget is \$3 Billion for both years of the projected budget

6



Division Title	FY 2023-24 FTE	FY 2023-24 Budget
Zuckerberg SF General	2,974	\$ 1,143,490,000
Behavioral Health	848	\$ 592,600,000
Laguna Honda Hospital	1,386	\$ 336,650,000
Health Network Services	728	\$ 376,960,000
Jail Health	161	\$ 42,700,000
Primary Care	562	\$ 123,160,000
Population Health	547	\$ 190,810,000
DPH Operations	610	\$ 189,050,000
Grand Total	7,815	\$ 2,995,420,000

- Budget increases by 6% compared to current year, but remains flat over the two-year budget
- DPH leverages 67% of revenues and receives only 33% of GFS

Approach for FY 22-24 Budget

7

Balances investments between major Multi-Year Strategic Priorities and Department operations and programmatic support

Areas of major investment include

- ▣ Continuing COVID-19 Response
- ▣ Investing Population Health Infrastructure
- ▣ Improving Access to Behavioral Health System of Care
- ▣ Increasing access and creating sustainable staffing at the San Francisco Health Network
- ▣ Continuing Workforce and Health Equity
- ▣ Strengthening Hiring, Retention and Contracting



Key Initiatives for FY 2022-24

COVID-19 Response

9

- Continues the step down of services over the two budget years with a total of \$57.3 M in FY 22-23
- \$25 M in FY 23-24 to be detailed as part of next year's budget process
- Does not fund increased response due to surges
- FEMA reimbursement will be more limited in scope, reduced to 90% and set to expire in December 2022.
- Response will continue to evolve and DPH will seek additional funding opportunities

COVID Response	FY 2022-23
Testing	12,290,000
Vaccination	7,520,000
Isolation & Quarantine	2,880,000
Shelter in Place Hotels	330,000
CoVid Disease Response & Resources	1,760,000
Community & Equity	2,800,000
Epidemiology & Surveillance	960,000
Information & Guidance	800,000
Task Force	7,900,000
COVID-19 Response Subtotal	37,240,000
SFHN Operating Functions	FY 2022-23
Ambulatory Care	3,930,000
Laguna Operational Support	4,840,000
ZSFG Operational Support	11,280,000
DPH Operations	20,050,000
Total COVID Investments	57,290,000

COVID-19 Response - \$37.2 M

10

Testing – \$12.3 M	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 2,000 tests/week via mobile and pop up sites• Additional 1,500 tests the Alemany testing site through 12/22
Vaccinations – \$7.5 M	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 2,350 vaccines per week, with pop up and mobile events• focus on priority neighborhoods to close equity gaps
COVID Disease Response Unit – \$1.8 M	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Clinical consultation and other technical assistance to help facilities ensure compliance (jails, school, shelters, residential care)• limited case investigation and case monitoring
Community Engagement & Equity – \$2.8 M	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Coordinates efforts and prioritize populations• The Mayor's budget does not continue in one-time funding for CBOs, but will allow rollover of unspent funding
Isolation and Quarantine – \$2.9 M	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Hotel room vouchers for an average of 3 guests daily as well as staffing for coordination and roving clinical support
Shelter in Place Hotels – \$0.3 M	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Continue providing services on site for existing hotels through Sept 2022• In the fall, HSH plans convert the facilities to congregate shelter sites
Epi and Surveillance – \$1.0 M	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Core COVID epidemiology and surveillance functions and reporting
Task Force and Logistics – \$7.9 M	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Central functions including rent, information and guidance, logistics and operating functions including finance and cost recovery, human resources, and supply management.

COVID-19 Response – SFHN \$20 M

11

Zuckerberg San
Francisco General
\$11.6 M

- Increased staffing to ensure sufficient staffing for
 - Nursing ratios and regulatory requirements
 - Monoclonal Antibodies Clinic
 - Occupational Health Clinic to support DPH staff
 - A testing and vaccine site for DPH staff and SFHN patients.

Laguna Honda
Hospital \$4.8 M

- Staffing includes support in the areas of outbreak management, infection control, testing for patients and staff, security and enhanced sanitation requirements

Primary Care \$3.9 M

- Staff to support vaccinations and increased staffing for call center support to consult on the use of therapeutics for SFHN clients

Behavioral Health Investments

12

- Continued implementation of prior year initiatives, including Prop C
- Additional investment is needed to complement continuing initiatives and address unmet needs

Behavioral Investments

- \$2.0 M - Strengthen Services for Clients on Involuntary 5150 Holds
- \$3.2 M - Comprehensive Crisis Services for Crisis Line & Bereavement
- \$0.9 M - Expanding Adult and Older Adult Outpatient Care
- \$0.7 M - Children's Center of Excellence
- \$1.6 M - Residential System of Care
- \$1.8 M - Utilization Management
- \$3 M - Overdose Response
- \$10.6 M - Tenderloin Center – Funded by one-time Proposition C funding

Investing in DPH Operations

13

- DPH's involvement in multiple public health emergencies highlighted infrastructure and operating needs

Population Health

- \$4.2 M – Population Health Infrastructure
- \$2.6 M – Public Health Emergency Preparedness and Response
- \$3.0 M – HIV Prevention and Getting to Zero

DPH Operations

- \$6.3 M – DPH Contracts, Communications, Supply Chain and Facilities
- \$4.8 M – Human Resources, and Health and Workforce Equity

Expanding SFHN Operations

14

Ambulatory Care

- \$1.2 M - Re-entry Services, Buprenorphine Expansion and Quality Improvement at Jail Health
- \$1.0 M - Expansion of Dental Services
- \$0.3 M - Health at Home
- \$0.7 M - Maternal and Child Health

Laguna Honda Hospital

- \$2.0 M - Increasing Clinical Coordination and
- \$0.7 M - Expanding BH Emergency Response Team and patient safety

Zuckerberg San Francisco General

- \$3.4 M - Increasing staffing and clinical support to increase census at ZSFG
- \$1.6 M - Expanding Specialty Pharmacy Services
- \$1.7 M - Cardiac Impella Support Devices
- \$2.5 M - Building safety and security



Staffing and Vacancies

Vacancies and Salary Savings

16

- DPH budgets salary savings to recognize routine and temporary savings between an employee separation and new hire
 - ▣ Average rate ~8.8% across the department
 - ▣ Hospital attrition rate (24/7 facilities) - ZSFG 5.3% , LHH 7.4%
 - ▣ Regular operating budgets ~12%
- Positions are not intentionally held to achieve savings

Current Vacancy and Attrition Rates

17

Current Vacancies By Division										
Division	Funded Permanent Position Authority	Funded Temp & P103 FTE	Total Authorized Positions	Filled Permanent Positions	Filled TEMP	Total Filled FTEs	Vacant Perm	Vacant TEMP	Vacant FTE	
DPH Operations	549	5	554	447	26	473	102	(21)	81	14.6%
Behavioral Health	759	15	774	692	16	708	67	(1)	66	8.6%
Zuckerberg SF General	2,763	124	2,887	2,563	487	3,050	200	(363)	(163)	-5.6%
Jail Health	143	8	151	122	15	137	21	(7)	14	9.4%
Laguna Honda Hospital	1,292	40	1,332	1,218	100	1,318	74	(60)	14	1.1%
Health Network Services	648	22	670	556	31	587	92	(9)	83	12.4%
Primary Care	536	24	560	445	48	493	91	(24)	67	12.0%
Population Health Division	398	180	578	309	82	391	89	98	187	32.4%
	7,089	418	7,507	6,352	805	7,157	737	(387)	350	

DPH Vacancies For the Last Four Fiscal Years										
	Funded Permanent FTEs	Funded Temp & P103 FTE	Total Authorized Positions	Filled Permanent FTE	Filled TEMP	Total Filled FTEs	Vacant Permanent FTEs	Vacant Temp FTEs	Vacant Total	
2022	7089.71	417.41	7,507	6,352	805	7,157	738	(388)	350	4.8%
2021	6882.64	412.15	7,295	6,419	770	7,189	464	(358)	106	1.5%
2020	6749.49	244.26	6,994	6,400	761	7,161	349	(517)	(167)	-2.4%
2019	6712.07	257.19	6,969	6,190	662	6,852	522	(405)	117	1.7%


Top Vacancies by Classification

18

Job Class	Total Net Funded FTEs	Total Filled FTEs	Vacant Total	Percent Vacancy
2320 - Registered Nurse	1,356.42	1,254.88	101.55	7%
2586 - Health Worker 2	178.16	139.03	39.13	22%
2587 - Health Worker 3	179.88	141.10	38.78	22%
2593 - Health Program Coordinator 3	138.30	114.38	23.93	17%
2328 - Nurse Practitioner	168.29	146.80	21.49	13%
2305 - Psychiatric Technician	53.76	36.60	17.16	32%
2930 - Behavioral Health Clinician	201.58	185.08	16.50	8%
2589 - Health Program Coordinator 1	33.79	17.68	16.11	48%
2119 - Health Care Analyst	45.91	30.10	15.81	34%
2830 - Public Health Nurse	67.19	52.73	14.46	22%
Total			304.90	

Date of When Current Vacancies Were Vacated

19



Challenges for Filling Vacancies

20

External Challenges

- Workforce shortages across the healthcare industry due to the pandemic
- Competing for talent with other Hospitals and Healthcare entities including registry contracts – not just within the City
- Increased separations within CCSF overall

Internal Challenges

- Human Resources staffing has not kept up with increases in position authority
- Still recovering from delay of examinations at the start of the pandemic
 - Delay of permanent eligible lists due to pause in HR examinations
 - Internal staff compete for promotional opportunities, which creates a new vacancy behind them
- Unusual amount of transition due to increased opportunities as part of COVID-19 response

HR Accomplishments

21

- Hired 707 Staff (142 RNs) Since January 1, 2022
 - Average of over 100 positions filled monthly
- 359 Positions In Interview Stage
- Used Expedited Hiring Processes (RN, BHS/MHSF)
- Participated and Held Recruiting Events
- Collaborated with SEIU to Streamline Hiring Process
- Increased Classifications with Continuous Recruitments
- Produced Recruitment Videos
- Partnered with SEIU and DHR to Rethink Career Ladders for Job Classes with No or Few Promotive Options

Strategies to Fill Vacancies: Recruitment

22

Increase Hiring, Add Resources, Improve Systems

- **Process**

- Eliminate Unnecessary Processes
- Combine Steps
- Continuous hires
- Meet Regularly with Stakeholders
- Focus on PCS Hires and reducing temps

- **Resources**

- Hire Additional Human Resources Staff (19.0 FTE)
- Procure Human Resources Information Management System

- **System**

- Reorganize by Classification
- Automate Tasks
- Modernize Approach to Hiring

Strategies to Fill Vacancies: Retention

23

Retain Existing Employees

- **Service and Experience**

- Create Office of Employee Engagement
- Develop and Implement Supervisor Academy - Inclusion
- Provide EEO and Leave of Absence Support

- **Equity Adjustments**

- In addition to 5.25% COLAs, Equity Adjustments for RNs, Medical Evaluation Assistants, Dentists, Dietitians, and Neuropsychologists, and others for future discussion

- 10 • **Career Pathways**

- Partner with Unions, Educational Institutions, and DHR
- 1:1 Career Coaching




Thank You

Questions?



City and County of San Francisco
London N. Breed
Mayor

San Francisco Department of Public Health
Grant Colfax
Director of Health





SAN FRANCISCO
HUMAN SERVICES AGENCY

Human Services Agency FY 2022-23 Budget

June 16, 2022



HSA Overview

HSA is comprised of two city departments with one administrative foundation:

- Department of Benefits and Family Supports (BFS)
- Department of Disability and Aging Services (DAS)



Administration


HR, Facilities, Contracts, Budget and Fiscal, Communications, IT, Planning,
Program Integrity and Disaster Preparedness/Response

The Office of Early Education (OECE) was previously under HSA. As of FY 2022-23, OECE will become an independent entity, merging with First 5, as the new Department of Early Childhood.


HSA Proposed FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24 Budget

By Division


**FY22-23 HSA Proposed Budget
\$1.11 Billion**




**FY23-24 HSA Proposed Budget
\$1.14 Billion**



Growth in Medi-Cal and CalFresh Caseloads



Growth in Medi-Cal and CalFresh Caseloads



Medi-Cal and CalFresh Service Impacts

Performance Metric	FY18-19	FY21-22	Change %
Calls received	277,374	366,410 (YTD)	+32%
Call wait times	2.4 minutes	3.8 minutes	+58%
Call abandonment rate	9%	10.5%	+1.5%
Medi-Cal application timeliness (May snapshot)	88%	77%	-11%
CalFresh application timeliness (May snapshot)	96%	80%	-16%



BFS Initiatives


SF Benefits Net Staffing Increase

- SFBN administers the CalFresh and Medi-Cal eligibility programs.
 - Since the start of FY 2020-21, combined caseloads have increased by 21 percent and are expected to remain steady at current levels.
- Historical staffing levels are no longer able to deliver quality service
 - Wait times are increasing and proportion of calls meeting service standards is decreasing
 - State and Federal waivers, which have reduced SFBN workload during the pandemic, are slated to end in 2022-23.
- SFBN is requesting to increase the workforce by 11 percent: 42-2905 Senior Eligibility Workers and 3-2907 Eligibility Supervisors. Also requesting 3-2913 Program Specialists to meet outreach mandates.

Cost Share	FY22-23	FY23-24
Total Cost	\$5.6M	\$7.2M
Local Share	\$1.8M	\$2.3M



In-Home Supportive Services Caseload Growth



DAS Initiatives

In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) Expansion

- 8 percent increase in IHSS caseload over past two years; State expects additional 4.4 percent growth in FY 2022-23
 - New staff will improve outcomes in PSH and shelter settings; IHSS has proven a crucial support to newly-housed/formerly-homeless individuals
 - Additional social workers required to ensure enrollment into the entitlement program, reduce caseloads per worker, and achieve compliance with state mandates
- Inadequately staffing IHSS risks contributing to unnecessary hospitalization and institutionalizations in San Francisco
- IHSS = high leverage for the City because the local share of cost for services does not vary with service hours, i.e., more hours draw more state and federal revenue

Caseload July, 2019	Caseload April, 2022
22,678	25,142

Classification/Title	Positions
2918 Social Worker	16
2916 Social Work Specialist	11
2914 Social Work Supervisor	4
1408 Principal Clerk	1
0923 Manager II	1
Total	33

Share of cost	FY22-23	FY23-24
Total cost	\$4.1 M	\$5.2 M
Local share	\$1.8 M	\$2.3 M



DAS Initiatives

\$3.5 million ongoing for Food and Nutrition

- \$2.3 million to meet increased needs for and inflationary costs of post-pandemic meals
- \$1.2 million to address inflationary costs of meals for consumers in the Tenderloin

\$1.9 million ongoing for Social Connection

- \$396,000 for the Older Adults Learning Program
- \$100,000 for Adult Day Health programming
- \$100,000 for community center programs
- \$59,000 for violence prevention



DAS Initiatives

\$881,250 for Technology and the Digital Divide

- \$600,000 ongoing for a LGBTQ+ technology support and mental telehealth
- \$281,250 in FY 2022-23 for an Online Resource Directory

\$400,000 ongoing for a Disability Community Cultural Center

- First of its kind in the country
- Virtual and in-person service connections and programming for individuals with disabilities

\$300,000 for LGBTQ+ services

- Funding for staff at three community-based organizations to meet increased demand for services



Dignity Fund: \$3 Million Annual Growth

New Initiatives FY 2022-23		\$645,000
Hybrid Meeting Equipment	To enable virtual service and program options	\$75,000
Technology and the Digital Divide	SF Connected refresh: navigation and community center services	\$350,000
Family caregiving	Resources and counseling for members of the public who care for older adults or Alzheimer's patients	\$220,000
Sustaining program expansions		\$672,479
Aging and Disability Resource Centers	Staffing and language support (Chinese, Russian)	\$212,156
Legal services	APS Financial Abuse Virtual Unit collaboration, Latinx-focused services, multilingual outreach	\$191,323
Senior Ex-Offender Program	Connection to services and community	\$135,000
Transgender and Gender-Nonconforming Services	Intentional community engagement and support	\$134,000
Estimated CBO COLA		\$1,682,521
Grand total		\$3 million



FY 2021-22 Staffing Challenges


- Higher than expected levels of separation this year; up 50 percent over the average in last four years
- Hiring not yet returned to pre-pandemic levels; however, we are above FY 19-20 and FY 20-21 pace
- Current low-staffing is not sustainable, and impacting services
- In response, HSA has:
 - Hired additional HR staff
 - Requested additional social workers and eligibility workers in IHSS and SFBN
 - Re-tooled 2905 Elig. Worker training process to fill vacancies more quickly and successfully
 - Looked to leverage recent HR policy changes (example: Tenderloin Emergency, MTB/STB)

Budgeted v. Actual Attrition


	Budget	Spending	Budgeted Attrition (Vacancy and Step \$s)	Actual Attrition (Vacancy and Step \$s)	# of Vacancies (as of May of FY)
FY18-19	\$284.4M	\$284.4M	12.6%	12.3%	154
FY19-20	\$303.6M	\$303.5M	12.4%	12.2%	222
FY20-21	\$315.4M	\$314.9M	12.5%	12.4%	214
FY21-22	\$335.4M	\$324.5M (projected)	12.9%	15.3% (projected)	339
FY22-23	\$354.4M		14.1%		



HSA FY21-22 Org Chart with Vacancies



Length of Current Vacancies



Exits / Entrances by Year

Year	New Hires to HSA (excludes internal promotions)	Exits from HSA
FY17-18	255	208
FY18-19	214	213
FY19-20	146	174
FY20-21	129	140
FY21-22 (6/2 projected)	204	278





SAN FRANCISCO
HUMAN SERVICES AGENCY

Thank you!

www.sfhsa.org






DEPARTMENT OF
HOMELESSNESS AND
SUPPORTIVE HOUSING

FY2022-23 & FY2023-24 Proposed Budget

Budget & Appropriations Committee | June 16, 2022





DEPARTMENT OF
HOMELESSNESS AND
SUPPORTIVE HOUSING


Proposed Budget Overview

- Overview of Total Budget
- Key Initiatives and Investments
- Staffing

Overview: FY2022-23 & FY2023-24 Budget

<i>Dollars in millions</i>	FY2021-22 Adopted	FY2022-23 Proposed	<i>Change from FY22 Increase/ (Decrease)</i>	<i>% Change from FY22 Increase/ (Decrease)</i>	FY2023-24 Proposed	<i>Change from FY23 Increase/ (Decrease)</i>	<i>% Change from FY23 Increase/ (Decrease)</i>
Total Budget	\$667.8	\$676.0	<i>\$8.2</i>	<i>1.2%</i>	\$635.4	<i>(\$40.6)</i>	<i>-6.0%</i>
Revenue	\$399.4	\$387.0	<i>(\$12.5)</i>	<i>-3.1%</i>	\$351.9	<i>(\$35.1)</i>	<i>-9.1%</i>
General Fund	\$268.4	\$289.0	<i>\$20.6</i>	<i>7.7%</i>	\$283.5	<i>(\$5.5)</i>	<i>-1.9%</i>

HSH's Budget Growth Since Inception





DEPARTMENT OF
HOMELESSNESS AND
SUPPORTIVE HOUSING

Budget Highlights

- Equity Investments in PSH
- Additional Housing Investments
- Shelter Investments
- Ending Transgender Homelessness
- New Systemwide Investments

Proposed Investments in PSH Equity

• **\$67.4 million** over two years in HSH's existing PSH portfolio.

Wage Equity Investments: **\$30 million**

\$3 m annually: \$28/hour
wage floor for case
managers

\$12 m annually: frontline
property management
staff.

Case Management: **\$32.4 million**

\$16.2 m annually:
increase case
management staffing

Achieves 1:20 ratio for
family & youth; moves
closer to 1:25 for adults.

Capital Improvements: **\$5 million**

One-time funding for
repairs and
improvements.

Wi-Fi and other
upgrades.

Additional Supportive Housing Investments

- Maintain portfolio of ~11,000 supportive housing units, including:
 - Open and operate **six new supportive housing sites** acquired in FY21-22.
 - Implement **1,784 scattered-site supportive housing subsidies** (Flexible Housing Subsidy Pool) over the next two years.
 - Leverage federal funds to **expand goal by ~289 slots** for adults and youth.
- Expansion of housing programs by **~725 units**, including:
 - **~70 step-up housing** units for families who no longer need PSH.
 - **40 units** of PSH for families in new MOHCD development.
 - **616 new PSH units** over two years through **LOSP** program to serve adults, seniors, families, and parenting youth.
 - Continue to acquire buildings for permanent housing for youth exiting homelessness.

Proposed Investments: End Transgender Homelessness

- **150 scattered-site permanent housing subsidies** to be allocated for Transgender and Gender Non-Conforming (TGNC) households.
- Acquire and operate **50 to 80 units** of PSH for **TGNC youth**.
- **\$6 million** over two years (\$3 million annually):
 - Build capacity among TGNC-serving providers.
 - Fund short-term/shallow subsidies and/or provide flexible financial assistance.

New Proposed Shelter Investments

- New **cabin program** in the Mission:
 - **\$2 million enhancement** in FY2022-23.
 - Leverages another **\$5 million** to build new non-congregate cabin site for up to 70 guests.
- Operate new **semi-** and **non-congregate shelter** programs:
 - **\$25 m** in anticipated new state funding over two years.
 - Operate **~410 beds** of non- & semi-congregate shelter at **711 Post & Baldwin Hotel**.



Existing non-congregate cabin program at 33 Gough.

Continuing Key Shelter Investments

Program	Details	Investment Level
Vehicle Triage Centers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue Bayview VTC. Capital and operating funds for a second VTC intended to serve west side of the City. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$18 million over two years.
Safe Sleep & Cabins	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintains cabin program at 33 Gough and tent spaces of Safe Sleep in the Mission and Bayview in FY2022-23. Continue Safe Sleep and cabin programs in FY2023-24 with prior year appropriations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FY2022-23: \$4 million for 33 Gough & \$4.1 million for Safe Sleep sites.
Non-Congregate Shelter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extend one year of operations at three hotel-based emergency shelters providing ~300 units. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$24 million in state and federal grants funds previously appropriated for SIP operations.



DEPARTMENT OF
HOMELESSNESS AND
SUPPORTIVE HOUSING

Staffing

- Filling Critical Gaps
- Vacancies
- Organizational Chart

HSH Proposed Staffing Overview

	FY21-22 Adopted	FY22-23 Mayor's Proposed Budget	Change from FY21-22	FY23-24 Mayor's Proposed Budget	Change from FY22-23	Two-Year Budget Total
Total FTE	217.21	236.62	19.41	246.25	9.62	29.03
<i>Permanent FTE</i>	<i>179.60</i>	<i>230.30</i>	<i>50.70</i>	<i>239.95</i>	<i>9.64</i>	<i>60.34</i>
<i>Temp FTE</i>	<i>37.61</i>	<i>6.32</i>	<i>(31.29)</i>	<i>6.30</i>	<i>(0.02)</i>	<i>(31.31)</i>


🔑 **HSH completed a record 94 hires this fiscal year.**

- In addition, HSH completed 65 promotions (internal and from other City depts)
- However, 48 employees left HSH – 44% left for a promotion at another City dept.
- HSH's turnover rate this year was 24.6%, comparable to the 5-year average turnover
- 33 permanent budgeted positions are vacant as of May 2022; average time vacant 6 months.

Lack of Staffing Resources Leads to High Staff Turnover

- Proposed FY2022-24 Budget seeks to **right-size HSH staffing levels** and **enhance effectiveness**.
- Exit interviews cite **unsustainable workload** as primary reason for leaving.
- Since FY2016-17, on average **23% staffing turnover** rate each year
 - Departures compound overwork issues.
 - Challenge to fill new positions while backfilling.
 - Impact on department's ability to deliver timely and effective services.

Permanent FTE Vacancies over Time:



Proposed FY2022-24 Staffing Investments

Staffing as a % of Total
Proposed Budget

Total Staff:
under 7%


Admin Staff:
under 3%

- **60** new HSH positions requested **department-wide** over the next two years.
 - Keep pace with **multi-million-dollar** expansion of services across the Homelessness Response System.
- Address **unsustainable workloads** by investing in **department infrastructure**.
 - Reduce workloads of existing staff by filling critical staffing gaps: ADA compliance, emergency preparedness, contracting, community engagement, program monitoring, planning, and more.


Proposed HSH Staffing Investments

- **Shelter:** Improve management and monitoring - including **dedicated ADA coordinator** to oversee 20+ sites.
- **Outreach:** new positions to coordinate assessments & placements, contracts, and expand clinical supervision.
- **Prevention:** Expansion to implement new Prop C programs.
- **Housing:**
 - Creation of **HSH housing placement team** that will match Housing Referral Status people and help reduce vacancies.
 - Expansion of housing team to implement new programs (2,500 new PSH units since July 2020)
- Community engagement lead.
- **Disaster planning** and preparedness lead.
- Additional contract analysts to support swift procurement and contract implementation.
- **Planning and data positions** to design new programs, implement strategic planning, provide analytical/project management support & mandatory reporting.
- Dedicated **HSH equity analyst** to implement Racial Equity Action Plan & equity initiatives.
- Additional HR and IT support to support rapidly expanding department


HSH Organizational Chart: Overview



- *Total Proposed FY2022-23 FTE: 240.6 (excludes 9.7 FTE attrition).*
- *Chart excludes temporary FTE and off-budget positions.*



HSH Organizational Chart: Overview



HSH Organizational Chart: Admin & Finance

Deputy Director: Administration and Finance

Contracts: 19.37 FTE	HR & Operations: 12.04 FTE	Facilities & Real Estate: 13 FTE	Fiscal: 16.2 FTE	IT: 10.37 FTE
2 vacancies	0 vacancies	4 vacancies	1 vacancy	0 vacancies
7.37 proposed	3.04 proposed	0 proposed	3.2 proposed	3.37 proposed

HSH Organizational Chart: Programs

Deputy Director: Programs

Outreach and Disaster Planning: 21 FTE	Shelter: 8 FTE	Housing: 38.9 FTE	Housing Services: 33.4 FTE	<u>New</u> Housing Placements: 8 FTE	Coordinated Entry & Problem Solving: 16.6 FTE
7 vacancies	0 vacancies	4 vacancies	4 vacancies	1 vacancy	2 vacancies
4.2 proposed	3.2 proposed	4.95 proposed	2.37 proposed	7 proposed	2.58 proposed



DEPARTMENT OF
HOMELESSNESS AND
SUPPORTIVE HOUSING

Thank you.


Questions?




DEPARTMENT OF
HOMELESSNESS AND
SUPPORTIVE HOUSING

Appendix Slides

FY2022-23 & FY2023-24: Funding Sources




FY2022-23 & FY2023-24 Budget: Population Served



Adult/mixed funding: programs or agreements that primarily serve adults but can serve other subpopulations like veterans or youth.

FY2022-23 & FY2023-24 Budget by Service Area



Supportive Housing Acquisition Strategy

- Since July 1, 2020, the City has acquired or leased **over 2,500 units** of supportive housing; exceeded goal of 1,500 **by ~70%**.
- HSH has received **four state Homekey awards (more than \$139 million)** to support this acquisition work.
- Local acquisition dollars (Prop C) have been spent for **adults and families**.
 - **~\$58 million** remain for **youth housing**.
 - Issued new Request for Information (RFI) to identify available properties for TAY housing.
 - Continue to leverage available local, state and federal funding.
- HSH is moving from an **emergency acquisition** model to a **long-term sustainable** model of acquisition and operations:
 - Moving to lease agreements with non-profit providers for recent acquisitions.
 - Developing **standard processes** to review, acquire, and open new supportive housing sites.

Other Key Proposed Investments.

\$1.2 million
ongoing:

Support Street Wellness Response Teams.

\$900,000
over 2 years:

Pilot HSH Street Ambassadors program.

\$300,000
annually:

Mental health training & support for frontline staff.

\$230,000
annually:

Implement overdose requirements; reduce overdoses.

Civil Service Commission's Budget Submission Request for Fiscal Years 2022–2023 and 2023–2024

Board of Supervisors' Budget and Finance
Committee Hearing
June 16, 2022

Sandra Eng, Executive Director

Overview of the Civil Service Commission

- ▶ **Purpose:** Per the Charter, the Civil Service Commission is charged with “the duty of providing qualified persons for appointment to the service of the City and County of San Francisco.” The Commission is responsible for establishing, regulating, overseeing and serving as final arbiter of the City and County of San Francisco’s merit system.
- ▶ **Mission Statement:** The Commission’s mission is to establish, ensure, and maintain an equitable and credible merit system for public service employment for the citizens of San Francisco. The Commission’s goal is to consistently provide the best-qualified candidates for public service in a timely and cost-effective manner.
- ▶ **Equal Employment Policy:** It is the goal and policy of the Commission to provide fair treatment of applicants in all aspects of employment without regard to membership in a protected category and to prohibit nepotism or favoritism.

Authority and Responsibilities under the Charter and Administrative Code

- 1) Definitions, administration and organization of the merit system, Rules and the Civil Service Commission.
- 2) The establishment of policies, procedures governing the merit system.
- 3) The ability to review the conduct and actions of employees and departments in merit system matters including exempt appointments through Inspection Service Investigations and Audits.
- 4) Conduct hearings over appeals on merit system matters; review decisions in discrimination complaints, examination matters, and classification actions taken by the Human Resources Director, Director of Transportation of the Municipal Transportation Agency or Executive Director of the Civil Service Commission.
- 5) Review requests for proposed Personal Service Contracts for the feasibility of public employees hired through the merit system to perform services to the public as a priority.
- 6) Wage and Benefit-Setting Responsibilities: For Elected City Officials, Members of the Board of Supervisors, and Prevailing Wage Certification.
- 7) Employee Relations Ordinance Administration: Coordinate administration of unfair labor practice charges for peace officers and unrepresented employees; appeals of bargaining unit assignments; category designation of management, supervisory, and confidential; recognition elections for labor organization and certification or decertification, affiliation, disaffiliation or merger of labor organizations.)

Staffing and Projects:

- ▶ The department is budgeted for 6 full time positions: 1 Department Head (0961), 1 Deputy Director (0951), 1 Senior Human Resources Analyst (1244), 1 Human Resources Analyst (1241), 1 Personnel Technician (1203), and 1 Senior Clerk (Vacant 1426)
- ▶ Strategic Planning with departments, unions, Office of Racial Equity, and other stakeholders on the department's Racial Equity Action Plan to provide training and expand opportunities for employment with the City and County of San Francisco
- ▶ Amendments to the CSC Policy and Procedures for Personal Service Contracts to expand on transparency
- ▶ Continue to seek ways to create greater transparency and efficiencies in the Commission's procedures and communications
- ▶ Address departments' need for flexibility in personnel management issues while maintaining the integrity of the City's merit system as mandated by the Charter
- ▶ Continue to ensure the timely resolution of appeals so that merit system issues are addressed efficiently, effectively and fairly


The Civil Service Commission's Budget Request for Fiscal Years 2019–2020 and 2020–2021

- ▶ Current and Submitted Budget Request:
 - FY 2021–2022 Budget: \$1,388,312
 - FY 2022–2023 Budget Submission: \$1,447,365
 - FY 2023–2024 Budget Submission: \$1,460,521
- ▶ Increases in the Commission's budget over the next two fiscal years are primarily due to: 1) increases in employee salaries (per the City's labor agreements); and 2) projected increases in fringe benefit costs.
- ▶ CSC requested to increase staffing to 1 FTE (1244 Senior Human Resources Analyst) to support departments Citywide in their Racial Equity Action Plans and train hiring managers on the applicability of the Civil Service Commission Rules and the resources available to expand opportunities while still hiring well-qualified and committed candidates. PUC and MTA approved the total increase in their work orders for CSC to provide additional necessary services in the total amount of \$70,000, but the Mayor's Office denied the increase in staffing by 1 FTE.

DEPARTMENT ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN

BUDGET AND APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE | JUNE 16, 2022

The San Francisco Commission and Department on the Status of Women promote equitable treatment and foster the advancement of women and girls throughout San Francisco through policies, legislation, and programs.



AGENDA + OUTLINE

- I. The Department – Then and Now
- II. The Budget
- III. Our Work – Phase 1, 2, 3 + Core Service Areas
- IV. Coordinated Roe Response
- V. Staffing, Vacancies and Organizational Chart
- VI. Blueprint for the Future SF DOSW

I. THE DEPARTMENT

THEN [June 2021]


- Challenged with operational and fiscal mismanagement issues
- Systematically underfunded staffing needs to the detriment of the Department
- Misaligned funding re: needs of and equity for the communities most impacted
- Work generally siloed into a single-issue area

NOW [June 2022]


- Reorganized and operationally & fiscally sound
- Added 4 new staff members for a total of 10 FTE
- Realigned funding to be consistent with CCSF priorities, including support for Black and Indigenous communities
- Work Reorganized into 3 Core Service Areas:
 - Health & Safety
 - Economic Security
 - Civic Engagement & Political Empowerment

II. THE BUDGET

FY 2021-22 General Fund Budget - \$11,100,578



Fiscal Year 2022-23 General Fund Proposed Budget -
\$13,359,741



In Action

- Guaranteed Income Pilots
- Youth Voter Activation
- Narrative Shifting Project

In Procurement

- Data System Build-Out
- Community Needs Assessment
- Public Opinion Polling Project


In Planning

- Host Women's Policy Summit & Small Biz Vendor Faire
- Launch SF/Bay Area Regional Abortion Coordination Table
- Cohost Mental Health Popups

III. OUR WORK - PHASE I, PHASE II, PHASE III

- New Data System
- Women's Policy Summit
- Profiles Project (She-The-People)
- Voter Registration (IGNITE)
- The Political Makeup Series
- Cameo House
- SF / Bay Abortion Collaborative
- New CDSS Grant
- Peloton / Meditation in Park
- Mental Health Popups
- Micro Grants
- DOJ Human Trafficking Grant
- Artists in Residence GI Program
- Fellows Program Relaunch

P2



- Relaunch / Rebranded Dept. P1
- Reorganized Department
- Increased Budget \$1M
- Secured 3 New Grants
- Increased Staff
- Renovated / Updated Office
- Initiated Contracts in FSP System
- Produced Gender Analysis Report

- RFP for New Programs / Awards
- GBV Porting Project
- Human-Centered Budgeting Initiative
- Launch Inaugural Pink Week
- Not-In-Our-Bay Human Trafficking
- WOM Policy / Bills Package
- MYR's Human Trafficking Taskforce
- YouTube Programming Channel P3

III. OUR WORK CON'T: THREE CORE SERVICE AREAS

Health & Safety

- GBV: Non-Housing Grants
- Peloton/ Meditation in the Park
- Coordinated Roe Response
- Mental Health Pop-Ups
- Nutritional Health - Choppin' It Up – Cooking to Thrive Series
- Self Defense Classes


Economic Security

- Guaranteed Income Pilots
- Small Business Vendor Faire
- Guaranteed Income Gender Analysis
- Student Loan/ Debt Forgiveness Program
- Childcare in the Community Initiative
- Pay Equity Statistics Project


Civic Engagement & Political Empowerment

- Inaugural Women's Policy Summit
- Citizen Resource Guide
- Education, Engagement and Empowerment Program


DOSW POLICY AGENDA




Policy Initiatives



Women's Policy
Summit & Small
Business Vendor Faire




Legislative Portfolio




"PINK WEEK" Planning

IV. Coordinated Roe Response




V. STAFFING, VACANCIES, AND ORGANIZATIONAL CHART

WOM
BASELINE
FUNDING
FY18-21



6 FTE
Permanent Funded
Positions

WOM
BASELINE
FUNDING
FY21-24



VI. BLUEPRINT FOR THE FUTURE SF DOSW



Watchdog

Serve as an accountability partner by holding all CCSF agencies accountable to our commitment to gender equity in service delivery, employment practices and budget allocation



Advocate

Advocate for equitable funding in budgets and champion policies that best support women, girls and nonbinary people to thrive





Convener

Bring people together in community and conversation to collaborate on ideas, strategy and impactful action

Social Innovation – Data Driven – Human Centered

THANK YOU!

QUESTIONS?



Asian Art Museum

City and County of San Francisco
Budget and Appropriation Meeting
June 16, 2022



Mission and Vision

Our Mission

The Asian Art Museum celebrates, preserves, and promotes Asian and Asian American art and cultures for local and global audiences. We provide a dynamic forum for exchanging ideas, inviting collaboration, and fueling imagination to deepen understanding and empathy among people of all backgrounds.

Our Vision

Where experiences of Asian and Asian American art and cultures inspire and connect us all.




Rebuilding a Better City



FY 2023 Proposed Budget Summary

\$11.2 million



Personnel	Budgeted FTEs
Security Officers	33.0
Stationary Engineers	6.0
Admission Attendants	3.1
Other	10.5
Total	52.6

FY 2023 Proposed Budget Summary \$11.2 million

	FY 2019 Budget	FY 2022 Budget	FY 2023 Proposed	% Change Compared to FY 2019
AAM	\$11,997,993	\$10,598,289	\$11,248,545	(6%)
FTEs	58.2	51.9	52.6	(10%)

- AAM budget has been significantly reduced since FY 2019, and even more so taking into account inflationary factors
- Solely to meet City budget reductions, 6 vacant positions (5 security) have been frozen by increasing attrition factor from 2.17 to 6.04 FTEs, resulting in significant negative operational and financial impacts
 - 24-7 security is needed
 - Operating hours reduced to 5 days a week due to insufficient security staffing
 - Periodic gallery closures due to insufficient security staffing, impacting attendance and visitor experience
 - teamLab exhibition sold out almost every day (Jul 21–Feb 22); 15-20% more attendance if opened 6 days
 - 9,000 square feet of new gallery space opened July 2021, requires more (not less) security

Asian Art Museum Organization Chart (City and Foundation Personnel)

Bold = Museum Departments
with City personnel

Department Head

Arts and Program

- **Curatorial**
- Museum Services
 - **Preparation**
 - **Registration**
 - **Conservation**
- Education & Programming

Chief of Staff

- Development
- IT

Administration & Operations

- **Security**
- **Engineering**
- Facility Operations
- Finance
- **HR**

Marketing & Communications

- Marketing
- Communications
- Creative Services
- Exhibition Design
- **Guest Experience**

FY 2023 Budgeted FTEs

City	52.6
Foundation	117.3
Total	169.9


Current Staffing and Vacancies

Personnel	FY 2019 Budgeted FTEs	FY 2022 Budgeted FTEs	FY 2022 Budgeted Vacant FTEs	Vacancy Date	"Frozen" Attrition Vacancy
Security Officers	38.1	32.8	2.0	Feb, May 22	5.0
Stationary Engineers	6.0	6.0	0.0		
Admission Attend.	3.1	3.1	1.0	Mar 22	
Department Head	1.0	1.0	0.0		
Deputy Director	1.0	1.0	0.0		
Curator	2.0	2.0	0.0		
Chief Preparator	1.0	1.0	0.0		
Principal Preparator	1.0	1.0	0.0		
Senior Registrar	1.0	1.0	0.0		
Assoc Conservator	1.0	1.0	1.0	Jul 21	
Librarian	1.0	0.0	0.0		1.0
Electrician	1.0	1.0	0.0		
Executive Secretary	1.0	1.0	0.0		
Total	58.2	51.9	4.0		6.0

- 10 vacant positions
 - 6 “frozen” positions – Attrition rate has increased from 2.17 to 6.04 FTEs in order to “freeze” vacant positions to meet City budget cuts over last 2 years
 - 4 budgeted vacant positions – Ability to backfill has been more challenging due to limited DHR resources available to AAM
 - % vacant is currently 17% (6 frozen + 4 budgeted vacant) in comparison to 5-6% in FY 2019
- Filling 4 budgeted vacancies and restoring budget to backfill the 6 “frozen” positions is of utmost importance to AAM

Upcoming Exhibitions


Carlos Villas Worlds in Collision
Jun 17, 2022 – Oct 24, 2022



Lost Kingdoms
Sept 23, 2022 – Feb 6, 2023



Bernice Bing
Sept 30, 2022 – May 1, 2023



FY23 FAMSF Budget Hearing

**de Young **
\ Legion of Honor
fine arts museums
of san francisco

CONFIDENTIAL USE ONLY – PLEASE DO NOT SHARE



Mission of the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco

To connect our visitors with local and global art in order to promote their knowledge of and curiosity about the past, deepen their engagement with the art and ideas of today, and stimulate their creative agency in their own futures.

**de Young **
\ Legion of Honor
fine arts museums
of san francisco

Fine Art Museums (FAM) City Department Budget

General Fund Only (excludes Admissions Fund)

FY23 Mayoral Budget vs FY22 Approved Budget

(\$ in thousands)

	Mayoral Budget FY23	% of FY23 Budget	Approved Budget FY22	% of FY22 Budget	Variance to FY22 Budget
Staffing (primarily security)	14,762	77%	14,251	78%	511
Utilities	2,143	11%	1,730	9%	413
Art and Property Insurance	1,352	8%	1,629	9%	(277)
Buildings Service Contracts	370	2%	348	2%	22
Other expense	<u>365</u>	<u>2%</u>	<u>409</u>	<u>2%</u>	<u>(44)</u>
Total Expenses	18,992	100%	18,367	100%	625
Capital Expenditures	<u>1,035</u>		<u>1,400</u>		<u>(365)</u>
Total Spending	<u>20,027</u>		<u>19,767</u>		<u>260</u>

- Total budget up \$260,000 or 1%.
- FY23 Staffing expense higher due to add-back of 3 Security Guards.
- FY23 Utilities, Insurance, Capital are based on FY22 actuals and provided by related departments.


ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE: FINE ARTS MUSEUMS



Total FTE: 103

**de Young **
\ Legion of Honor
fine arts museums
of san francisco

General Fund Supports 26% of \$76.7 Million of Fine Arts Museums Spending



Community Engagement

de Young \
 Legion of Honor
 fine arts museums
 of san francisco





Impact: Free Saturdays

Fiscal Year 2022:

Free Saturday Attendance: 121,473

Average Attendance: 2,585

Free Saturday as % of Total General Admission: 41%

Change in Saturday Attendance Compared To 2018 (Before Program Inception): 133%

Free Saturday Attendance Since Inception: 214,288

**de Young **
Legion of Honor
fine arts museums
of san francisco



THE OBAMA PORTRAITS TOUR

JUNE 18, 2022–AUGUST 14, 2022

de Young
museum

Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Access

**de Young **
\ Legion of Honor
fine arts museums
of san francisco



Advancing FAMSF's DEIA Work: Two New COFAM Roles

Courtney Jones, Manager of Diversity and Inclusion, Human Resources Department

- Joined FAMSF in January 2022 in a new role that supports and manages DEIA work across the museums
- Creating a structured framework that lays out how we move towards becoming an anti-racist institution
- Developing a training program for FAMSF staff

Abram Jackson, Director of Interpretation, Education Department

- Joining FAMSF on June 21, 2022 in a new role that leads FAMSF's interpretation work
- Jackson will utilize DEIA theories and practices in partnership with staff and colleagues across the Museums to create more inclusive interpretive frameworks, design new processes for interpretation, and support the development of FAMSF's gallery guide program

**de Young **
\ Legion of Honor
fine arts museums
of san francisco



FAITH RINGGOLD: AMERICAN PEOPLE

JULY 16, 2022–NOVEMBER 27, 2022

de Young \
museum

Growing the City's Art Collection with Work By Emerging Bay Area Artists: A Snapshot of a Recent Gift from the Svane Family Foundation

1. Stephanie Syjuco
2. Allison Smith
3. Chris Johanson
4. Clare Rojas
5. Katy Grannan
6. Chelsea Wong
7. Koak
8. Ruby Neri
9. Maria A. Guzman Capron
10. Daisy May Sheff
11. Christiane Lyons
12. Wesaam Al-Badry
13. Guillermo Galindo
14. Sahar Khoury
15. Muzae Sesay
16. Woody De Othello
17. David Huffman
18. Postcommodity
19. Miguel Arzabe
20. Saif Azzuz

21. Rupy C. Tut
22. Sydney Cain
23. Rashaad Newsome
24. Ramekon O'Arwisters
25. Angela Hennessey
26. Ana Teresa Fernández
27. Liz Hernandez
28. Demetri Broxton
29. Kota Ezawa
30. Sadie Barnette

TOTAL: \$999,700

Artists/Collectives: 30 Works: 42

Women: 17

BIPOC Women Artists: 11

Men: 15

BIPOC Male Artists: 13

LGBTQ: 6



100 \ Legion of Honor


CCSF Budget Presentation

Mathew Lau, Interim Chief Financial Officer
June 2022




SCI Budget | 5 Year Trend

SCI Budget | FY19 to FY23



SCI Budget | FY23 High-level Summary

- Total FY23 Budget for SCI is \$7.4M vs. \$5.6M in FY22. This increase is mainly driven by:
 - **Utilities** - The budget for FY23 includes 1) changes in usage and rates, as well as 2) to cover for current fiscal year utilities not accurately reflected in SCI's FY22 budget.
 - **CapEx Projects** - FY23 marks a return to the level of capital expenditure support at pre-pandemic levels.
 - **Salaries & Benefits** - FY23 includes an adjustment in attrition to pre-pandemic levels.
- **Services**, which is a line item for the Academy to receive reimbursement for Steinhart Aquarium expenses, is staying at the same level as FY22.





SCI Budget | Staffing & Vacancies

<i>FTEs by Fiscal Year</i>							
	Budget					Actual	Actual vs. Budget
	Chief Eng	Engineer	Sr Engineer	Attrition	Total	Total	
FY20	1.0	11.3	1.0	(1.3)	12.0	10.3	1.7
FY21	1.0	11.3	1.0	(2.3)	11.0	11.0	0.0
FY22	1.0	11.3	1.0	(2.2)	11.1	10.5	0.6
FY23	1.0	11.3	1.0	(1.2)	12.1	NA	NA
FY24	1.0	11.3	1.0	(1.2)	12.1	NA	NA

- Actual attrition rates have been on par or better than budgeted rates as we are not able to hire beyond our budgeted headcount net of the attrition rate.
- A few noted impact as a result of our lower headcount:
 - Increased spending on overtime to cover for shift coverage, due to planned and unplanned absences.
 - Negatively impacted team morale as staff are asked to work outside of their normal schedule.
 - Added risk to adequately respond to potential emergencies outside of our control, such as earthquake, fire and extended power outages.
 - Increased the amount of outsourcing needed to complete maintenance projects that should ideally be completed by in-house staff.

SCI Budget | Org Chart (City Employees Only)





Thank you



© Brechin Fournoy

Sorry/Please/No, Flyaway Productions, Photo by Brechin Fournoy, 2022

FY 2023 & FY 2024 Proposed Budget

Presentation to the Board of Supervisors
Budget & Appropriations Committee | June 16, 2022

Mission



Untitled, by Jorge Pardo, 2022; Location: Van Ness Avenue, between Geary & O'Farrell;
Photo Credit Ethan Kaplan Photography

The San Francisco Arts Commission is the City agency that champions the arts as essential to daily life by investing in a vibrant arts community, enlivening the urban environment, and shaping innovative cultural policy

Economic Recovery & Vibrancy

Investing in and supporting Artists and Arts Community Based Organizations

\$4.8M

in grants awarded in
FY21-22

38

Nonprofit Arts &
Culture Organizations

75

Individual artists



Liewi Wang, Art Vendor
Image courtesy of the Art Vendor Program

Art Vendor Program

1972

Supporting artists for
50 years!

9,000

Nearly 9,000 licenses
issued since 1972

144

Art Vendor Licenses
Issued in FY 21-22

Economic Recovery & Vibrancy

Investing in our Cultural Centers

- Increase all Cultural Center operating budgets by 10%
- Seismic improvements at MCCLA & AAACC
- MCCLA Landmark Designation



Racial Equity




MONUMENTS & MEMORIALS
advisory committee




Back to Basics & Core Programs

Public Art & Civic Art Collections



Bow, by Walter hood, 2022 | *Untitled*, by Jorge Pardo, 2022
Photo Credit: Ethan Kaplan Photography




Renderings of **Southeast Community Center at 1550 Evans** (upper left) SECC
Entrance Plaza by Mildred Howard (right) and 2D Artwork Program (lower left)




Back to Basics & Core Programs

SFAC Galleries



Taking Place, SFAC Main Gallery
Photo by Phillip Maisel



David Johnson: In the Zone, City Hall, May 19-January 6, 2023
Carlos Villa: Roots & Reinvention, Main Gallery, June 17-September 3, 2022



Staffing

42

Total Staff Positions

13

Positions Filled within
past 15 months

6


Internal
Promotions

8

Vacancies


7

Positions Posted or in
Hiring Selection
Process




The Onyx at Local Sirens, 2019
Image courtesy of Women's Audio Mission

sfac san francisco arts commission **Org Chart**



Detailed Organization Chart



Org Chart Legend

Director/Office: 3 FTE

Communications: 2 FTE

Finance & Administration: 5 FTE

Racial Equity & Policy: 1 FTE

Programs: 30.5 FTE

Vacant Positions: 8 FTE

Budget Revenues


ART Revenues by Funding Source (in Millions)						
		FY 21-22		FY 22-23		FY 23-24
General Fund (GFS)	\$	8.71	\$	9.06	\$	9.24
GFS - Cultural Centers Retrofits		23.10		10.92		-
GFS - Dream Keeper Initiative		2.11		2.11		2.11
GFS - Hotel Room Tax Backfill		7.57		1.36		0.21
Hotel Room Tax		3.95		11.30		11.52
Interdepartmental		2.56		2.94		3.25
Other		3.17		1.88		1.88
Total Revenues	\$	51.17	\$	39.57	\$	28.21



Embodiment, 2020
Image courtesy of Arts Commission

Hotel Tax Funding Revenues


Hotel Tax Revenues (Prop E) With General Fund Backfill by Allocation (in Millions)						
		FY 21-22		FY 22-23		FY 23-24
Arts Impact Endowment	\$	2.23	\$	2.45	\$	2.27
Cultural Centers		3.39		3.72		3.45
Cultural Equity Endowment		5.70		6.27		5.80
Total Funding	\$	11.32	\$	12.44	\$	11.52




PUSH Dance Company, 2020
Photo by Matt Haber

Budget Expenditures

ART Expenditures by Program (in Millions)				
		FY 21-22	FY 22-23	FY 23-24
Community Investments	\$	16.16	\$ 17.73	\$ 16.11
Administration		7.70	7.37	7.56
Administration – Capital		23.10	10.92	-
Public Art & Collections		3.08	2.35	3.33
Other		1.13	1.20	1.21
Total Expenditures	\$	51.17	\$ 39.57	\$ 28.21



FY22-23




FY23-24

- Community Investments
- Administration
- Admin. - Capital
- Public Art & Collections
- Other



TNT Traysikel, 2021
Image courtesy of APICC

Questions



Bow, by Walter hood, 2022; Painted Steel, Glass, Wood and Aluminum;
Location: Pier 22 1/2; Photo Credit Ethan Kaplan Photography



Thank You!

San Francisco War Memorial & Performing Arts Center

BUDGET PRESENTATION: FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24
B.O.S. BUDGET AND APPROPRIATIONS: JUNE 16, 2022

MISSION STATEMENT

Manage, operate, and maintain the War Memorial and Performing Arts Center, which includes the War Memorial Opera House, Veterans Building, Davies Symphony Hall, Zellerbach Rehearsal Hall, Memorial Court and adjacent grounds.

Our staff strives to treat all clients and presenters with equal attention and respect and prides itself on providing full-service production support to a diverse array of nonprofit arts and culture organizations.



PERFORMANCE AND EVENT ACTIVITY

VENUE	FY2020-21 Actual	FY2021-22 Projected	FY2022-23 Target	FY2023-24 Target
War Memorial Opera House	0	93	165	174
Davies Symphony Hall	59	130	206	229
Herbst Theatre	3	117	220	226
The Green Room	21	103	141	170
Zellerbach Rehearsal Hall	0	36	10	10
Wilsey Center	0	4	66	67
TOTAL	83	483	808	876

ECONOMIC IMPACT

According to the “Arts and the Economy” report published by the *Bay Area Council Economic Institute*, in 2019 the War Memorial:

- Welcomed 1 million visitors
- 30% from the City and County of San Francisco
- 70% from the neighboring 8 Bay Area Counties
- Driver of regional tourism

In 2019 the War Memorial:

- Was directly connected to **\$430 million** in economic activity
- Supported over **9,000 jobs**

Those 9,000 jobs:

- Included 4,000 full-time equivalent positions, many of which were union represented
- Covered employment in a wide range of industries, including restaurants and bars, hotels, transportation, retail, and arts/culture



BUDGET SUMMARY

REVENUE SUMMARY

SOURCES OF FUNDS	FY 2021-22	FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24
Operating Support (General Fund)	\$13,601,291	\$14,696,162	\$15,896,580
Earned Revenue (Rents/Concessions)	\$2,263,028	\$3,485,627	\$3,613,192
Interdepartmental Recovery (VB Rent)	\$258,466	\$273,987	\$273,987
Charges for Services	\$199,021	\$586,778	\$586,778
War Memorial Fund Balance	\$750,000	\$966,937	\$588,501
SUB-TOTAL	\$17,071,806	\$20,009,491	\$20,959,038
Capital Planning – FM/CIP Support**	\$2,780,263	\$7,809,276	\$639,739
Debt Service (General Fund)	\$9,502,809	\$9,096,780	\$9,096,476
Carry Forward	\$736,724	-	-
TOTAL	\$30,091,602	\$36,915,547	\$30,695,253

**FY 2022-23 Facilities Maintenance and Capital Request:


- | | |
|--|-------------|
| 1. Annual Facilities Maintenance | \$ 609,276 |
| 2. Davies Symphony Hall Elevator Modernization | \$2,200,000 |
| 3. Opera House Mansard Roof Replacement | \$5,000,000 |

TOTAL REQUEST \$7,809,276

**FY 2023-24 Facilities Maintenance and Capital Request:

- | | |
|----------------------------------|------------------|
| 1. Annual Facilities Maintenance | \$639,739 |
| TOTAL REQUEST | \$639,739 |

EARNED REVENUE



NOTE: FY2019-20 through FY2021-22 reflect reduced revenue due to COVID-19 closures. FY2022-23 and FY23-24 is expected to return to average earned revenues based on projected activity levels.


EXPENDITURE SUMMARY

USES OF FUNDS	FY 2021-22	FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24
Salaries	\$7,248,300	\$8,121,922	\$8,504,131
Benefits	\$3,484,112	\$3,615,213	\$3,545,162
Non-Personnel Services	\$1,341,552	\$1,078,150	\$1,130,574
Materials & Supplies	\$278,657	\$292,017	\$300,627
Services of Other Departments	\$4,520,174	\$6,902,189	\$7,478,544
TOTAL OPERATING BUDGET	\$16,872,795	\$20,009,491	\$20,959,038
Facilities Maintenance	\$580,263	\$609,276	\$639,739
Capital Projects	\$2,200,000	\$7,200,000	-
Debt Service (General Fund)	\$9,502,809	\$9,096,780	\$9,096,476
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$29,155,867	\$36,915,547	\$30,695,253



POSITIONS & VACANCIES

ORGANIZATIONAL CHART




JUNE 13, 2022

POSITION SUMMARY

POSITION COUNT CATEGORY	FY 2021-22	FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24
Budgeted Salaries FTEs	70.00	70.00	70.00
Less Budgeted Attrition Adjustment	-6.00	-3.00	-1.00
<i>Sub-total Permanent Salaries FTEs</i>	<i>64.00</i>	<i>67.00</i>	<i>69.00</i>
Plus Temporary Salaries as FTEs Adjustment	4.49	4.66	4.80
TOTAL FTEs	68.49	71.66	73.8

ATTRITION: BUDGETED VS. ACTUAL



HIRING PLAN

FY 2021-22:

- Vacancy: 1 – 1844 Senior Management Assistant (since 5/28/22)
- Attrition: 2 – 1406 Senior Clerks; 1 – 7205 Chief Engineer; 1 – 7334 Stationary Engineer; 1 – 8207 Building and Grounds Patrol Officer; 1 – General Attrition Savings
- *BUDGETED ATTRITION: 6*

FY 2022-23:

- Backfilling: 2 – 1406 Senior Clerks; 1 – 7205 Chief Engineer; 1 – 1844 Senior Management Assistant
- Attrition: 1 – 7334 Stationary Engineer, 1 – 8207 Building and Grounds Patrol Officer, 1 – General Attrition Savings
- *BUDGETED ATTRITION: 3*

FY 2023-24:

- Backfilling: 1 – 7334 Stationary Engineer, 1 – 8207 Building and Grounds Patrol Officer
- Attrition: 1 – General Attrition Savings
- *BUDGETED ATTRITION: 1*

VACANCY CHALLENGES & IMPACTS

Hiring Challenges:

- Long wait-time for PCS exams to be administered and lists to be established
- Initial Hiring Freeze following COVID closures created a City-wide logjam when all departments started hiring again
- For Engineers, private industry has more competitive wages, which makes it harder to attract talent

Vacancy Impacts on Department:

- Increased OT and Temp Salary expenditures to cover shifts due to FTE vacancies
- Shift coverage has been challenging due to lack of FTEs and resultant expiration of as-needed hours earlier in the year
- Decreased morale due to staff performing additional duties for extended periods of time
- High turnover has resulted in a larger than typical number of new staff needing to be trained





San Francisco Recreation & Parks



**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
BUDGET & APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE**

June 16, 2022

Budget Development

Six public meetings: Rec Park Commission, virtual public meetings, and the Parks, Recreation, & Open Space Committee (PROSAC)

City Charter mandated plans:



Strategic Plan



Operational Plan



Capital Plan



Racial Equity Action Plan & Metrics




FY 2022-23 Proposed Budget


Open Space Fund: \$0.025 for each \$100 valuation of taxable property.

June 2016 Proposition B: General Fund baseline which increases \$3.0 million annually through FY 2026-27, after which the baseline is adjusted by changes in citywide discretionary revenue.



FY22-23 Proposed Budget By Sources \$241.2M



FY22-23 Proposed Budget by Program \$241.2M




Earned and Program Revenues



Organizational Chart

San Francisco Recreation & Parks
FY23 Proposed Org Chart
(All Units FTE)



Staffing and Vacancies

Rec Park slowed hiring and kept more positions vacant during the pandemic

- On average, positions are vacant four to nine months

In the current year, RPD is strategically increasing the number of positions available to fill due to increases in earned revenue and program demand.

Positions	June 2019	% of Total	June 2020	% of Total	June 2021	% of Total	June 2022	% of Total
Total Positions	1,026		1,068		1,068		1,068	
Vacant Positions	200	19.5%	175	16.4%	210	19.7%	217	20.3%
Held for Attrition	80	7.8%	128	12.0%	150	14.0%	121	11.3%
In Hiring Process	120		47		60		96	

In FY 20-21 and FY 21-22, to keep permanent positions filled, the department reduced temporary salaries for the Recreation program.

Recreation Temporary Salaries	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21	FY 2021-22
Actual Expenditures	\$5,032,506	\$6,864,572	\$1,211,236	\$3,548,229 (through PPE 5/27/22)



Staffing Issues and Solutions



Great Resignation. Wave of retirements throughout the organization.

Solution: Leading with values and ensuring that RPD is an employer of choice. Increased job fairs and strategic hiring efficiencies.

With Lifeguards Scarce, It's Beach Season That Needs Rescuing

Lifeguards are in short supply around the country this year because of low unemployment and Covid's effects on training.

New York Times, June 9, 2022

Lifeguards. National crisis in personnel who have completed certification training.

Solution: New certification training path using the Public Service Trainee job class.



Gardeners. Only funded one apprentice class during pandemic.

Solution: Returned to funding two full classes in the current fiscal year.



Recreation. Inability to run programming during the pandemic.

Solution: Additional funding in the proposed budget.



Recreation Investment Proposals



Recreation Leader Funding

Seasonal programming funding will increase by \$1.25M in both fiscal years reaching Rec Park's pre-pandemic level in FY23-24.



Sports and Athletics

3.0 FTE Recreation Specialist positions to bolster athletics.



Cultural Arts

1.0 FTE Curator II and 1.0 FTE Curator IV Randall Museum Director



Golf Course Gardeners

1.0 FTE Sharp Park and 1.0 FTE Golden Gate Park Golf Course.



New Park Staff Support Proposals



India Basin - 900 Innes and Herz Playground Rec Center

Two park sites are scheduled to open in FY23-24. The Department is proposing to add 2 Custodians, 2 Gardeners, and 1 Custodial Supervisor.

Mission Bay Parks

In anticipation of a potential transfer of former redevelopment project area parcels in Mission Bay, the Department is proposing to add 11 new positions, (7 Gardeners, 1 Park Section Supervisor, 2 Custodians, and 1 Custodial Asst. Supervisor,) to start May 2023. Rec Park projects that Community Facilities District funding will offset the cost of the positions in FY23-24.



Investment in Services Proposals



Park Safety and Cleanliness

Ten Park Ranger positions are proposed for approval (8 Park Rangers and 2 Head Park Rangers.) These new positions allow the department to add public safety staffing for a park system of our size and complexity. In addition, one Painter is proposed to address graffiti in the park system.




GGP Shuttles Seven Days a Week

New service on weekdays and additional shuttle service on weekends. All Golden Gate Park guests are welcome to use the shuttle but it especially benefits people with disabilities, seniors, others with limited mobility, and families with young children to go along the JFK promenade when it is closed to vehicular traffic.



Park Stop

The Department will continue the Park Stop Program which provides clean and safe public toilets, supervised used-needle receptacles, and dog waste stations at RPD sites.



Gas-Powered Tool Conversion to Battery-Powered Leaf Blowers

The department is proposing to replace 289 gas-powered leaf blowers with battery powered units. Battery powered blowers reduce noise to non-damaging levels and do not release the toxic exhaust emissions of gas-powered blowers.

Capital Investment Proposals



Turf Playing Fields Program
Crocker Amazon Playground
\$5.2M, FY22-23; \$3.7M, FY23-24



Irrigation Systems
Lincoln Park Recycled Water Project
\$500,000 ongoing



ADA Harding Park Project
\$900,000 FY22-23
ADA Annual Program
\$600,000, FY22-23; \$800,000, FY23-24



Precita Park Restroom
Planning and Design
\$200,000, FY22-23 one-time



Noe Valley Town Square Restroom
Planning and Design
\$200,000, FY22-23 one-time



Kelloch Velasco Fitness Court
Planning and Design
\$100,000, FY22-23 one-time

Accountability and Equity in Programming



Requity

RPD will continue free, dynamic, engaging, and culturally relevant recreation programming to all youth under 18 living in shelters, foster care, public housing, or housing developments assisted by the City through the Mayor's Office of Housing & Community Development (MOHCD).



Peace Parks

RPD will continue to promote community wellness by offering a safe space for residents of all ages, where they can engage in healthy recreational activities while also building relationships with their neighbors, recreation staff, and police officers assigned to their community.



Tennis and Learning Center

The ongoing RPD Tennis and Learning Center (TLC) program provides one-on-one tutoring, parent engagement, tennis instruction and other support services for a total of 100 underserved elementary students each year.



Digital Equity

RPD has proposed additional IT funding to fund digital equity initiatives such as connectivity at Rec Park sites in Equity Zones.





Thank You







FY2022-23 & FY2023- 24 Budget

Board of Supervisors
Budget & Appropriations
Committee
Maria Su, PsyD
Director
June 16, 2022





FY 2022-23
DCYF Operating Budget
vs Other Programs



FY 2022-23
DCYF Operating Budget
General Fund vs Self-Supporting

DCYF Operating Budget FY2223 & FY2324^A

Mayor Phase Revenues (\$ in Millions)	FY21-22 Current Year Approved	FY22-23 Myr Phase Proposed	FY23-24 Myr Phase Proposed
Property Taxes	110.3	121.2	126.5
Interest Earned - Pooled	0.1	0.1	0.1
Federal Grants	1.1	1.5	1.4
State Grants	11.4	5.1	3.2
Other Revenues	0.4	0.4	0.4
Expenditure Recovery ^B	3.8	10.5	4.2
Use of Fund Balance ^C	4.0	8.6	-
GF Support / Transfers	67.3	58.5	57.5
Total	198.4	205.8	193.3
% Change		4%	-6%

Mayor Phase Expenditures (\$ in Millions)	FY21-22 Current Year Approved	FY22-23 Myr Phase Proposed	FY23-24 Myr Phase Proposed
Salaries	7.1	9.3	10.3
Mandatory Fringe Benefits	3.3	3.6	3.6
Non-Personnel Services ^D	7.8	10.8	12.2
City Grant Program ^E	118.8	129.5	116.7
Materials & Supplies	0.4	0.8	0.3
Programmatic Projects ^F	16.6	5.5	3.7
Services Of Other Depts	38.9	40.1	39.7
Transfers	5.6	6.3	6.8
Total	198.4	205.8	193.3
% Change		4%	-6%

Notes:

- A. DCYF operating budget excludes SFUSD & Free City College.
- B. Expenditure Recovery increases from FY21-22 to FY22-23 primarily due to new JPD collaboration. Funding for FY23-24 may increase as JPD receives more grant funding.
- C. One-time Fund Balance is used to support FY22-23 budget restoration and new requests.
- D. In FY22-23 and FY23-24, Non-Personnel Services are restored to the pre-pandemic level and additional technical assistance is proposed to support CBOs.
- E. Decreases to City Grant Program in FY23-24 are due to one-time Source decreases. In FY22-23, one-time prior year cuts were primarily restored by one-time funding.
- F. Programmatic Projects decrease from FY21-22 primarily due to one-time Learning Loss funding and decreases from FY22-23 due to one-time JPD interdepartmental service funding.

DCYF Personnel FY2223 & FY2324

Source Type	Personnel Type	FY21-22 Approved		FY22-23 FTE Proposed		FY23-24 FTE Proposed	
		FTE	Amount (in Millions)	FTE	Amount (in Millions)	FTE	Amount (in Millions)
GFS	Regular ^A	9.0	1.4	11.5	1.5	11.5	1.5
GFS	Temp ^B	0.2	0.0	0.3	0.0	4.0	0.5
GFS	Attrition (Salary Savings) & Other Special Class	0.0	(0.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)
GFS Total		9.2	1	11.8	1.5	15.5	2.0
NGFS	Regular & Grants ^C	59.8	9.9	64.5	11.3	66.3	11.8
NGFS	Temp ^D	1.9	0.2	9.4	1.3	9.3	1.2
NGFS	Attrition (Salary Savings) & Other Special Class	(8.9)	(1.5)	(8.4)	(1.6)	(8.3)	(1.5)
NGFS Total		52.8	9	65.5	11.0	67.3	11.5
Grant Total		61.9	10	77.3	12.5	82.7	13.5

Notes:

- A. 2.5 additional Off-Budget FTE in GFS was proposed for FY22-23 to set up and implement new collaboration with JUV.
- B. Majority Temp Positions in GFS are Summer Food Aids and Monitors. The increases are technical adjustments moving from NGFS to GFS.
- C. 1.6 FTE in NGFS was proposed for FY22-23 to support SF RISE, and 2.9 FTE to support the growth of the organizational structure. 0.8 additional FTE was proposed for FY23-24, pending restructuring of the Senior Management.
- D. TEMP Positions in NGFS are for the Recovery Plan and the temporary needs for the growth of the organizational structure, offset by the technical adjustments moving from NGFS to GFS.

DCYF Vacancy FY1819 to FY2122^A

	FY18-19	FY19-20	FY20-21	FY21-22
Regular/Grant ^B	9	13	9	13
Off-Budget ^C	2	3	0	4
Total	11	16	9	17

Notes:

- A. DCFY's current year vacancy is consistent with prior years' trend. The Department holds approximately 8-10 FTE each year for attrition. The average length of vacancy for these regular/grant positions is 10 months.
- B. Three positions are currently in the hiring process. Two positions are substituted up in this budget cycle after the Department reviewed the staffing model to adjust to COVID response needs and new growth.
- C. Off-budget position vacancy is usually held due to lacking a current funding source.

DCYF Attrition Rates FY1819 to FY2122^A


Fiscal Year	Funded FTE	Vacant FTE	Actual Vacancy Rate	ASO Authorized FTE	Attrition FTE	Budgeted Attrition Rate
FY18-19	58.8	7.6	13%	65.0	8.9	14%
FY19-20 ^B	59.9	5.1	9%	67.0	9.4	14%
FY20-21 ^B	60.9	4.8	8%	68.0	9.2	14%
FY21-22 ^C	62.2	7.1	11%	69.0	8.9	13%

Notes:

- A. Data Source: Vacant FTE by Dept & Job Class, as of 5/26/22.
- B. In FY19-20 and FY20-21, the lower Vacancy Rates, comparing to the Budgeted Attrition Rates, are due to emergency responses to the pandemic.
- C. In FY21-22, the lower Vacancy Rate is due to the temporary staff hired for the planning of the Recovery Plan.

DCYF FY22-23 Organizational Chart

Senior Staff



Notes:


- Approximately 8.4 FTE funded positions vacant for attrition at this time
- Recurring Temporary Salary positions are included on Organization Chart
- This Org Chart is for Mayor's Proposed Budget and may change with further Leadership & Decision Support review
- Color Key: Green- Non-ASO positions through other Depts; Grey- Off-Budget
- Budget Key: "A"-Budgeted "O"-Off Budget "G"-Grant Funded

DCYF Positions Posted with Other Departments


OCOF Director
0931 O
50/50 SFUSD PEEF & DCYF
OCOF
01/05 – [v]

Education Liaison
(Mayor's Office)
1842 A
01/02 – [v]


Finance & Administrative Operations




Strategic Initiatives & Operations



City & Community Partnerships



Program Planning & Grants



Thank you!

Making San Francisco



a great place to grow up





+



San Francisco Office
of Early Care & Education

Department of Early Childhood (DEC)

2022-23 & 2023-24 Budget

A young girl with dark skin and curly hair in two buns is crawling on a light-colored rug, looking up and smiling. In the background, a woman with curly hair is sitting on the floor, smiling. The scene is indoors with a bright, warm atmosphere and some green plants visible in the background.

Informing the Department of Early Childhood Spending Plan FY 22-23

Department of Early Childhood (DEC)

- ❖ FY2022-23 is first year of operations for DEC.
- ❖ Merger between Children and Families First Commission (CFC) and the Office of Early Care and Education (OECE).

Baby Prop C System Building Blocks

Our Children Our Families Goal

100% of kindergartners from all ethnic backgrounds are ready for school.



Expand access to high-quality, free/affordable early care and education, including greater support for low- to moderate-income families

Finance infrastructure and provide operating support to build out and sustain birth to 3 capacity (largest population on the waitlist)

Improve educational qualifications and degree attainment for educators and recruit and retain them through increased compensation


DEC 2022-24 Expenditure Budget

	2022-23	2023-24
Salaries/fringe	12,124,318	12,338,430
Non-personnel services	3,773,434	3,586,338
Aid assistance - child care	470,510	470,510
Capital outlay - child care facilities	0	1,750,822
City grant program	319,163,143	324,904,614
Materials & supplies	378,210	373,210
Services of other depts - administrative	3,962,991	3,894,687
Services of other depts - programmatic	2,790,268	2,790,268
Transfers out - legislative requirement for Baby Prop C	34,000,000	34,500,000
Total Expenditures:	376,662,874	384,608,879

- ❖ Largest investment in Early care and Education for Workforce: \$71 million.
- ❖ Increased child care subsidies \$45 million from prior year.
- ❖ Build child care spaces to meet demands of infant/toddler care, \$40 million.
- ❖ Over **100+ NEW** early care and education providers into the city's network.

DEC 2022-23 Budget Breakdown *(in millions)*

- ❖ 86% of the total DEC budget is for community-based programs.
- ❖ 89% of the programmatic budget (or 76% of total DEC) is for early care and education programs.




DEC 2022-24 Administrative Expenditure Summary

	2022-23	2023-24
Salaries & benefits	12,124,318	12,338,430
Non-personnel	3,773,434	3,586,338
Materials & supplies	378,210	373,210
Interdepartmental Services - dept overhead	2,657,375	2,574,982
Interdepartmental Services - transfer to TTX	1,305,616	1,319,705
Interdepartmental Services - transfer to GF	34,000,000	34,500,000
Total Administrative Expenditures:	54,238,953	54,692,665

- ❖ The administrative expenditures make up 14% of the total DEC budget.
- ❖ Only 22% of administrative budget is for personnel (or 3% of total DEC).
- ❖ 65% of the administrative budget (or 9% of the total DEC) is the required Baby Prop C transfer to the Controller's Office and the Treasury.


DEC 2022-24 Organizational Chart & Staffing



- ❖ DEC has a total of 66.33 FTE for FY2022-23 and 66.96 FTE for FY2023-24.
- ❖ FY2022-23 will be first year of operations for DEC.
- ❖ CFC and OECE will be bring over 35 employees to DEC (34.5 FTEs).
- ❖ DEC will need to fill 32 positions in the next two years.
- ❖ Currently, each staff is covering multiple responsibilities to keep operations running.

DEM's FY 2022-2024 Budget Proposal

OVERVIEW OF DEM'S DIVISIONS




Department of Emergency Management

DEM's FY 2022-2024 Budget Proposal

DEM'S POSITIONS BY DIVISION

FY 2022-23 = 297 Requested Positions



New Positions Budgeted for FY 2022-23

- ❖ 2-1824s & 1-8603 for Crisis Management
- ❖ 1-0931 Street Response Planning Coordinator
- ❖ 1-0922 Data Manager
- ❖ 1-1250 Recruiter
- ❖ 1-2533 Specialty Care EMS Specialist




Department of Emergency Management

DEM's FY 2022-2024 Budget Proposal

FUNDING SOURCES BY DIVISION

DEM FY 2022-2023 Proposed Budget = \$136,380,467




Department of Emergency Management

DEM's FY 2022-2024 Budget Proposal

FUNDING SOURCES BY DIVISION

DEM FY 2023-2024 Proposed Budget = \$140,868,101



Department of Emergency Management

DEM's FY 2022-2024 Budget Proposal

STAFFING & VACANCIES

Vacant FTE by Department

Time run: 6/8/2022 4:30:50 PM

Fiscal Year **2022**

Department Group	(a) Funded Permanent FTEs	(b) Funded Temp FTEs	(a)+(b) =(c) Total Net Funded FTEs	(d) Estimated Filled Permanent FTEs	(e) Estimated Filled Temp FTEs	(d)+(e)=(f) Total Filled FTEs	(a)-(d) = (g) Vacant Permanent FTEs	(b)-(e) = (h) Vacant Temp FTEs	(g)+(h)= (i) Vacant Total	Vacant FTE %
Grand Total	270.86	25.91	296.77	256.50	21.26	277.76	14.36	4.65	19.01	6.4%
DEM	270.86	25.91	296.77	256.50	21.26	277.76	14.36	4.65	19.01	6.4%

- ❖ DEM's Total # of Vacant Positions = 19.01
- ❖ DEM's Overall Vacancy Rate = 6.4%



Department of Emergency Management

DEM's FY 2022-2024 Budget Proposal

STAFFING & VACANCIES (CONT.)

❖ DEM's Vacancy Data Prior to 2022:

- FY 2021 = 23.27; 7.8%
- FY 2020 = -0.92; -0.3%

❖ Impact of Vacancies:

- For 9-1-1 Operations
 - Slower Call Answering Times
 - Higher Use of Overtime



DEM's FY 2022-2024 Budget Proposal

QUESTIONS



Department of Emergency Management

Budget & Appropriations Committee Hearing

DHR Budget,
Fiscal Years 2022-23 & 23-24


Carol Isen, Human Resources Director
June 16, 2022





Budget & Core Responsibilities

- Hire, develop, support, and retain a highly qualified workforce
- Core Functions
 - Workers' Compensation
 - Employment Services
 - Employee Relations
 - Equal Employment Opportunity & Leaves
 - Diversity, Equity, & Inclusion
 - Workforce Development



- **Recruiting in a Tight Market**

- Technology investments
- Civic Center Career Fair
- Diversity recruiting, career pipelines, mass-hire events
- Applications at pre-pandemic levels


- **Workplace Safety**

- National leader on vaccine mandate
- Consulting with departments on workplace COVID policies
- Payments to injured workers and healthcare providers

- **Labor Negotiations**

- Reached agreement with all unions without arbitration

San Francisco to require COVID-19 vaccinations for all city workers



A section of Market Street is seen from above

SUBSCRIBERS ARE READING >

OPINION

L.A. Times electoral endorsements for 2022

CALIFORNIA


Your guide to California's 2022 primary election

CALIFORNIA

2022 U.S. Senate race in California guide: Alex Padilla battles challengers

OPINION

The Times Editorial Board's endorsements for June 7



- Report of the Independent Review, “the Gould Report”
- Key reforms completed or in process :
 - EEO Process and Reforms
 - Equitable, Fair, Respectful Workplace Policy
 - Career Pathways and Development Initiatives

BAY AREA

S.F. city workers subject to racially unequal treatment, ‘interminable’ complaint process, report says



Mallory Moench

July 9, 2021 | Updated: July 9, 2021 5:09 p.m.



Mayer London
Eric Orlansky/News

“

“City policy requires employees to treat co-workers and members of the public with **courtesy and respect**. City employees and managers are responsible for maintaining a safe and productive workplace which is free from inappropriate workplace behavior.”

- SF Employee Handbook (page 46)

”




Rebuilding City's Workforce

Two Years of Disruptions

- HR key to DSW activation
- Testing Center closed temp.
- Applications down 40%

Staffing Impacted

- Pre-COVID: 0.8% vacancy rate
- Current: 7% vacancy
- Staffing shortages impact service delivery & new initiatives





Speed Up Hiring Processes and Stabilize Workforce

- DHR recently implemented Citywide efficiencies
 - Streamline recruitment approval
 - Provide greater hiring flexibility
 - Make certain exams optional
- Update rules to streamline competitive processes
- Examples
 - Speed up examination processes
 - Convert paper exams to on-demand computer exams
 - Minimize redundant recruitments and stale hiring lists
- Goal: Dramatically Reduce Vacancy Rate and the Time Required to Hire Permanent Civil Service Employees

Modernizing SF's HR Infrastructure

- Digitizing exams, onboarding, & employee files
- EEO Case Management system

COVID & Workers' Comp


- Smart investments to control costs
- Temporary assignments to return employees to work sooner and reduce costs
- Focus on employee safety

Labor Negotiations

- Police and Fire agreements in FY23
- All other agreements in FY24

Rebuilding Our Workforce

- Fill thousands of vacant positions
- Apprenticeships and career pathways
- Welcome largest class of SF Fellows




Fiscal Year	Net Funded FTEs	Vacancies	Vacancy %
2019-20	215.66	20	9.0%
2020-21	216.74	27	12.5%
2021-22	250.61	31	12.2%

- Of the 31 vacancies in FY21-22:
 - 12 have accepted an offer
 - 8 are actively in recruitment
 - 5 are filled or filled temp pending PCS recruitment
 - 3 had no funding in FY22
 - 3 have a recruitment plan pending (2 recently vacant)
- Adjusted vacancy rate = 2.4%



DHR Organization & Vacancies





DHR's Commitment to the City

- Addressing Vacancies and Hiring Improvements
- Maintaining Core Responsibilities
- Ensuring Safety for City Workers

Thank You

Budget & Appropriations Committee Hearing

DHR Budget,
Fiscal Years 2022-23 & 23-24


Carol Isen, Human Resources Director
June 16, 2022





Budget & Core Responsibilities

- Hire, develop, support, and retain a highly qualified workforce
- Core Functions
 - Workers' Compensation
 - Employment Services
 - Employee Relations
 - Equal Employment Opportunity & Leaves
 - Diversity, Equity, & Inclusion
 - Workforce Development






FY22: Innovating for a Changing City

- **Community Outreach**
 - Career Fairs
 - Hiring workshops
- **Workplace Safety**
 - Vaccine mandate
 - COVID policies
- **Labor Negotiations**
 - Negotiated successor labor contracts
- **Independent Review “the Gould Report”**
 - EEO reforms
 - Equitable, Fair, Respectful Workplace Policy

San Francisco to require COVID-19 vaccinations for all city workers



A section of Market Street is seen from above.

SUBSCRIBERS ARE READING >

OPINION

L.A. Times electoral endorsements for 2022

CALIFORNIA

Your guide to California's 2022 primary election

CALIFORNIA

2022 U.S. Senate race in California guide: Alex Padilla battles challengers

OPINION

The Times Editorial Board's endorsements for June 7






Rebuilding City's Workforce

Two Years of Disruptions

- HR key to DSW activation
- Testing Center closed
- Applications down 40%

Staffing Impacted

- Pre-COVID: 0.8% vacancy rate
- Current: 7% vacancy
- Staffing shortages impact service delivery & new initiatives





Government Operations Recovery

- Partnership with CON and ADM to address backlogs in hiring, contracting, and financial systems
 - **DHR's Goal: Speed Up Hiring Processes and Rebuild Workforce**
- DHR recently implemented Citywide efficiencies
 - Streamline recruitment approval
 - Provide greater hiring flexibility
 - Make certain exams optional
 - 48th Supplemental
- Planned Initiatives
 - Speed up examination processes
 - Focus on recruitment
 - Convert paper exams to on-demand computer exams
 - Eliminate process redundancies
 - Partner with other departments

Modernizing SF's HR Infrastructure

- Digitizing exams
- Onboarding & employee files

COVID & Workers' Compensation


- Smart investments to control costs
- Temporary assignments to return employees to work
- Focus on employee safety

Labor Negotiations

- Police and Fire agreements in FY23
- All other agreements in FY24

Rebuilding Our Workforce

- Fill thousands of vacant positions
- Apprenticeships and career pathways
- Welcome largest class of SF Fellows




Fiscal Year	Net Funded FTEs	Vacancies	Vacancy %
2019-20	215.66	20	9.0%
2020-21	216.74	27	12.5%
2021-22	250.61	31	12.2%

- Of the 31 vacancies in FY21-22:
 - 13 have accepted an offer
 - 9 are actively in recruitment
 - 4 are filled or filled temp pending PCS recruitment
 - 3 had no funding in FY22
 - 2 have a recruitment plan pending (2 recently vacant)
- Adjusted vacancy rate = 2.4%



DHR Organization & Vacancies





DHR's Commitment to the City

- Addressing Vacancies and Hiring Improvements
- Maintaining Core Responsibilities
- Advancing Equitable and Inclusive Workplace for All
- Ensuring Safety for City Workers

Thank You



Juvenile Probation Department Budget Proposal FY 2022-23 & FY 2023-24

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

JUNE 17, 2022

KATHERINE W. MILLER
CHIEF PROBATION OFFICER

Vision & Priorities

- **Equitably right-size and operate** the Juvenile Probation Department
- **Center the voices**, experiences, and well-being of young people and their families.
- Effectively serve the needs of justice-involved youth through **strengths-based youth-and family-centered strategies** that are grounded in the community.
- **Improve coordination** across government agencies, community-based organizations, and youth and families to provide holistic support that helps justice-involved youth thrive and prevents future justice involvement.
- **Keep youth in their communities whenever possible**; provide safe alternatives to detention for youth who cannot return home; reserve secure detention as a last resort when it is necessary to protect the safety of youth and those around them; develop secure long-term setting(s) that are healing-centered, family-centered, community-centered, and culturally responsive.
- Collaborate with the community and partner agencies to **expand diversion opportunities** that prevent justice system involvement.
- **Reinvest and redirect juvenile justice funding** to the community, including directly to youth and families.
- **Advance transparency and accountability** through data-driven operations, and evidence-based and promising practices.

JPD Race Equity Goals



- **Reimagine** how the City addresses juvenile delinquency, from referral through reentry, in collaboration with the community and our system partners, emphasizing research and evidence-based practices, and sustainably addressing pervasive racial disparities throughout the system.
- **Advance** a Whole Family Engagement strategy that places racial equity at its center to ensure that all youth have equal access to successful outcomes, and that advances youth-and family-centered case plans and goal development, with the supports and resources necessary to help justice-involved youth thrive.
- **Bolster** equitable leadership development opportunities for BIPOC staff; implement change that meaningfully improves the workplace experience of BIPOC staff; enact our organizational belief of redemption and helping people to succeed.

Staffing & Organization


JPD Vacancy Summary

- **As of May 2022, JPD has 30 vacant positions.** This is the lowest number of vacancies in the past four years. The highest number of vacant positions (54) was in FY 19/20.
- The number of vacant position was reduced in the past two years in part due to position eliminations. Since **FY 18/19 JPD has eliminated 37 FTEs**. JPD's proposed budget for **FY 22/23 includes the elimination of 5 additional positions**.
- Nearly half of our vacant positions became vacant this fiscal year (n=12), and more than three-quarters are from the last two fiscal years (n=21). Our oldest position (n=1) is from 2019. **JPD is actively filling 10 of these positions**, with expected hiring dates between June and September 2022.
- **Vacancy Breakdown:**
 - 5 proposed eliminations
 - 10 actively filling – need to be filled to meet operational needs
 - 7 Counselors (8318, 8320, 8562)
 - 1 Information Systems Engineer (1043)
 - 1 Principal Accountant Clerk (1634)
 - 1 Management Assistant (1842)
 - 4 proposed re-classifications to better meet new and emerging responsibilities
 - 6 contribute to required attrition savings
 - 5 required to remain technically vacant as a legacy of the closure of Log Cabin Ranch
- **With our proposed budget, JPD anticipates being properly staffed in FY 22/23.** New vacant positions will be backfilled according to the operational needs and legal requirements of the department.


JPD Vacancy Summary




Juvenile Hall Overtime




Juvenile Probation Department Org Chart
Proposed FY22/23



JPD Staffing FY19/20 – FY23/24 (Source: ASO)



JPD Caseloads Over Time



JPD Budget Framework & Proposal

JPD Budget Framework

- Continuing efforts to **clean-up JPD finances & budget.**
- Continuing **COVID-19 response**: both fiscal & operational.
- **Right-size & Right-structure**
 - Last year: Lowest budget since FY 13/14; lowest FTE in decades.
 - **This year**: Converting positions to absorb new responsibilities associated with DJJ Realignment, support juvenile justice system transformation, and advance racial equity throughout JPD operations.
- **Justice Reinvestment**
 - Expanding reinvestment of juvenile justice apportionments in community-based services for youth and their families.

Juvenile Justice Landscape – DJJ Realignment

- In September 2020, Governor Newsom signed legislation to close the Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ).
- Each county required to develop a plan for youth committed by the court to long term secure confinement for serious charges.
- Legislation also extended the age of local jurisdiction to 21, 23, or 25, depending on offense.
 - On average, in 2021, 36% of the Juvenile Hall Daily Population was 18 and older, as compared to 12.5% in 2020.
- **New JPD functions include:**
 - **Care and custody of youth committed by the court to long term secure confinement**
 - **Secure housing of young adults detained in Juvenile Hall**
 - **Implementing programming and strategies identified by the DJJ Realignment Subcommittee.**


JPD Capital Plan Budget Request

The Juvenile Probation Department has requested, “\$500,000 to hire a consultant(s) to create a **conceptual design** for the replacement of the Juvenile Justice Center (Juvenile Hall), so that the City can begin the process of moving forward toward a new place of detention that is **youth-centered, rehabilitative, and trauma-informed**. With the conclusion of the Close Juvenile Hall Work Group, and the support from City leadership for a reimagined secure setting for youth, this is the first step in the process of developing building plans, determining project cost, working with the Court and Board of State and Community Corrections to **create a new place of detention that combines local vision and efforts with state mandates**. Critical elements of the project will include review of information gathered through the CJHWG process; review of innovative designs both nationally and internationally; and **centering the voices of youth and stakeholders in the new design.**”

JUV Juvenile Probation

	2021-2022 Original Budget	2022-2023 Proposed Budget	Changes from 2021-2022	2023-2024 Proposed Budget	Changes from 2022-2023
Authorized Positions					
Total Authorized	181.25	175.81	(5.44)	176.26	0.45
Non-Operating Positions (CAP/Other)	(5.00)	(1.00)	4.00	(1.00)	
Net Operating Positions	176.25	174.81	(1.44)	175.26	0.45
Sources					
Intergovernmental: Federal	1,172,000	1,366,060	194,060	1,366,060	
Intergovernmental: State	11,014,409	18,543,073	7,528,664	15,000,451	(3,542,622)
Charges for Services	3,000	3,000		3,000	
Other Revenues	10,000		(10,000)		
Expenditure Recovery	180,000	180,000		180,000	
Other Financing Sources		1,476,000	1,476,000		(1,476,000)
General Fund	30,594,294	31,268,239	673,945	31,699,058	430,819
Sources Total	42,973,703	52,836,372	9,862,669	48,248,569	(4,587,803)
Uses - Operating Expenditures					
Salaries	18,780,361	19,742,423	962,062	20,463,845	721,422
Mandatory Fringe Benefits	10,580,560	10,451,134	(129,426)	10,589,134	138,000
Non-Personnel Services	4,770,388	5,128,280	357,892	5,133,884	5,604
City Grant Program	235,000	235,000		235,000	
Capital Outlay	859,139	2,354,346	1,495,207	397,263	(1,957,083)
Materials & Supplies	497,200	393,800	(103,400)	393,800	
Programmatic Projects	2,869,334	3,933,073	1,063,739	6,253,783	2,320,710
Services Of Other Depts	4,381,721	10,598,316	6,216,595	4,781,860	(5,816,456)
Uses Total	42,973,703	52,836,372	9,862,669	48,248,569	(4,587,803)
Uses - By Division Description					
JUV Children'S Baseline		20,892	20,892	27,264	6,372
JUV General	11,381,518	21,424,048	10,042,530	19,078,430	(2,345,618)
JUV Juvenile Hall	16,792,280	18,160,935	1,368,655	18,660,774	499,839
JUV Log Cabin Ranch	2,456,053		(2,456,053)		
JUV Probation Services	12,343,852	13,230,497	886,645	10,482,101	(2,748,396)
Uses by Division Total	42,973,703	52,836,372	9,862,669	48,248,569	(4,587,803)

JPD Justice Reinvestment



Departmental Budget Plan - Personnel

- Position Changes (*all vacant*)
 - Convert Supervising Probation Officer to Social Work Supervisor
 - Convert Supervising Probation Officer to Manager I (Racial Equity)
 - Convert Deputy Probation Officer to Training Officer
 - Convert Deputy Probation Officer to Senior Admin Analyst (Youth Justice Transformation Coordinator)
- Position and/or Funding Eliminations (*all vacant*)
 - Food Service Worker (1)
 - Cook (1)
 - Deputy Probation Officer (3)

Questions?





ADULT PROBATION DEPARTMENT

PROPOSED FISCAL YEAR 2022-23 & 2023-24 BUDGET

June 17, 2022

Cristel M. Tullock

Chief Adult Probation Officer



APD'S MISSION & VALUES

Mission

**Protect & Serve the
Community, Further Justice,
Inspire Change, and
Prioritize Racial Equity so
that All People May Thrive**

Values

- **Service**
- **Equity**
- **Respect**
- **Validate**
- **Ethics**



CRITICAL REENTRY SERVICES

APD strives to address the Complex Needs of Justice Involved Individuals through Direct Contracts

- 26 Grant Agreements
- 55 Reentry Programs
- Services for ANY justice involved individuals, not just those on formal supervision

FY 20-21 Highlights:

- 600 clients engaged in Clinical & Reentry Case Management
- 120 clients enrolled in Residential Treatment
- 61 clients placed in Permanent/Stable Housing
- 149 clients place in Jobs



Behavioral Health / Clinical Case Management



Housing



Employment



INNOVATIVE REENTRY INITIATIVES





APD'S BUDGET PRIORITIES

- **Support and Invest in our Workforce**
- **Preserve Investments in Community Partners who provide essential direct services**
- **Develop Strategic Plan & Implement our Racial Equity Action Plan**



PROPOSED FY 2022-23 AND FY 2023-24 BUDGET

Revenues	FY 2021-22	FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24
State Revenue: AB 109 /SB 678	22,238,682	25,949,275	27,865,307
Federal Grants	402,946	387,356	387,356
Charges for Services	2,500	2,500	2,500
Expenditure Recovery	1,389	3,235,369	3,352,988
General Fund	26,017,985	24,369,394	19,049,736
Revenue Total	48,663,502	53,943,894	50,657,887
Expenditures	FY 2021-22	FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24
Salaries	18,215,609	19,059,341	19,815,320
Fringes	9,926,159	10,474,276	10,568,519
Non-Personnel	7,260,582	7,206,582	7,092,653
City Grant	6,155,146	9,550,584	9,668,203
Materials & Supplies	211,783	211,783	211,783
Programmatic Projects	3,505,189	4,050,000	0
Services of Other Departments	3,389,034	3,391,180	3,301,409
Expenditure Total	48,663,502	53,943,746	50,657,887




BUDGET HIGHLIGHTS

- **\$3.9M increase in ABI 09 Realignment funds.**
- **Increase in salaries/fringes due to colas.**
- **\$3.4M increase in City Grant program primarily due to funding for the Minna, a new mental health housing and therapeutic community.**
- **Increase in Programmatic Projects for the Treatment Recovery and Prevention Program (TRP) and Dream Keepers Initiative(DKI).**



Notes:
SPO = Supervising Adult Probation Officer
DPO = Deputy Probation Officer
CO = Court Officer (DPO)





STAFFING AND VACANCIES

- **Over the past three years, department vacancies have increased to 23. In the prior two fiscal years (FY 20 and FY 21), the department exceeded budgeted positions resulting in -5.3% attrition rate. FY 22 attrition equals 14.5% compared to budgeted attrition of 8%. Most of these position have been vacant for 1 year or less.**
- **The increase in vacancies is attributed recruitment and retention difficulties experienced citywide. For ADP, delays with adopted eligible lists, retirements and staff moving to other jurisdictions/department have had an impact.**
- **ADP continues to provide services; however, limited staffing (particularly Deputy Probation Officer (DPO) and Probation Assistant) has resulted in increased caseloads and the need to reassign staff.**
- **The department's hiring plan includes recruitments for several classifications, including priority recruitments of Probation Assistants; HR Manager; Policy Director and DPOs in the first quarter of the fiscal year.**

THANK YOU!



Staffing Analysis of the San Francisco Police Department 2021



March 7, 2022

City & County of San Francisco
Police Department

About this report

In November 2020, San Francisco voters approved Proposition E, amending the City Charter to remove the previously established Police staffing baseline and requiring the Police Department to submit a report and recommendation on staffing levels every two years to the Police Commission for consideration when approving the Department's budget. **The purpose of this report is to determine and recommend baseline staffing levels for the San Francisco Police Department using rigorous, industry-reputed methodologies.**

Executive Summary

Background & Purpose

In 2018, the San Francisco Police Department formed a Task Force on Strategic Police Staffing (“Staffing Task Force”) per direction from the Board of Supervisors and the Police Commission as adopted in Resolution No. 63-17. Resolution No. 63-17, supported and signed by the Mayor, “[urged] the San Francisco Police Commission to form a Task Force, in collaboration with the San Francisco Police Chief, on Strategic Police Staffing and with the purpose of determining the best methodology for establishing staffing levels in the San Francisco Police Department.” Resolution 63-17 was adopted to initiate an update to the 1994 Proposition D Charter amendment by determining SFPD staffing levels using a

workload methodology based on the demand for police services rather than utilizing other metrics such as population size.

RESOLUTION 63-17 CALLED FOR THE FORMATION OF A TASK FORCE ON STRATEGIC POLICE STAFFING TO INITIATE AN UPDATE TO THE PREVIOUSLY ESTABLISHED BASELINE USING INDUSTRY-REPUTED, DATA-DRIVEN METHODOLOGIES.

As prescribed in Resolution No. 63-17, the Staffing Task Force included a cross-section of community stakeholders, nationally recognized police staffing experts, data analysts, City and County of San Francisco agency partners, and Police Commissioners. In early 2019, the San Francisco Police Department hired police

staffing expert Matrix Consulting Group, Ltd (“Matrix”) to conduct a comprehensive staffing analysis of the Department. Matrix was directed to develop an understanding of SFPD staffing, operations, and workload; and to develop methodologies to use in the analysis. In 2019, Matrix developed the staffing analysis framework and presented the methodologies throughout the duration of the project to the Staffing Task Force to seek input and direction. In early 2020, Matrix released its report that described the methodologies used to establish SFPD staffing levels, developed in collaboration with the Staffing Task Force; and provided the results of the staffing analysis.

MATRIX CONSULTING GROUP DEVELOPED A STAFFING ANALYSIS FRAMEWORK IN COLLABORATION WITH THE STAFFING TASK FORCE AND RELEASED THE RESULTS OF THE ANALYSIS IN EARLY 2020.

In November 2020, San Francisco voters approved Proposition E, amending the City Charter to remove the previously established 1,971 baseline staffing level and requiring the Police Department to submit a report and recommendation on staffing levels every two years to the Police Commission for consideration when approving the Department’s budget. **The purpose of this report is to recommend baseline staffing levels for the San Francisco Police Department using the rigorous, industry-reputed methodologies developed and used by Matrix Consulting Group and vetted by the Staffing Task Force.**

Methodologies Used to Determine Staffing

In mid-June 2021, following the passage of Proposition E, the Police Commission adopted Resolution No. 21-60 which prescribes the methodologies to be used in establishing San Francisco Police Department staffing levels in this 2021 report. Per the Resolution, Chief Scott directed the Project Team to utilize the following methodologies, as developed and used by Matrix Consulting Group and vetted by the Staffing Task Force, in establishing staffing levels for the Department.

Workload-based Methodology

This analysis utilizes a workload-based methodology that uses quantitative metrics, including community-generated calls for service (CFS), to quantify staffing required for Sector Patrol cars.


THIS WORKLOAD-BASED METHODOLOGY IS THE INDUSTRY STANDARD. IT HAS BEEN UTILIZED IN PREVIOUS ANALYSES ON DEPARTMENT STAFFING AND CITED IN VARIOUS REPORTS AS THE BEST PRACTICE FOR DETERMINING POLICE STAFFING.

- Matrix Consulting Group’s 2020 “Report on the Police Department – Staffing Study” used the percentage of time spent responding to calls for service from the public, and a target percentage of time devoted to community engagement, to establish recommended staffing levels for patrol officers.
- The Controller’s Office’s 2018 “SFPD Car Sector Patrol Staffing Analysis” conducted best practices research including interviews with police staffing experts and a literature review. The Controller’s Office determined that a workload-based approach was the most rigorous and appropriate methodology and used a framework based on a target percentage of time spent responding to community-generated calls for service and a percentage of time devoted to community engagement, to establish recommended staffing levels for patrol officers.
- The Police Executive Research Forum’s (PERF) 2008 “Organizational Assessment of the San Francisco Police Department” determined via extensive interviews with San Francisco community members, members of the Police Department, and elected and appointed local government officials that “Officers assigned to the 10 districts are expected to perform reactive policing tasks in response to calls for service but also to perform proactive tasks featuring substantial community engagement and partnership.” PERF uses a workload-based methodology with various targets for percentage of time spent responding to community-generated calls for service, with a percentage of time devoted to community policing and problem-solving, to establish recommended staffing levels for patrol officers.
- The San Francisco Budget and Legislative Analyst’s 2016 policy analysis report “Best Practices Related to Police Staffing and Funding Levels found that “the preferred approach by experts in the field, as well as professional organizations, is the workload-based approach as it considers historical workload data, such as calls for service.” The report recommends that “any changes to

the SFPD’s minimum staffing level should be based on a workload-based assessment that accounts for department-specific conditions, as well as a comprehensive examination of historical workload data.”

- Ph.D. Professor James McCabe’s International City/County Management Association (ICMA) Center for Public Safety Management White Paper analyzes police department staffing and reviews findings from 62 agencies nationwide. The White Paper recommends staffing decisions made on actual workload, as “it relies on actual levels of demand for police services and matches that demand with the supply of police resources.” The report notes that a workload-based approach does have shortcomings because demand is modeled entirely on calls for service and “ignores other elements of community demands placed on a department.” Therefore, ICMA advocates for modeling workload and then placing the quantitative analysis in context with other demands facing a department, resulting in “a comprehensive assessment of workload through both calls for service and other sustained operational commitments placed on the department.” The report asserts that a workload-based methodology is the most accurate and reliable predictor of police staffing levels.

Sector Patrol staffing is determined using a workload-based methodology which, as demonstrated by the research presented here, is the industry best practice. This workload-based analysis uses the demand for police services, represented by the time spent responding to calls for service (CFS) from the public, and a target percentage of time devoted to community engagement, to establish recommended staffing levels for Sector Patrol Officers. This is the same methodology used by Matrix Consulting Group in 2020, and aligns with the methodology utilized by the Controller’s Office in 2018 and the Police Executive Research Forum in 2008. An illustration is shown below.



A workload-based methodology is also employed to determine recommended staffing levels for positions with investigative caseloads. Matrix Consulting Group used the same methodology; a basic equation is shown below.

Investigative Workload = [Number of cases assigned] x [Time spent working each case]

Ratio-based Methodology

This analysis utilizes the ratio-based methodology to determine recommended staffing levels for supervisory positions and positions that scale directly with another metric. One example is Sergeants that provide street-level supervision for Sector Patrol Officers.

1 Sergeant to 6 Officers – the police organization industry standard for patrol officer oversight

Fixed Post Methodology

This analysis utilizes the fixed post methodology to establish recommended staffing levels for positions that must be staffed at a specific level for a determined number of hours. The fixed post methodology is an operational analysis such that the Project Team calculated recommended staffing based on designated number of positions or teams must be staffed for a designated timeframe to meet operational coverage needs for the Department.

Non-scaling Methodology

This analysis utilizes the non-scaling methodology to recommend staffing levels for positions that fulfill unique Department functions and are staffed electively to facilitate citywide and Department priorities. Positions that use the non-scaling methodology to determine recommended staffing do not scale based on workload metrics such as calls for service (CFS) or other determined ratios (e.g., number of sworn members in the Department). A senior leadership position is one such example.

Detailed methodological descriptions are provided in each Bureau section.

Approaches Utilized in the Staffing Analysis

- **Data Wrangling and Analysis:** The Project Team conducted extensive quantitative data analysis on calls for service (CFS) to determine recommended staffing levels for Sector Patrol Officers. This workload-based analysis utilizes demand for police services and is the industry best practice that has been utilized in the previous three analyses on SFPD staffing. The Project Team developed and documented replicable data cleaning and data filtering steps for preparing and analyzing the data. This methodology can be used ongoing and will be utilized in future Department staffing analyses.
- **Interviews and Data Collection:** The Project Team conducted extensive qualitative data analysis in the form of interviews with every Bureau, Division, and unit in the Department. The objectives of the interviews were to learn about the function and role of the unit, understand contextual factors that may impact staffing, and to collect data (e.g., caseload data from investigative units).
- **Information Synthesis and Analysis:** Using methodology guidance from the Matrix Consulting Group staffing analysis and police organization industry best practices, the Project Team synthesized both the quantitative data analyzed and the qualitative information collected to determine recommended staffing levels across all Bureaus, Divisions, and units in the Department. These are the “Recommended” figures presented in the report. The “Current” numbers presented are as of September 2021 due to the fact that 1) it is possible to obtain granular patrol assignment data at the bi-annual sign-ups, which occur in March and September of each year; and 2) the Project Team authored the report through the fall/winter, post-data collection. Given the dynamic nature of the “Current” number, the “Recommended” number is the unchanging baseline.

Major Findings

The results of the analysis indicate that the San Francisco Police Department has a significant staffing deficit across both sworn and non-sworn professional staff.

A summary table showing current and recommended staffing for the San Francisco Police Department by Bureau is shown below followed by a brief discussion of high-level themes and recommendations.

Summary of Staffing Analysis Results						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Bureau						
Field Operations Bureau	1,263	1,528	+265	68	82	+14
Investigations Bureau	278	322	+44	98	136	+38
Special Operations Bureau	151	199	+48	23	24	+1
Administration Bureau	84	80	(4)	121	148	+27
Strategic Management Bureau	11	11	0	64	96	+32
Chief of Staff	40	39	(1)	46	66	+20
Chief's Office	3	3	0	1	2	+1
DEPARTMENT TOTAL	1,830	2,182	+352	421	554	+133

Sworn Staff: High-level Themes

The San Francisco Police Department has a substantial sworn staffing shortage in the Field Operations, Investigations, and Special Operations Bureaus.

A LARGE MAJORITY (72%) OF RECOMMENDED ADDITIONAL SWORN POSITIONS ARE CONCENTRATED IN THE FIELD OPERATIONS BUREAU AT THE DISTRICT STATIONS.

In line with industry best practices, the Project Team conducted a workload-based quantitative analysis using community-generated calls for service (CFS) to determine that the District Stations have a significant resource need in Sector Patrol, representing those Officers in sector cars

that are responsible for responding to calls for service from the public. According to the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing, building trust and legitimacy on both sides of the police-citizen divide is the foundational principle underlying relations between law enforcement and the communities they serve. Therefore, the Department and the City have set the directive and expectation that Sector Patrol Officers should not only respond to calls for service, but also ideally have dedicated time for engaging with community residents and local businesses. Per the report on 21st Century Policing, community policing emphasizes working with neighborhood residents to coproduce public safety. Law enforcement agencies should, therefore, work with community residents to identify problems and collaborate on implementing solutions, yet these activities are resource intensive, requiring time from police officers and Department personnel, and must be accounted for when determining staffing need.

In the post-pandemic environment, the City's objective is to ensure that San Francisco is a vibrant and welcoming place for residents and visitors alike. Over the past year, the City has launched various initiatives aimed at keeping San Francisco's communities safe, such as targeted

interventions addressing gun violence. San Francisco's gun intervention program, launched in February 2021 as a coordinated response between the City's law enforcement agencies, implements strategies to help reduce shootings, break the cycle of recidivism, and build trust between the community and the Police Department. Other initiatives include the Mid-Market Vibrancy and Safety Plan, and the Tourism Deployment Plan. SFPD is central to both of these initiatives by providing staffing resources to deter crime, engage with the community, and problem-solve with other involved agencies. The Department is fully supportive – but it must be recognized that such initiatives require specialized resources. Due to staffing shortages and citywide resource prioritization, some of the smaller District Stations have temporarily disbanded their specialized units such as Footbeat and Homeless Outreach Officers to ensure adequate Sector Patrol coverage.

In addition to the Field Operations Bureau, the Investigations Bureau and the Special Operations Bureau, whose functions require law enforcement expertise and jurisdiction in all operations, have demonstrated sworn staffing need based on workload and coverage metrics. Current trends in organized retail theft, shootings, and homicides require that the Investigations Bureau collaborate with other regional agencies and City partners to address complex, organized crime, and increase investigative efforts across the Bureau in response to rising caseloads. Staffing need in the Special Operations Bureau has been identified in the Municipal Transportation Division, for traffic enforcement and for Muni positions, and in the Tactical Division, to ensure minimum coverage for specialized units such as SWAT that operate in teams.

Professional Staff: High-level Themes

Professional staff, Department members who are not sworn police officers, possess unique expertise and skills in areas such as analysis, and hence contribute to Department operations and support in critical areas. Throughout the report, these Department members are referred to interchangeably as professional staff, civilians or civilian members, and non-sworn staff. The San Francisco Police Department has a shortage of professional staff given the increasing demand for analytics and reporting,

policy development, technology, and specialized expertise.

SFPD HAS A SIGNIFICANT NEED FOR HIGHLY TRAINED PROFESSIONAL STAFF TO SUPPORT ANALYTICAL, TECHNICAL, AND MANAGEMENT FUNCTIONS THROUGHOUT THE DEPARTMENT.

Over the last several years, the breadth and depth of analytical projects in the Department have increased dramatically due to various factors. These the Collaborative

WHILE THE MAJORITY OF THE STAFFING NEED AT THE DISTRICT STATIONS IS IN SECTOR PATROL, THERE IS A RESOURCE NEED IN SPECIALIZED UNITS (E.G., FOOTBEATS) AT THE DISTRICT STATIONS.

Reform Initiative (CRI) implementation and ongoing progress monitoring; an internal shift toward using management analyses in decision-making, with specialized units such as the Crime Strategies Division and the Staffing and Deployment Unit undertaking such data-oriented projects; and increased externally facing reporting and interface with external partners, exemplified by the work conducted by the Business Analysis Team and the Policy and Public Affairs Office.

Conducting and managing the Department's analytical projects is one piece, and the other is technology. Given the increasingly technological nature of the field, driven in part by the demand for large IT infrastructure projects and systems that can seamlessly store and report large volumes of data, and the continuously involving demand for advanced IT security, the Department has a significant need for technically trained professional staff, in areas from IT Project Management to IT Architecture and Operations to IT Support.

There is a significant need for professional staff who possess a broad skillset in management operations to enhance the functionality of units across the Department. Historically, operational units have relied heavily on Clerks for data entry and record keeping, and it would be beneficial to expand the role of professional staff in administrative management. A classification such as a Management Assistant can manage office operations, conduct basic reporting and analysis, author memos and newsletters, and develop and implement processes. Various units across the Department would greatly benefit from professional staff trained in operational management, from the Captain's Staff at District Stations to the Community Engagement Division, to the units responsible for the Department's permitting functions.

SFPD HAS A NEED FOR PROFESSIONAL STAFF WHO POSSESS SPECIALIZED SKILLSETS, SUCH AS CRIMINALISTS AND POLICE SERVICES AIDES (PSAS).

Other examples of professional staffing needs can be seen with the Department's Forensic Services Division, which requires specialized positions such as Criminalists, who are trained in forensic investigation; and in

the ID Unit, which requires Fingerprint Technicians, who are trained in biometric identification systems. At the District level, Police Services Aides (PSAs) would be beneficial as they are able to work alongside sworn members in areas such as staffing public facing windows at the District Stations and taking certain types of reports. PSAs would also prove useful in areas such as the Report Writing Units by facilitating continuity in operations and providing high-quality service, and may yield opportunities to civilianize portions of sworn member job duties.

According to the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) Model Policy establishing law enforcement agencies' commitment to hiring and utilizing professional staff, the "efficiency and effectiveness of law enforcement agencies is enhanced when sworn and non-sworn personnel are appropriately used to perform those functions that are best suited to their special knowledge, skills and abilities." Throughout, the full report suggests civilian staffing opportunities that can be categorized by: the complete civilianization of a position, the addition of a civilian position to remove some job duties from a sworn member and hence utilize the sworn member's expertise elsewhere, and the addition of a civilian position because the unit's responsibilities necessitate additional staffing and specialized professional staff expertise in particular. The full report provides detailed analysis and considerations.

Summary and Recommendations by Bureau

Field Operations Bureau

Field Operations Bureau						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Administration	4	4	0	3	3	0
Operations - Executive Team	1	1	0	1	1	0
Field Operations Bureau - Admin	3	3	0	2	2	0
FOB - Patrol	1,203	1,472	+269	57	67	+10
Metro Division	692	860	+168	31	36	+5
Golden Gate Division	511	612	+101	26	31	+5
FOB - Other Units	56	52	(4)	8	12	+4
FOB-Headquarters (FOB-HQ)	22	19	(3)	1	2	+1
Alcohol Liaison Unit and Permits	4	4	0	3	5	+2
Crisis Intervention Team	5	5	0	0	0	0
Healthy Streets Operations Center	9	9	0	0	0	0
Community Engagement Division	16	15	(1)	4	5	+1
BUREAU TOTAL	1,263	1,528	+265	68	82	+14

Please note that the Assistant Chief of Operations is included in FOB Administration for the purpose of summarizing full Department numbers.

Methodologies Used to Determine Recommended Staffing

The methodologies used to determine staffing levels for the Field Operations Bureau are listed below followed by brief Bureau-specific examples.

- **Workload-based Methodology:** The Project Team conducted a workload analysis based on community-generated calls for service (CFS) to determine staffing for Sector Patrol Officers.
- **Ratio-based Methodology:** The industry best practice span of control ratio of one Sergeant to six Officers is used to determine staffing for Sector Patrol Sergeants, who provide street-level supervision to Sector Patrol Officers.
- **Non-scaling Methodology:** An example here is Community Engagement Division (CED), as staffing levels are driven by Department priorities, initiatives, and staffing availability.

Summary and Recommendations

- All sworn need in the Field Operations Bureau is in Patrol (District Stations), where the Project Team recommends an additional 258 sworn members across the Metro Division and the Golden Gate Division. The workload-based analysis indicates that the majority of sworn staffing need is in Sector Patrol for both Divisions, with additional resources needed to fully staff District Station specialized assignments such as Foot Beat Officers.
- The City and the Department need to determine priorities and vision around SFPD's involvement in the City's response to homelessness. In September 2021, SFPD's HSOC staffing level was the bare minimum for SFPD having any presence at all at HSOC: two representatives at the City's Emergency Operations Center, and one field team of one supervising Sergeant and seven

Officers. Since the vaccine mandate and SFPD's ongoing operational need for staffing, the Department's HSOC presence has been entirely disbanded. Future SFPD staffing at HSOC must be driven by the City's vision for the Department's role in HSOC and staffing availability. Similarly, staffing for the Community Engagement Division (CED) is based on Department policy initiatives and staffing levels must be determined based on prioritization and resource availability.

- **There are opportunities for increased professional staffing in various units throughout the Field Operations Bureau to facilitate improved operational management and service delivery.** Subunits such as [Overtime] Police Law Enforcement Services (PLES) in the FOB-HQ have significant administrative tasks involving record keeping and coordination and could benefit from a Management Assistant; Alcohol Liaison Unit and Permits similarly are responsible for a range of different administrative processes and coordination with internal and external partners and could benefit from professional staff trained in operations. At the District Stations, a Management Assistant would play a valuable role on the Captain's Staff and would be tasked with office operations, basic reporting and analysis, and authoring newsletters. Finally, the Department should consider utilizing professional staff rather than sworn members on temporary modified duty (TMD) in the newly formed Report Writing Unit to promote continuity and a high level of service.

Investigations Bureau

Investigations Bureau						
Division or Unit	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Investigations - Admin	3	3	0	6	5	(1)
Strategic Investigations	49	54	+5	2	2	0
Major Crimes	71	83	+12	2	2	0
General Crimes	53	67	+14	8	11	+3
Special Investigations	31	32	+1	1	1	0
Special Victims	47	61	+14	4	4	0
Forensic Services	21	21	0	65	80	+15
Crime Strategies	3	1	(2)	10	31	+21
BUREAU TOTAL	278	322	+44	98	136	+38

Methodologies Used to Determine Staffing

The methodologies used to determine staffing levels for the Investigations Bureau are listed below followed by brief Bureau-specific examples.

- **Workload-based Methodology:** The Project Team conducted analyses using the number of assigned cases to be investigated and hours per case to determine staffing for Sergeant Investigators in investigative units.
- **Ratio-based Methodology:** The Project Team used a ratio-based span of control methodology to determine staffing for supervisory positions such as Sergeants supervising Officers in some investigative units and Criminalist Supervisors supervising Criminalists in the Forensic Services Division.
- **Non-scaling Methodology:** Examples of positions that do not scale to workload or other metrics include leadership positions such as the Lieutenant that serves as the Officer in Charge (OIC) of an investigative unit and positions in Special Investigations such as the liaison with the US Marshall's Task Force.

Summary and Recommendations

- **Based on the caseload-based analyses conducted, the Project Team recommends additional sworn staffing primarily in the Strategic Investigations Division, the Major Crimes Division, the General Crimes Division, and the Special Victims Unit.** In the Strategic Investigations Division, caseload data indicates the need for additional Investigators in the Homicide Unit; in the Major Crimes Division, there is a need for additional Investigators in the Robbery and Burglary Units. Caseload data across the 10 District Stations shows that the Station Investigation Teams (SIT) in the General Crimes Division have a need for additional resources. Across the Bureau, staffing need is driven by current crime trends as well as case assignment dynamics between units: as robbery cases become more complex and more time intensive (e.g., series robberies), lower-level robbery offenses such as Estes robberies are pushed down from Robbery to SIT. Special Victims Unit (SVU) covers a broad range of person crimes and conducts a large portion of the

Department's rebookings; caseloads have remained relatively constant, yet current staffing is down significantly due to retirements and assignment to other units.

- **The Forensic Services Division has a need for professional staff who possess specialized skills and training in specific areas.** For example, Criminalists in Forensic Services are trained to scientifically analyze the nature, origin, and significance of physical evidence in criminal investigations; additional Criminalists are needed to support the chemical analysis function in the Forensic Alcohol section. The ID Unit requires additional Fingerprint Technicians, trained specifically in fingerprinting and biometric identification systems, to support the unit's workload.
- **The Project Team recommends that the Department initiate the process of civilianizing Crime Scene Investigations (CSIU).** One critical consideration is that it is likely that new professional staff classification(s) will need to be created to ensure that the unit is staffed with well-trained civilian specialists. This process is possible but not timely; the Department should explore civilianization options for the Unit while maintaining current staffing to provide continuity of operations and service.
- **Given the breadth and depth of the analytical work conducted by the Crime Strategies Division (CSD), there is a significant need for Analyst positions in the Division.** CSD supports the entire Operations branch of the Department – Field Operations Bureau, Investigations Bureau, and Special Operations Bureau – in conducting strategic, tactical, and operational analyses and case support. Using a ratio-based methodology established by the International Association of Crime Analysts (IACA), the Project Team recommends additional staffing in CSD.
- **The Project Team recommends that the Department explore splitting Crime Strategies Division into two separate units, one devoted to strategic analyses, and the other specifically focused on tactical, operational analyses and case support.** Given the different workflows, timelines, and skillsets required (e.g., certifications and case/court knowledge) for these analyses, creating two separate units may enable the Division to serve the Department more efficiently. Moreover, the Department should explore the possibility of utilizing Crime Analysts who are certified to testify in court, be it through the creation of a new classification or an advancement pathway under the current Analyst classification.

Special Operations Bureau

Special Operations Bureau						
Division or Unit	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Special Operations - Admin	1	1	0	1	1	0
Traffic Division	60	88	+28	5	6	+1
Tactical Division	61	79	+18	6	7	+1
Homeland Security Division	27	29	+2	10	9	(1)
Urban Areas Security Initiative	2	2	0	1	1	0
BUREAU TOTAL	151	199	+48	23	24	+1

Methodologies Used to Determine Staffing

The methodologies used to determine staffing levels for the Special Operations Bureau are listed below followed by brief Bureau-specific examples.

- **Workload-based Methodology:** The Project Team conducted a workload-based analysis using the number of investigated traffic collisions and the time per case to determine recommended staffing for the Traffic Collision Investigations Unit (TCIU).
- **Ratio-based Methodology:** The Project Team used a ratio-based span of control methodology to determine staffing for supervisory positions such as Sergeants supervising Officers on Special Weapons and Tactics (SWAT) teams. One additional example is using a ratio of Officers to average daily SFMTA ridership figures to determine staffing for the Muni Response Team.
- **Fixed Post Methodology:** The Project Team used the “fixed post” methodology to determine staffing for units with coverage requirements, meaning that the Project Team must consider that operationally teams must be staffed on both sides of the watch and across multiple shifts. One example is the SWAT team: to ensure full coverage, recommended staffing is four teams of one Sergeant and seven Officers.
- **Non-Scaling Methodology:** The Special Operations Bureau has several positions that do not scale to workload or other metrics. Examples are positions whose staffing is determined via directive codified in grant agreements with other City and regional/federal agencies such as positions on the Muni Task Force (MTF) and in the Homeland Security/Urban Areas Security Initiative. The non-scaling methodology is also used to determine staffing for positions that provide highly specialized skills and expertise to the Department.

Summary and Recommendations

- The Project Team recommends additional staffing in the Traffic Division, the Tactical Division, and the Homeland Security Unit based on analyses conducted using the methodologies described above. In the Traffic Division, resources are recommended primarily in Traffic Enforcement, with some additional staffing recommended in Traffic Collision Investigations Unit (TCIU) and on the Muni Task Force (MTF). In the Tactical Division, additional resources are recommended in SWAT and in the Honda Unit based on the fixed post, team-based structure utilized by both units.

Minimal positions are recommended in Homeland Security based on grant funding agreements currently in place.

- **The Project Team recommends that the Department explore options for civilianizing the Department Operations Center (DOC).** Currently DOC is staffed with sworn members who are less than full duty (and therefore not fully deployable to other assignments) based on some sort of temporary modified duty (TMD) classification or pending disciplinary investigation. Therefore, sworn members in this assignment are often only temporarily assigned to provide call center services, and may not provide a standard level of service and continuity. As a large portion of DOC staffing does not require law enforcement expertise, the Department should consider civilianizing DOC for both continuity and to promote high quality service.

Administrative Services Bureau (“Administration Bureau”)

Administrative Services Bureau						
Division or Unit	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Need	Difference	Current	Need	Difference
Admin and Office of Equity and Inclusion	5	6	+1	1	2	+1
Administration Division	2	2	0	28	39	+11
Academy Division	42	42	0	7	7	0
Staff Services Division	19	19	0	49	55	+6
Crime Information Services Unit	17	18	+1	39	45	+6
BUREAU TOTAL	85	87	+2	124	148	+24

Methodologies Used to Determine Staffing

The methodologies used to determine staffing levels for the Administration Bureau are listed below followed by brief Bureau-specific examples.

- **Workload-based Methodology:** The Project Team conducted a workload-based analysis using the number of background investigations for potential Police Officer candidates and the time per case to determine recommended staffing for the Background Investigations Unit.
- **Ratio-based Methodology:** The Project Team used a ratio-based methodology to determine staffing for units like Fleet and Facilities, where a ratio based on the number of Department vehicles and Department facilities, respectively, is used to determine recommended staffing; the Range, where a ratio based on the number of sworn members in the Department is used; and various units in the Academy, where Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) mandates instructor-to-trainee ratios in training classes.
- **Non-scaling Methodology:** Examples include staffing for units that are specific Department and citywide priorities such as the Office of Equity and Inclusion (OEI). San Francisco’s Office of Racial Equity (ORE) was established via ordinance in July 2019; ORE has the authority to enact a citywide Racial Equity Framework and to direct City departments to develop and implement mandated Racial Equity Action Plans (REAP). SFPD’s OEI was created in response to the Racial Equity Framework and the Department’s REAP.

Summary and Recommendations

- **The Administration Bureau needs additional professional staff in some key areas: Fleet and Facilities in the Administration Division, various units in the Staff Services Division, and Records Management in the Crime Information Services Unit.** The Project Team recommends additional staff in the Fleet and Facilities units to effectively manage and maintain the Department’s physical assets. In the Staff Services Division, additional analytical resources are needed to support the Bureau’s analytical projects on recruitment, hiring, training, retention, and staffing.
- **The Department should consider centralizing command of the Fleet and Facilities unit entirely within the Administration Division.** Currently, the Automotive Service Workers and the Facilities Coordinators that manage and maintain the District Station vehicles and facilities, respectively,

report to the Commanding Officers of their respective stations. Developing a centralized management and reporting structure would facilitate standardized processes, unified direction, and more efficient management of the Department's physical assets.

- **The Department worked with the City's Department of Human Resources (DHR) to create a civilian Background Investigator classification that is now active.** Background Investigators are important because they are responsible for conducting background investigations on potential police officer candidates, a critical role in the Department's hiring pipeline. Past studies identified the Background Investigator position as an opportunity for civilianization and this recommendation has largely been fulfilled, as the unit is comprised of predominantly professional staff. Many of the civilian part-time Investigators in the Background Investigations unit are now under the new classification, and the Department should continue to explore the implications of utilizing part-time versus full-time Investigators.
- **The Crime Information Services Unit (CISU) currently faces oversight challenges due to the lack of supervisory staff.** Between the Records Management Division and the Property Control Division, CISU needs supervisory staff in the Chief Clerk classification to oversee daily operations.
- **There is an opportunity to civilianize all sworn positions within the Records Management Division of CISU.** The Records Management Division is responsible for the collection, storage, and distribution of all incident reports; and the maintenance of historic records, with the added responsibility of ensuring that all digital records are searchable and available to be used for statistical and investigative purposes. Staff in the Division are responsible for fulfilling information requests from the public, other agencies, and internal units. While some Officers are assigned to Records Management due to temporary activity restrictions, there are some sworn members who hold a permanent assignment. All duties and responsibilities of the Records Management Division, which are largely administrative, can be performed by professional staff.
- **The Property Control Division of CISU needs additional support and can utilize members on temporary modified duty (TMD) to prepare for the Division's anticipated planned relocation.** The Property Control Division is responsible for maintaining and processing all property and evidence that is entered into the custody of the San Francisco Police Department. Considering physical limitations, additional support is needed with administrative tasks to prepare for the move. Thousands of old cases will need to be reviewed to determine if property and evidence can be disposed of and items will need to be barcoded, packed, transported, and/or prepared for destruction. This is a temporary assignment that provides an opportunity for the Department to utilize sworn members with temporary activity restrictions in the one-time, critical task of assisting with the Division's anticipated relocation.

Strategic Management Bureau

Strategic Management Bureau						
Division or Unit	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
SMB - Admin	0	0	0	2	3	+1
Professional Standards	10	10	0	9	21	+12
Fiscal Division	0	0	0	12	14	+2
Technology Division	1	1	0	41	58	+17
BUREAU TOTAL	11	11	0	64	96	+32

Methodologies Used to Determine Staffing

The methodologies used to determine staffing levels for the Strategic Management Bureau are listed below followed by brief Bureau-specific examples.

- **Ratio-based Methodology:** The Project Team used a ratio-based span of control methodology to determine the appropriate staffing levels for supervisory roles based on the targeted number of direct reports for a specific unit/function. For example, span of control for the Program Manager of the Business Analysis Team scales at a rate of one full-time equivalent (FTE) per 10 direct reports; the Business Analysis Team currently has seven Analysts which can be managed by one Program Manager.
- **Non-scaling Methodology:** Many of the units and roles within the Strategic Management Bureau are specialized and are not scalable to workload or other metrics. These positions are unique and staffing levels are determined by Department leaders and key decision makers.

Summary and Recommendations

- **The Project Team recommends additional professional staff in the Professional Standards and Principled Policing (PSPP) Unit to support growing needs in data collection, monitoring, and reporting.** The Collaborative Reform Initiative (CRI) has been the Department's top priority over the last five years. As the Department's focus shifts to sustaining the CRI efforts, Professional Standards and Principled Policing will need additional resources to implement change management and policy development, which includes conducting best practices research, developing drafts, managing workgroups, consulting with subject matter experts (SMEs), and working internally with Command Staff and other Department stakeholders. Data collection and transparency continue to be critical aspects of Department operations, and additional analytical resources are needed to meet the demands of data-driven decision-making and data reporting requirements.
- **The Project Team recommends additional professional staff in the Fiscal Division, which handles all budgeting, accounting, contracts, and grants for the Department.** The Fiscal Division has several vacancies, and citywide changes in technology procurement as well as the City's transition to a new financial management system have placed additional pressure on the Fiscal Division's

capacity. The addition of a Grants Manager, and an Analyst to support the Contracts and Budget Managers, would support the Division in managing its workload.

- **The Project Team recommends additional professional staff in the Technology Division in various areas such as IT Project Management and IT Support.** The Technology Division provides all communication and information technology support services for the Department in areas including IT Project Management, Architecture and Operations, Applications, Business Intelligence, and IT support. The Project Team recommends additional resources to develop a long-term IT strategic framework and a comprehensive technology training program for the Department, to create redundancy in crucial security and database programming functions, to support the Department's evolving business analysis needs, and to provide high-quality technological support that enables Department members to do their jobs effectively.

Office of Chief of Staff

Office of Chief of Staff						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Administration	1	1	0	1	1	0
Strategic Communications	4	4	0	6	7	+1
Policy and Public Affairs				4	5	+1
Labor Relations Office				2	3	+1
Risk Management - Admin	2	2	0			
RMO - Legal	11	12	+1	26	42	+16
RMO - Internal Affairs	20	18	(2)	5	6	+1
Commission Office	2	2	0	2	2	0
BUREAU TOTAL	40	39	(1)	46	66	+20

Methodologies Used to Determine Staffing

The methodologies used to determine staffing levels for the Office of Chief of Staff are listed below followed by brief Bureau-specific examples.

- **Workload-based Methodology:** The Project Team conducted analyses on various measures throughout the different Divisions to determine appropriate staffing levels for Officers, Sergeant Investigators, Legal Assistants, and Clerks. Examples of workload measures include the total number of various Public Records Act (PRA) requests, the number of Internal Affairs (IA) investigations, and the number of officer-involved shootings.
- **Ratio-based Methodology:** The Project Team used a ratio-based methodology to determine staffing for positions supporting the Court Liaison Unit. Recommended staffing for sworn and civilian members is scaled to the total number of court dates within the calendar year.
- **Non-scaling Methodology:** Many of the units and roles within the Office of Chief of Staff are specialized and are not scalable to workload or other metrics. These positions are unique and staffing levels are determined by Department leaders and key decision makers.

Summary and Recommendations

- **Given recent legislative changes, the Project Team recommends additional professional staff in the Legal and Internal Affairs Divisions within the Risk Management Office.** Senate Bill (SB) 1421, which mandates the disclosure of all records connected to officer-involved shootings, use of force resulting in great bodily injury, and cases of dishonesty and/or sexual assault by Department members, has increased workload significantly for all Divisions and a significant backlog exists. Senate Bill (SB) 16, which became effective on January 1, 2022, will also increase the workload for all Risk Management units, as this bill expands use of force disclosures and allows for the release of sustained findings of unlawful/discriminatory conduct by Department members. While the impact is not yet fully known, SB-16 has the potential to produce 18,000 backdated/historical cases, in addition to over 1,000 new cases each year.

- **The Media Relations Unit and the Policy and Public Affairs Office need additional specialized and analytical professional staffing.** As social media platforms continue to evolve, there is a great demand for video content and Media Relations needs an additional videographer to support the Department's multiple video projects. In addition to liaising with the Board of Supervisors and collaborating with the Police Commission, the Policy and Public Affairs office must stay up to date with constantly changing legislation. Currently the unit does not have the resource availability to routinely review more than 30 state bills that impact the Department and participate regularly in all committee meetings and therefore additional analytical support is recommended.
- **Given the Police Commission's recent decision to apply the Department's Code of Conduct (DGO 2.01) and all other DGOs to civilian employees, the Labor Relations Office needs additional analytical support.** Prior to this decision, the Labor Relations Office only worked with the two unions for sworn members: Police Officers Association (POA) and the San Francisco Municipal Executives Association (SFMEA). Effective September 2021, the Labor Relations Office must now provide an opportunity to meet and confer for the general ordinance with all 10 unions that represent employees in the Department.

Chief's Office

Chief's Office						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Chief of Police	1	1	0			
Sergeant	1	1	0			
Officer	1	1	0			
Executive Assistant				1	1	0
Clerk				0	1	+1
CHIEF'S OFFICE TOTAL	3	3	0	1	2	+1

Summary and Recommendations

- **There is a need for additional clerical support within the Chief's Office to assist with various administrative tasks.** Members in the Chief's Office provide high-level administrative support for the Chief of Police in managing the oversight of the Department and its operations. Sworn Detail triages, refers, and elevates points of contact to the Chief as appropriate, and serves as an escort detail for the Chief. Staffing has decreased in recent years due to promotions and other Department staffing priorities.

Conclusion

The analysis shows that the San Francisco Police Department has a significant staffing deficit across both sworn and professional staff when assessed against recommended staffing levels, determined using the industry-reputed methodologies used by Matrix Consulting Group and prescribed in Police Commission Resolution No. 21-60. For detailed analysis on the staffing figures and summarized recommendations, please reference the full report "Staffing Analysis of the San Francisco Police Department."

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	3
Background & Purpose	3
Methodologies Used to Determine Staffing	4
Workload-based Methodology	4
Ratio-based Methodology	5
Fixed Post Methodology	6
Non-scaling Methodology	6
Approaches Utilized in the Staffing Analysis.....	6
Major Findings	7
Sworn Staff: High-level Themes	7
Professional Staff: High-level Themes	8
Summary and Recommendations by Bureau	10
Field Operations Bureau	10
Investigations Bureau	12
Special Operations Bureau.....	14
Administrative Services Bureau (“Administration Bureau”).....	16
Strategic Management Bureau	18
Office of Chief of Staff.....	20
Chief’s Office	21
Conclusion.....	21
Table of Contents.....	22
Field Operations Bureau	26
Overview	26
Recommended Staffing.....	26
Organizational Chart	27
Methodologies Used to Determine Staffing	28
FOB Patrol – Unit Descriptions.....	37
FOB Patrol – Current Trends	44
Recommended Staffing by Division and Unit	45

Administration	45
FOB Patrol – Metro Division.....	46
FOB Patrol – Golden Gate Division	53
FOB – Other Units	59
Police Headquarters (FOB-HQ)	59
Alcohol Liaison Unit (ALU) and Permits	62
Healthy Streets Operations Center (HSOC).....	65
Community Engagement Division (CED)	67
Investigations Bureau	69
Overview	69
Recommended Staffing.....	69
Organizational Chart	70
Methodologies Used to Determine Staffing	71
Recommended Staffing by Division and Unit	73
Investigations – Administration	73
Strategic Investigations Division	74
General Crimes Division	83
Special Investigations Division (SID)	86
Special Victims Unit.....	88
Forensic Services Division	90
Crime Strategies Division	96
Special Operations Bureau	99
Overview	99
Recommended Staffing.....	99
Organizational Chart	100
Methodologies Used to Determine Staffing	101
Recommended Staffing by Division and Unit	102
SOB – Administration	102
Traffic Division.....	102
Muni Enforcement	107
Tactical Division	110
Homeland Security Division	114

Administrative Services Bureau.....	118
Overview	118
Recommended Staffing.....	118
Organizational Chart	119
Methodologies Used to Determine Staffing	120
Recommended Staffing by Division and Unit	121
Administrative Services – Administration	121
Office of Equity and Inclusion (OEI)	121
Administration Division.....	122
Academy Division	126
Staff Services Division	136
Crime Information Services Unit (CISU)	147
Records Management Division	148
Strategic Management Bureau.....	157
Overview	157
Recommended Staffing.....	157
Organizational Chart	158
Methodologies Used to Determine Staffing	159
Recommended Staffing by Division and Unit	160
Strategic Management Bureau – Administration	160
Professional Standards and Principled Policing (PSPP) Unit	160
Fiscal Division	166
Technology Division	169
Office of Chief of Staff.....	175
Overview	175
Recommended Staffing.....	175
Organizational Chart	176
Methodologies Used to Determine Staffing	177
Recommended Staffing by Division and Unit	178
Office of Chief of Staff – Administration	178
Strategic Communications/Media Relations Unit	178
Policy and Public Affairs Office	180

Labor Relations Office	181
Risk Management Office (RMO)	182
RMO – Legal Division	183
RMO – Internal Affairs (IA) Division	190
Police Commission Office.....	195
Chief’s Office	196
Overview	196
Recommended Staffing.....	196
Discussion of Non-Police Response	197
Project Overview.....	197
Street Crisis Response Team (SCRT)	197
Priority C Calls	199
Homelessness	199
Behavioral/Mental Health	199
Well-Being Check	200
Civilian Staffing Opportunities	201
Overview	201
Identified Opportunities for Civilianization	202
Challenges	205
Work Culture.....	205
Other Considerations	206
SFPD Staffing Context	207
Summary	207
Trends in Declining Staffing Levels.....	207
Reasons Behind Declining Staffing Levels	209
Trends in the Academy, 2016 – 2020	212

Field Operations Bureau

Overview

The Field Operations Bureau provides patrol services to the City and County of San Francisco. There are 10 District Stations located throughout San Francisco, organized under two Divisions: Metro and Golden Gate. Each District Station includes Sector Patrol cars, which respond to community-generated calls for service, and specialized station assignments like Foot/Bike Beat, Homeless Outreach, and Housing officers. Full duty sworn members across all ranks in Patrol – meaning, assigned to the District Stations – represent approximately 70% of the Department’s full duty sworn workforce.

The Field Operations Bureau also includes specific units located at Police Headquarters that provide centralized operational support to the Bureau in areas such as creating citywide event plans, managing vendor contracts in the hiring of off duty personnel to provide uniformed patrol, and coordination of the Department’s Cadet program. The Field Operations Bureau also includes citywide units that operate permitting and crisis intervention training and implementation, and SFPD’s unit within San Francisco’s Healthy Streets Operations Center (HSOC). The Department’s Community Engagement Division (CED) also sits within the Field Operations Bureau.

Recommended Staffing

The results of the analysis indicate a significant staffing need at the District Stations in order to handle workload demand. The next section provides an explanation of the workload-based methodology utilized to determine staffing.


Field Operations Bureau						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Administration	4	4	0	3	3	0
Operations - Executive Team	1	1	0	1	1	0
Field Operations Bureau - Admin	3	3	0	2	2	0
FOB - Patrol	1,203	1,472	+269	57	67	+10
Metro Division	692	860	+168	31	36	+5
Golden Gate Division	511	612	+101	26	31	+5
FOB - Other Units	56	52	(4)	8	12	+4
FOB-Headquarters (FOB-HQ)	22	19	(3)	1	2	+1
Alcohol Liaison Unit and Permits	4	4	0	3	5	+2
Crisis Intervention Team	5	5	0	0	0	0
Healthy Streets Operations Center	9	9	0	0	0	0
Community Engagement Division	16	15	(1)	4	5	+1
BUREAU TOTAL	1,263	1,528	+265	68	82	+14

* Please note that the Assistant Chief of Operations is included in the Field Operations Bureau table.

Organizational Chart



Field Operations Bureau



Methodologies Used to Determine Staffing

Workload-based Methodology

Sector Patrol Officers are responsible for responding to community-generated calls for service; these are the Officers that arrive on-scene when members of the public request law enforcement services. At each District Station, Lieutenants oversee the Sector Patrol function, while Sergeants provide street-level supervision and the Police Officer rank responds to calls for service.

The District Stations represent approximately 70% of the Department's sworn full duty workforce, and approximately 80% of Officers at the District Stations are assigned to Sector Patrol. Providing direct patrol services accounts for a significant portion of the Department's resources and this function is paramount to the services provided by any law enforcement agency. The following section provides a detailed description of the methodology used to determine workload and service levels at each District Station, metrics that are then used to determine recommended staffing levels for Sector Patrol Officers. **Per industry best practices, Sector Patrol Officer staffing needs are determined using a workload-based methodology based on calls for service from the public.**

Sector Patrol Officer Definition

- **SECTOR PATROL ONLY:** Sector Patrol units are identified in the data by a "call sign" code that indicates the District Station, the assignment, and the shift. To be included in this analysis, the assignment number must represent a Sector Patrol unit. ***Other station personnel assigned to units such as Foot/Bike Beat, Housing, Homeless Outreach, and Plainclothes are not included in this analysis.*** Even though officers in specialized units do respond to calls for service (e.g., a Footbeat officer may respond to call for service in the designated beat area), it is not their primary responsibility to do so, as is the case with Sector Patrol.
- **OFFICER RANK ONLY:** Sector Patrol supervisors (Lieutenants and Sergeants) are not included in this analysis. Other methodologies such as span of control are used to determine Sector Patrol supervisory staffing levels.

METHODOLOGY SUMMARY: Recommended staffing for Officers assigned to Sector Patrol is calculated by measuring workload, which is community-generated calls for service (CFS), and the time it takes to respond to the CFS workload, as well as accounting for time dedicated to community engagement and time dedicated to administrative tasks. Time spent on community engagement is a policy decision for which a target must be set. Workload is then assessed against staffing availability, which is the net available work hours (NAWH) for personnel, representing work time available after leave and training.

Workload – Community-Generated Calls for Service (CFS)

Data

The Project Team calculated the community-generated calls for service workload of Sector Patrol Officers by analyzing incidents in the computer-aided dispatch (CAD) system for calendar year 2019. The Covid-19 pandemic dramatically impacted law enforcement call volume across the nation in calendar year 2020. Therefore, the Project Team determined that 2019 data provides a more accurate representation of calls for service without pandemic restrictions and other factors present in anomaly year 2020.

Criteria

For incidents to be classified as a community-generated call for service in this analysis, the following criteria must be met:

- The incident was first created in calendar year 2019.
- The incident must have been assigned to a unit designated as Sector Patrol via the “call sign” identifier 1-19. This includes both one-person and two-person Sector Patrol units.
- ***The incident is a community-generated call for service and therefore NOT an “on view” incident (e.g., a self-initiated traffic stop).*** Specific incident types that are likely to be self-initiated as well as administrative call codes are excluded from this analysis.
- The incident is a unique record (duplicate records have been eliminated from the analysis).

Using this methodology, the Project Team determined the community-generated calls for service workload for Sector Patrol officers at the 10 District Stations. **It should be noted that the calls for service figures presented in this analysis are a specific subset of SFPD *total* calls for service given that these incidents represent: 1) only those that are community-generated (rather than self-initiated), 2) were responded to by a Sector Patrol unit, and 3) by personnel holding the Officer rank.**

Community-Generated Calls for Service Responded to by Sector Patrol Officers by District Station

District Station	# CFS
Co. A - Central Station	41,693
Co. B - Southern Station	41,172
Co. C - Bayview Station	25,449
Co. D - Mission Station	37,358
Co. E - Northern Station	41,252
Co. F - Park Station	16,456
Co. G - Richmond Station	18,980
Co. H - Ingleside Station	25,300
Co. I - Taraval Station	25,699
Co. J - Tenderloin Station	34,738
Grand Total	308,097

Workload Hours – Time Spent on Calls for Service

Calls for service workload hours – the hourly measurement of the time spent responding to CFS – are determined by multiplying the number of community-generated calls for service and the time spent responding to (“handling”) this workload. Handling time (HT) represents the duration of time from the call dispatch timestamp to the call close time stamp in order to accurately account for the full interval of time that a unit spends committed to a call. This is the same handling time interval used by Matrix Consulting Group to calculate Sector Patrol workload hours.

It should be noted that more serious calls for service result in an assigned (primary) unit responding to the incident with an additional backup unit(s) subsequently responding to provide additional support. As these backup units are devoting staffing hours toward a particular call, backup unit responses and backup unit handling time must also be included in the calls for service workload hours. On average, backup unit handling time is *longer* than assigned unit handling time for a few key reasons. First, incidents that warrant support from additional units are inherently more severe and hence generally record longer handling times. Similarly, incidents of higher severity often require multiple backup units, and additional handling time for *all* backup units must be included to accurately represent workload hours.

Based on professional experience, Matrix Consulting Group estimated backup unit handling time at a rate of 75% of the assigned unit’s handling time on each individual call, and the Project Team used the same methodology and estimate. The overall average backup unit handling time is *higher* than the overall average handling time for assigned units for the reasons described above.

Therefore, the **workload hours** calculation of Sector Patrol staffing must include:

- The number of community-generated calls for service for the assigned unit, and the number of backup unit responses to these calls for service
- Average handling time for assigned unit and backup units

The following table presents these calculations, showing the total workload hours resulting from the community-generated calls for service workload.

Total Calls for Service Hours by District Station

District Station	# CFS	Assigned Unit HT (minutes)	Assigned Unit Hours	Backup Unit Count	Backup Unit HT (minutes)	Backup Unit Hours	Total CFS Hours
Co. A - Central Station	41,693	34.3	23,854	25,265	52.8	22,252	46,105
Co. B - Southern Station	41,172	38.5	26,428	23,706	56.8	22,427	48,856
Co. C - Bayview Station	25,449	44.2	18,734	17,636	69.8	20,504	39,238
Co. D - Mission Station	37,358	38.2	23,759	23,921	63.0	25,106	48,866
Co. E - Northern Station	41,252	39.1	26,917	18,454	68.0	20,911	47,828
Co. F - Park Station	16,456	33.8	9,282	6,333	50.4	5,320	14,602
Co. G - Richmond Station	18,980	37.9	12,005	11,953	58.2	11,590	23,594
Co. H - Ingleside Station	25,300	50.0	21,065	16,715	77.9	21,700	42,765
Co. I - Taraval Station	25,699	36.8	15,767	18,610	55.4	17,179	32,946
Co. J - Tenderloin Station	34,738	31.5	18,225	11,567	65.6	12,641	30,866

CFS hours are taken in tandem with administrative time and an established community engagement time target to determine the number of unit hours needed to handle workload. This entails handling calls for service and related administrative tasks, while retaining sufficient time for Officers to engage in community engagement activities.

Utilization

Administrative Time

Recent staffing analyses have measured and estimated time spent on administrative tasks using slightly different methodologies. While the CAD system includes various administrative codes (under the “10-7” identifier) to indicate unit administrative activity, the 10-7 code is used inconsistently – and on a limited basis – across the District Stations. For example, units are often writing reports but display themselves in CAD as available (“10-8”) should they need to respond to a call, and events like meal breaks are rarely recorded in the CAD system. As units run from call to call, administrative time is limited, fragmented, and not recorded consistently in the dispatch system.

Previous Analyses

In spring 2018, the Controller’s Office released a report on Sector Patrol staffing. The Controller’s Office analyzed the 10-7 code in CAD from FY 2015 to FY 2017 and found that Sector Patrol officers spend 25% of available work time on administrative tasks; the report acknowledged that because “the tracking of administrative tasks is done inconsistently, time on Admin could be higher than 25%” and that 25% administrative time should be considered the minimum. The Controller’s Office also found that call duration for the administrative codes increased by 26% from FY 2015 to FY 2017 and attributed this increase at least in part to policy changes that impact report writing and other policing protocols. In the years since the Controller’s Office analysis, additional reform efforts and subsequent policy changes have come into effect. Therefore, it is likely that Sector Patrol Officer time spent on administrative tasks greatly exceeds the 25% baseline calculated by the Controller’s Office.

Matrix Consulting Group used figures developed from prior work with other jurisdictions to estimate the time spent on two key types of administrative time:

- Administrative time (meal breaks, line up, gas, email, etc.) – estimated at 263 hours
- Report writing time – based on number of reports written and estimated at 45 minutes per report

Due to the inconsistency of the administrative time data in the CAD system, the Project Team utilized the same estimates and methodology as those utilized in the most recent analysis conducted by Matrix Consulting Group. Estimated report writing time, which is a component of administrative time for which an actual hour estimate is available, is shown below.

Report Writing Hours by District Station

District Station	# Reports	Estimated Time/Report (Hours)	Report Writing Hours
Co. A - Central Station	7,401	0.75	5,551
Co. B - Southern Station	6,402	0.75	4,802
Co. C - Bayview Station	4,986	0.75	3,740
Co. D - Mission Station	5,986	0.75	4,490
Co. E - Northern Station	5,954	0.75	4,466
Co. F - Park Station	2,118	0.75	1,589
Co. G - Richmond Station	2,961	0.75	2,221
Co. H - Ingleside Station	4,671	0.75	3,503
Co. I - Taraval Station	3,898	0.75	2,924
Co. J - Tenderloin Station	4,432	0.75	3,324

* Please note that whole number rounding may impact how numbers appear in the table.

Community Engagement Time

Community engagement time is calculated by deducting 1) CFS workload hours and 2) administrative hours from net available work hours (NAWH). Community engagement time represents the balance of time units have available after responding to calls for service and conducting job-related administrative work. Setting a target for community engagement time enables units to problem-solve and interact with the community – residents, visitors, and merchants – in a manner that is not possible when units are running from call to call to call.

It is important to note that setting a target for the amount of community engagement time is a policy decision that must be set by the organization or jurisdiction based the priorities of the community that the agency serves. The Police Executive Research Forum's (PERF) 2008 "Organizational Assessment of the San Francisco Police Department" determined via extensive interviews with San Francisco community members, members of the Police Department, and elected and appointed local government officials that "Officers assigned to the 10 districts are expected to perform reactive policing tasks in response to calls for service but also to perform proactive tasks featuring substantial community engagement and partnership." In the many years since the PERF study was conducted, the expectation that officers engage with the community has only increased given reform efforts, many of which are explicitly recommended in the Department's Collaborative Reform Initiative (CRI) and the ongoing recognition that community engagement and policing is a cornerstone of 21st century police reform. Best practice research indicates that the industry standard target for time devoted to community engagement should be 30-40%¹. ***Most recently, Matrix Consulting Group used a target of 30% of Sector Patrol time devoted to community engagement. This analysis uses the same target of 30% community engagement time.***

¹ Previous analyses conducted by the Controller's Office and by the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF) utilized the following breakdown: 30-35% time spent responding to calls for service, and 25-30% administrative time with a remaining balance of approximately 40% community engagement time, respectively.

Staffing Availability

Out of the total number of hours that an employee could theoretically work over the course of the year, only a certain percentage of these hours are actually worked and spent on-duty in the employee's assignment after leave and training. This figure represents net available work hours (NAWH).

Net Available Work Hours Calculation

Definition	Explanation	Number of Hours
Max # work hours per year	40 hours/week x 52 weeks/year	2,080
Leave hours	Estimated usage of paid leave (FH, SP, VA)	(310)
Court hours	On duty court time	(60)
Training hours	On duty training allotment per year	(50)
Net Available Work Hours (NAWH)	Time balance available for on-duty work	1,660

It is a policy decision whether an agency chooses to operate one- or two-person units. SFPD's Chief has previously directed that Sector Patrol should operate two-person units for officer safety and officer accountability. The Project Team learned through interviews with District Station staff that in response to declining staffing levels and to maintain coverage, one-person units are prevalent during certain shifts and at particular stations. Matrix Consulting Group estimated that 98.2% of Sector Patrol units are two-person and therefore the Project Team deemed it necessary to conduct an analysis of calls responded to by one-person units by District Station. For each District Station, the Project Team analyzed the percentage of calls within the respective district that were responded to by a one-person versus a two-person unit, identified by the unit's "call sign" identifier.

Calls for Service Responded to by One- and Two-Person Units by District Station

District Station	One Person Units	Two Person Units	Total
Co. A - Central Station	16.00%	84.00%	100.00%
Co. B - Southern Station	19.30%	80.70%	100.00%
Co. C - Bayview Station	11.35%	88.65%	100.00%
Co. D - Mission Station	8.42%	91.58%	100.00%
Co. E - Northern Station	11.84%	88.16%	100.00%
Co. F - Park Station	19.32%	80.68%	100.00%
Co. G - Richmond Station	50.54%	49.46%	100.00%
Co. H - Ingleside Station	0.21%	99.79%	100.00%
Co. I - Taraval Station	0.76%	99.24%	100.00%
Co. J - Tenderloin Station	4.35%	95.65%	100.00%
Citywide	13%	87%	100%

The results of the analysis indicate that citywide, two-person units respond to approximately 87% percent of calls, and one-person units respond to approximately 13% of calls. This is a departure from previous operating procedures. The District Station-level results show that some stations respond to calls with two-person units over 90% of the time, while others run one-person units more frequently. Richmond Station in particular responds to calls for service with one-person units roughly 51% of the time, a finding that is aligned with information provided by Richmond Station personnel during interviews.

While it may be appropriate in limited instances to run one-person units, the Department aims to staff Sector Patrol with two-person units to promote officer safety and accountability. Significantly, two-person units align with the reform efforts and training that the Department has been implementing around de-escalation and Critical Mindset and Coordinated Response (CMCR) training. This analysis uses the two-person unit “ideal state” in determining staffing need. **Therefore, in this Sector Patrol analysis, the staffing availability figure in question is for the Sector Patrol unit – two Officers that jointly operate a sector car – rather than an individual employee.** The number of Sector Patrol units by District Station is shown below.

Sector Patrol Units by District Station

District Station	# Ofc.	# Units
Co. A - Central Station	83	42
Co. B - Southern Station	87	44
Co. C - Bayview Station	86	43
Co. D - Mission Station	96	48
Co. E - Northern Station	82	41
Co. F - Park Station	55	28
Co. G - Richmond Station	52	26
Co. H - Ingleside Station	85	43
Co. I - Taraval Station	70	35
Co. J - Tenderloin Station	79	40

Putting the Analysis Together

Workload hours are then assessed against staffing availability, which includes unit NAWH with utilization rates for administrative time (reporting writing time and an estimate for tasks such as Department emails, gas, etc.) and community engagement time, set at 30% of NAWH), factored in. This calculation hence determines the recommended number of Sector Patrol Officers by District Station based on workload.

Additional Staffing Considerations

Hospital Watch

For incidents in which SFPD makes an arrest, the prisoner must see a nurse prior to being admitted to the County Jail. If the nurse rejects the prisoner’s admission for medical reasons, the prisoner must go to Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital (ZSFGH) until cleared. SFPD is responsible for remaining with the prisoner until they are officially booked, taking available work time away from District Station patrol efforts. In the first 24 hours of a hospital watch, the arresting Sector Patrol Officers are generally responsible for the remaining with the prisoner. **The Project Team analyzed the 10-7H “Admin Time – Hospital Watch” code and found that citywide in 2019, approximately 9,000 Sector Patrol *on-duty* hours were devoted to hospital watch.** In order to account for this known number of workload hours, the Project Team incorporated District Station-level hospital watch data into the workload analysis. These figures are minimal compared to the workload hours devoted to responding to calls for service; however, it is important to factor in known workload where data is available.

Shift Schedules

The SFPD uses a 10-hour shift platoon schedule for officers assigned to patrol. A research study funded by the Police Foundation analyzed the differences between an 8-hour, 10-hour, and 12-hour shift lengths (Karen L. Amendola, 2011). The study sample included 226 volunteers from the Detroit Police Department and Arlington Police Department over the course of two years. Researchers examined numerous areas of interest, including officer performance, safety, health, quality of life, fatigue, sleep, and extra-duty employment, in order to examine the potential advantages and disadvantages associated with various shift schedules. Key findings from the study suggests that:

- 10-hour shifts have several advantages over 8-hour shifts:
 - Reduces the number of days worked, the total amount of commute time, and the likelihood of working on a holiday
 - Provides an overlap period between shifts when officers from two shifts are working, effectively allowing the Department to double staffing during peak demand times
 - Officers assigned to 10-hour shifts reported significantly more sleep per night (over half an hour) and a significantly higher quality of work life
 - Officers assigned to 10-hour shifts worked the least amount of overtime amongst the three shift-lengths
- Benefits from 10-hour shifts did not extend to 12-hour shifts:
 - Officers assigned to 12-hour shifts did not report sleeping significantly more hours than those on 8-hour shifts
 - Officers assigned to 12-hour shifts worked less overtime than those working 8-hour shifts, but worked comparatively more overtime hours than those on 10-hour shifts
- 12-hour shifts may pose safety risks to officers and the public:
 - Officers assigned to 12-hour shifts had significantly lower levels of alertness and were sleepier than those on 8-hour shifts. These findings were not true for those on 10-hour shifts
- 8-hour shifts may be more costly
 - Officers assigned to 8-hour shifts worked significantly more overtime than those on 10-hour or 12-hour shifts

The study noted that shift length did not have a significant impact on measures of performance, safety, work-family conflict, or health. While there may be varying advantages with each shift length, the Department acknowledges that any major changes to the work schedule policy will require a meet and confer process with the Police Officers Association.

Response Times

Response times are not a direct input into the workload-based calls for service methodology, yet analyzing response time service levels provides additional insight into Sector Patrol staffing.

Response time analytics developed by the Controller's Office in partnership with SFPD and the Department of Emergency Management (DEM) define the SFPD response time as call entry to on-scene, representing the interval from when the DEM dispatcher enters the call into the queue until the time that

the first SFPD unit arrives on-scene. **For the period of time January 31st, 2020 through January 31st, 2021, the median SFPD response time for Priority A calls was 5.5 minutes.** This means that for half of the calls with imminent threat to life or property, an SFPD unit arrived on scene within 5.5 minutes or faster, indicating an effective response to high priority incidents.

For Priority C calls, the median SFPD response time over the same time period was 61 minutes, meaning that only half of non-emergency calls were responded to within one hour. In this analysis, 38% of calls were classified as Priority C. It is not typical for a response time category that represents almost 40% of calls to have wait times of well over an hour in many instances. This finding indicates a resource shortage: Sector Patrol units are quickly responding to high priority incidents, but are running from call to call without adequate time to address lower priority incidents, which are subject to significant wait times.

SFPD, the Controller's Office, and DEM continue to monitor Priority A, B, and C response times through a dashboard developed via a mutually agreed upon methodology.

Events & Special Details

SFPD must plan for and staff events throughout San Francisco and there are hundreds of events citywide every year. Though the number of citywide events decreased in 2020 due to Covid-19, events are resuming again as San Francisco re-opens again as pandemic restrictions loosen. Based on the timing, location, and magnitude of events, some event staffing is done on overtime; however, on-duty work time likely accounts for a significant portion of event staffing, particularly for smaller events localized to individual Districts. SFPD currently does not have a comprehensive methodology for tracking time spent on events and the Department should determine a system and methodology for tracking event staffing to be included in future analyses. Event staffing is not factored into this analysis.

Moreover, there are specific, high priority incidents such as stunt driving and shootings that specialized units at the Stations are often pulled to handle in order to generate a citywide response. SFPD does not currently have an easy and comprehensive system and methodology for tracking the time that specific District Station units are pulled for these incidents. The Project Team recommends that the Department determine a process and technological solution for doing so in the future. Time spent on these special details are not included in this analysis.

Other methodologies used to determine staffing levels in the Field Operations Bureau include:

Ratio-based Methodology: The industry best practice span of control ratio of one Sergeant to six Officers is used to determine staffing for Sector Patrol Sergeants, who provide street-level supervision to Sector Patrol Officers.

Fixed Post Methodology: An example here is Homeless Outreach Officers for which the Department has determined that District Stations should have coverage in this position throughout the week. Though these Officers are not posted at a specific location, staffing is determined via coverage assignment.

Non-scaling Methodology: Example here is Community Engagement Division (CED), as staffing levels are driven by Department priorities, initiatives, and staffing availability.

FOB Patrol – Unit Descriptions

This section provides an overview and discussion of the units at the District Stations with some additional methodological description where relevant.

Sector Patrol

As described in the previous section, staffing for Officers assigned to Sector Patrol is determined using a workload-based methodology based on community-generated calls for service (CFS).

Patrol Sergeants provide direct supervision to Sector Patrol Officers, providing street-level supervision and responding to serious and complicated calls as needed. Patrol Sergeants also supervise other officers from specialized units (e.g., Foot/Bike Beat, Homeless Outreach) that work the same shift. Sergeants also provide management and guidance in administrative tasks and must sign off on every correspondence or report authored by an Officer. Interviews with station staff indicate that the new Use of Force policy will likely increase administrative time significantly for Sergeants, as they are the first line of review and sign off on all paperwork that must be completed. As mentioned above, Sergeant staffing is determined via a “span of control” ratio-based methodology in which a single Sergeant should supervise a designated number of Officers based on industry standard of 1:6.

Patrol Lieutenants are responsible for the day-to-day running of the watch to which they are assigned, serving as the operational lead under the District Station Captain. Lieutenants provide minimal direction and supervision in the field and spend the majority of their time managing station operations, including creating staffing and deployment plans, implementing operational orders, addressing personnel-related matters like training and scheduling, reading and signing off on police reports, and various other operational and administrative tasks. Given that Patrol Lieutenants provide day-to-day station-level supervision, Patrol Lieutenant staffing is determined using the fixed post methodology based on watch coverage: Patrol Lieutenants are assigned to opposite watches with morning and afternoon/evening shift start times to ensure coverage.

Foot/Bike Beats

Foot/Bike Beats, referred to as such or as “Footbeat Officers” or “uniformed foot patrol,” facilitate desired public safety outcomes through improved community relationships and high visibility. While foot and bicycle officers do respond to calls for service in their beats, their primary functions are to engage and forge relationships with merchants, residents, and visitors; and to serve as a visible law enforcement presence in the community to deter crime.

Due to the community engagement component of the assignment, Foot/Bike Beats do not scale directly with workload. Staffing is determined using the fixed post methodology in which the Project Team assessed the appropriateness of the current footbeat sectors, utilizing the results of an analysis conducted by public policy think tank California Policy Lab (CPL). Given the demonstrated appropriateness of the current footbeat sectors, the Project Team determined the resources required to provide consistent coverage to these designated footbeat areas. It should be noted that Footbeat staffing may also be determined electively, based on Department and/or citywide prioritization or directive.

The Project Team uses this section to:

1. Provide a discussion on the benefits and efficacy of footbeat staffing in meeting various desired public safety outcomes; and
2. Incorporate available data into the methodology for determining footbeat staffing.

The Benefits of Foot/Bike Beats & Current Initiatives

Footbeat Officers and Community Policing. In 2017, the SFPD Community Engagement Division convened an Executive Sponsor Working Group (ESWG) comprised of SFPD and community stakeholders to develop the Department's first Community Policing Strategic Plan. The Plan was developed in response to the 2016 United States Department of Justice (DOJ) Collaborative Reform Initiative (CRI) and lays out goals, objectives and measures for each unit. Footbeat officers feature prominently throughout the Plan and particularly in the "Goal 4: Relationship-Building" section, with a stated objective of "[increasing] visible officer presence and proactive, positive engagement with individuals outside of calls for service." Toward this objective, ESWG brainstormed that casual interactions or those unrelated to a specific crime incident help build goodwill, as "it is easier to build relationships in good times than in crisis." The group identified "[increasing the] number of foot and bicycle beat officers" as a strategy for promoting relationship-building, also noting that "staffing and funding availability is a huge barrier." Community policing is also the central strategy in the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing. The introduction of the Implementation Guide describes that: "Community policing is a philosophy as well as a way of doing business. The commitment to work with communities to tackle the immediate and longer-term causes of crime through joint problem-solving reduces crime and improves quality of life."

Footbeat Officers and Decreased Crime. In 2018, nonprofit policy group California Policy Lab (CPL) released a report evaluating the reallocation of police officers from Plainclothes and other special assignments to uniformed foot patrol. The analysis assessed the impact of this reassignment on reported daily criminal incidents for the 120-day period surrounding the policy change, which took place on September 1st, 2017. CPL analyzed micro-level data for the ten most frequently reported offenses and found statistically significant declines in the daily level of larceny thefts and assaults that correspond with the reallocation of police officers to uniformed foot patrol. While this study assesses a short time period and acknowledges that there may be additional external factors at play, the findings suggest that foot beat officers are an effective tool that police departments can utilize to deter crime.

Footbeat Officers and the Reopening of San Francisco. As San Francisco reopens following the 2020 pandemic shutdown, footbeat officers play a critical role in reinvigorating the city and helping to ensure that residents, visitors, and businesses feel welcome and safe. Current initiatives in which SFPD uniformed foot patrol play a vital role include the following:

- **Gun Violence Prevention Program.** In February 2021, the City introduced the strategies for addressing gun violence through targeted interventions. A coordinated effort between the City's law enforcement agencies, these programs aim to reduce shootings, break the cycle of recidivism, and build trust between the community and the Police Department.


- **Mid-Market Vibrancy and Safety Plan.** In May 2021, Mayor London Breed introduced the Mid-Market Vibrancy and Safety Plan which “includes both a visible increase in police presence to deter criminal activity and a community ambassador program to connect people in need with services, and provide a welcoming presence for residents, workers, visitors, and businesses.” **SFPD significantly increased deployments in the Mid-Market, UN Plaza and Tenderloin areas,** embodying strategies outlined in the SFPD Community Policing Strategic Plan: working collaboratively to problem-solve around issues that impact local residents, businesses and visitors; connecting individuals in need with appropriate services; and building trust with local residents and visitors in a high visibility assignment.
- **Tourism Deployment Plan.** In mid-July 2021, SFPD deployed 26 additional officers on bicycle and foot patrols to a number of high-traffic and highly sought-after travel destinations in five of the city’s 10 police districts with the goal of protecting tourists and supporting San Francisco’s tourism industry.
- **Organized Retail Crime Initiative.** On September 22nd, 2021, Mayor London Breed announced the SFPD-led Organized Retail Crime Initiative aimed at reporting, investigating, and solving retail theft crimes. One key element of the Initiative is increased law enforcement presence in hot spot areas, funded in large part through the 10B program in which private entities hire off-duty law enforcement personnel to provide uniformed presence.
- **Increased Uniformed Deployment in Union Square and the Tenderloin.** Throughout December 2021, the City increased SFPD deployment significantly in the Union Square area. Also in December 2021, Mayor London Breed announced an emergency declaration to deploy additional law enforcement resources to the Tenderloin District.
- **SFPD Community Ambassador Program.** SFPD’s Community Ambassador program utilizes the deployment of retired officers to highly-trafficked areas such as Fisherman’s Wharf, Union Square, and the Castro. These SFPD Community Ambassadors serve as a visible law enforcement presence, engage with merchants and visitors, and patrol these areas as needed.

Staffing Discussion


Evidently, uniformed foot patrol provides significant benefits to San Francisco through community policing and problem-solving, visible law enforcement presence, and strategic deployment based on the City’s priorities. While metrics related to this assignment cannot be directly quantified via workload, the Project Team determined that mapping the crime incidents in the 10 categories analyzed by CPL within current footbeat boundaries can, by proxy, indicate the appropriateness of SFPD’s footbeat locations, given that the CPL study found foot patrol to be an effective deterrent to these crime types.

These are the following crime categories mapped against the current footbeat boundaries below:
Larceny, Assault, Vandalism, Vehicle Theft, Suspicious occurrences, Burglary, Robbery, Drug/narcotic, Fraud and Other offenses.

2019 Top 10 CPL Crime Categories & SFPD Beats



2020 Top 10 CPL Crime Categories & SFPD Beats



These heat maps indicate that the current foot beat sectors are approximately aligned with the concentration of citywide incidents of the crime types analyzed in the CPL report. **It appears that the location and number of the current SFPD “beats” are generally appropriate for promoting a visible law enforcement presence in hot spot areas with high incident counts.** Hence, the Project Team assessed the resources needed to adequately staff these beats citywide to determine recommended Foot/Bike Beat staffing levels. The City’s current initiatives are discussed but the resources required are not included.

At the citywide-level, District Stations do not have the personnel to adequately staff, at minimum, the current beats. Given current trends and initiatives, the Department has prioritized foot beat staffing in the northeast quadrant of the City, where, for example, there is high-density tourist activity and auto break-ins (Fisherman’s Wharf); retail theft in shopping corridors (Union Square); and targeted robbery, theft, and violence against specific communities (e.g., Chinatown/North Beach). The Department has also prioritized foot beat staffing in the central eastern area of the city, around the Transbay Terminal and all along the Mid-Market, UN Plaza, and Tenderloin areas; and to some extent around specific areas such as Golden Gate Park in the western portion of the city. Foot/Bike Beats are a scarce resource that must be allocated across the city, and some of the smaller District Stations are unable to staff their footbeat assignments consistently or at all. The Project Team recommends that at minimum, each District Station have the Foot/Bike Beat resources to consistently staff the footbeat sectors in the district. **Additional resources are required to staff all District Station footbeat sectors on a regular basis. This analysis does not consider the resources needed to fulfill the staffing requirements of the City’s current initiatives.**

It should be noted that beyond the established beats, footbeat staffing and day-to-day deployment is at the discretion of the District Station Captain with guidance provided by the Field Operations Bureau and the City. District Station Captains must engage in dynamic decision-making on foot beat deployment, given current crime trends and hot spot areas and other demands of the district.

Housing Sergeants and Officers

Housing units consist of a supervisory Sergeant and a team of Officers and are responsible for patrolling public housing developments and for building relationships with the housing development community; these units are operational at five of the 10 District Stations. A significant benefit of the Housing assignment is that the officers have a rapport with the community: they know many of the community advocates and pastors, have credibility for being honest and trustworthy, and already know many of the suspects that they come into contact with. Though Housing officers do handle any calls for service at the public housing developments, much of their work is community engagement. Given the coverage requirements of the Housing assignment, staffing is determined using a fixed-post methodology, with the intention of having a team with full coverage over the course of the week. Housing unit structure examples include:

- 1 Sergeant supervisor (staffing based on span of control) and 6 Officers (electively staffed, team designed to have 3 Officers on each side of the watch)
- 1 Sergeant supervisor (staffing based on span of control) and 4 Officers (electively staffed, team designed to have 2 Officers on each side of the watch)

Through interviews, the Project Team determined that District Station staffing shortages have impacted the Housing assignment in a few different ways. First, District Stations that are directed to staff Housing Units are unable to staff full Housing teams; for example, the supervisory Sergeant is shared amongst other specialized station assignments or there are not enough Officers to equally cover each side of the watch. Second, Housing officers are often utilized to respond to calls for service across the district if day-

to-day shortages in Sector Patrol staffing require that resources be drawn from elsewhere in the station staffing. Housing units are often tasked with responding to critical incidents and staffing events.

Plainclothes

The Plainclothes unit provides district-level directed enforcement, with activities directed by the Captain of the District Station based on priorities of the Department and the City. The Plainclothes unit does not respond to calls for service; the unit's workload is self-initiated activity and directed enforcement focused on current hot crime types and locations. For example, District Station personnel indicate that the focus of the unit may range from narcotics to auto burglaries and nighttime burglaries/hot prowls to taking guns off of the streets. The Plainclothes unit also supports requests from investigative units and writes search warrants. As the Plainclothes unit provides specialized directed enforcement to each District Station, Matrix Consulting Group used a ratio-based methodology based on the station's number of core Sector Patrol Officers to determine a recommended number for Plainclothes officers. This analysis also uses a ratio-based methodology based on the number of Sector Patrol Officers.

The Field Operations Bureau is currently re-envisioning the Plainclothes unit so that its focus on directed enforcement can best address current crime trends in retail theft and other prevalent crime types. A centralized Field Operations Bureau unit is responsible for developing and implementing Plainclothes unit policies and protocols across the District Stations. In this re-envisioning process, the Project Team recommends that the Department incorporate a "problem-solving team" component into the Plainclothes assignment. Unpredicted and unexpected situations arise on a day-to-day basis at the District Stations, and it would be beneficial for District Station leadership to address these issues using dedicated personnel, leaving Sector Patrol officers free to perform routine law enforcement services. A sufficiently staffed Plainclothes team envisioned as a Problem Solving Team could provide resources for directed enforcement. The Department should continue to assess Plainclothes staffing need based on its overarching plan for the mission and function of the unit.

Captain's Staff

Captain's Staff at the District Stations are responsible for a variety of different tasks that support the Captain and the operation of the District Station. Captain's Staff includes both sworn officers and Police Services Aides (PSAs) that are largely responsible for managing the public-facing windows at the District Stations and assisting with reports and other law enforcement duties as they are able. Busier District Stations and/or those District Stations that are centrally located within the community and experience a high walk-in volume – generally those stations in the Metro Division – are staffed with more PSAs than those in quieter and/or outlying areas of the city. PSA staffing is determined using the non-scaling methodology; however, future analyses should determine if and what workload metrics might be available to determine PSA staffing.

Sworn member duties include issuing and enforcing permits, event planning, including writing operations orders for smaller district events and for coordinating with centralized FOB to plan for large scale events. Generally, Metro Division District Stations have more events than those in the Golden Gate Division and

therefore Metro Division Stations warrant a Sergeant position that is responsible for permitting and event planning in the community. Other duties include pulling together crime statistics and other data for internal Department and external community meetings, social media management and responding to inquiries from the community, producing various newsletters for the Station, assisting the Captain in preparing for community meetings, and attending meetings with or standing in for the Captain at meetings as necessary. While Captain's Staff assignment will always need sworn members to operate and enforce permitting, to plan events, and to attend community events as a sworn presence with the Captain, there is opportunity for some of the Captain's Staff tasks currently conducted by sworn members to be transferred to a civilian classification with the appropriate job description.

Recommendation: Every District Station should have a Management Assistant or equivalent classification on the Captain's Staff to assist with analysis, written content, and meeting preparation. Members of the Captain's Staff undertake duties such as managing the District Station's social media accounts, authoring the Station's newsletter, and assisting the Captain in preparing for meetings. These tasks can be conducted by a civilian member. Moreover, the Project Team learned from interviews that it would be useful for the Captain if there were a staff member who could pull and analyze various statistics pulled from the Department's Oracle Business Intelligence (BI) system. The Project Team recommends a classification such as a Management Assistant, whose job description indicates that the position "compiles and produces a variety of status reports for management," and "arranges meetings and assists in development of agenda; participates in department meetings, including making presentations," among many other tasks. This position could undertake tasks such as meeting preparation and newsletter development, enabling sworn members to utilize their unique skillset in relevant areas. This position would also prove useful in District Station office management.

Homeless Outreach

Homeless Outreach Officers at the District Stations handle homeless-related calls in the district. SFPD's centralized HSOC unit addresses large-scale issues such as working with other City agencies on encampment response whereas the Homeless Outreach Officers at the stations address localized smaller-scale homeless issues. Homeless Outreach Officers are aware of resources for individuals experiencing homelessness, mental health and/or substance use issues, and are familiar with the unsheltered population in their respective district. District Station staffing shortages have impacted Homeless Outreach staffing: many Stations are unable to field Homeless Outreach officers given resource availability. Homeless Outreach Officer staffing is determined using the fixed post methodology such that there are two to four Homeless Outreach Officers at each District Station, based on the size of and homeless population in the district. Recommended staffing is based on coverage across the week.

Other Assignments

District Stations may have other assignments relevant to the respective district such as Park Car – Officers that patrol Golden Gate Park – and Transbay Joint Powers Agreement (TJPA) Officers. These assignments are elective and at the discretion of the District Station Captain (except for TJPA, which is a funded agreement with the Transbay Terminal and is staffed based on the levels determined in the agreement).

FOB Patrol – Current Trends

Citywide full duty staffing has been declining steadily since the beginning of 2019. The primary indicator that the Department uses to monitor and assess staffing levels is the number of citywide full duty sworn. This figure represents currently deployable members who are not on some type of medical, family, or disciplinary leave; are not recruits in the Academy; and who hold an assignment in the city (rather than the Airport). Due to various factors that are described in detail in the Staffing Context section, this number declined 7% from January 2019 to September 2021 (from 1,868 to 1,742). The Field Operations Bureau includes 70% of the Department's sworn full duty workforce in the city and is the largest Bureau in the Department. Declining citywide staffing levels have significant operational impacts on the Field Operations Bureau.

District Station staffing is declining in tandem with citywide staffing. First and foremost, the Department must always staff police officers at the District Stations, which provide critical law enforcement services at a hyper-localized level. As staffing levels decline, the Department has continued to prioritize District Station staffing, and in particular, Sector Patrol staffing. As discussed in the Staffing Context section, the number of full duty police officers at the stations has declined in tandem with the citywide full duty staffing, down 3% from January 2019 through September 2021.

The Field Operations Bureau and the District Stations have had to make difficult resource allocation decisions amidst staffing shortages. Sector Patrol officers respond to calls for service from the public, fulfilling the critical mission of the Department: to arrive on-scene when community members request law enforcement services. As staffing levels decline, each District Station, with overall direction from the Field Operations Bureau, has had to make difficult decisions about how to allocate resources amongst competing unit assignments after striving to staff Sector Patrol adequately.

Traditionally, District Station assignments have included Sector Patrol, Foot/Bike Beat, Housing, Homeless Outreach, Plainclothes and Captain's Staff. Staffing shortages at the District Stations have become particularly dire. Sector Patrol staffing is the priority and many other assignments have either been eliminated or are operating at reduced capacity and with concurrent job duties (e.g., Housing officers often get detailed to events or to pulled to assist with other district activity). At some of the smaller District Stations, many of the specialized units have been disbanded due to staffing availability.

Recommended Staffing by Division and Unit

Administration

Operations

The Operations branch of the Department includes the Field Operations Bureau, the Investigations Bureau, and the Special Operations Bureau. Operations is overseen by an Assistant Chief of Police who is supported by an Executive Secretary. Staffing for this leadership position and supporting position are determined using the non-scaling methodology.

SFPD Operations						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Assistant Chief	1	1	0			
Executive Secretary				1	1	0

Field Operations Bureau

The Field Operations Bureau is overseen by a Deputy Chief with two Commanders managing field operations. One Commander oversees the Metro Division and select units centralized in FOB and the other Commander oversees the Golden Gate Division and another set of centralized FOB units. The Deputy Chief is supported by an Executive Assistant and the two Commanders are supported by a Senior Clerk. There is a third Commander in FOB that heads the Community Engagement Division and is therefore included in the CED section. All leadership and executive support positions are non-scalable.

Field Operations - Administration						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Administration	3	3	0	2	2	0
Deputy Chief	1	1	0			
Commander	2	2	0			
Executive Secretary				1	1	0
Senior Clerk				1	1	0

FOB Patrol – Metro Division

Metro Division District Stations are generally larger in personnel than those in the Golden Gate Division. These districts are the downtown core of San Francisco, representing relatively small geographic areas that are densely populated and heavily visited. These District Stations situated in the urban city center of San Francisco experience significant calls for service (CFS) volume.

Metro Division: Recommended Staffing by District Station

Metro Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Co. A - Central Station	145	180	+35	7	8	+1
Co. B - Southern Station	133	176	+43	5	6	+1
Co. D - Mission Station	145	181	+36	8	9	+1
Co. E - Northern Station	138	180	+42	6	7	+1
Co. J - Tenderloin Station	131	143	+12	5	6	+1
DIVISION TOTAL	692	860	+168	31	36	+5

Summary and Trends

- **The vast majority of the staffing need identified for the Metro Division is in Sector Patrol.** The results of the workload-based calls for service (CFS) analysis indicate that District Stations in the Metro Division require significant additional Sector Patrol officers to handle the calls for service workload while retaining sufficient time for community engagement. The number of additional Sector Patrol officers needed is greater in the Metro Division compared to the Golden Gate Division due to the higher volume of calls for service across Metro Division District Stations.
- **While additional resources are needed in the specialized units to ensure that they are fully staffed at each station, the Metro Division stations generally possess the staffing to consistently fill *prioritized* specialized unit assignments.** For example, through the City's Mid-Market Vibrancy and Safety Plan and due to prioritized deployments in Union Square and in the Tenderloin, the Department has prioritized, on a citywide level, Foot/Bike Beat deployment in the central/north central areas of San Francisco.
- **The Metro Division District Stations have a large volume of events such as First Amendment demonstrations and parades and the Captain's Staff assignment should be staffed accordingly.** The Project Team recommends that in the Metro Division District Stations, the Captain's Staff assignment be staffed with one Sergeant, two Officers, and one Management Assistant, with support from PSAs. The Sergeant oversees event planning. The addition of a Management Assistant to the Captain's Staff would reallocate some of the administrative and technical tasks to a civilian staff classification best suited for these job duties while retaining sworn members to execute tasks such as permitting and event planning where their sworn expertise and jurisdiction is necessary.

Co. A – Central Station

Co. A - Central Station						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Captain's Staff	6	4	(2)	7	8	+1
Captain	1	1	0			
Sergeant	1	1	0			
Officer	4	2	(2)			
Senior Clerk				1	1	0
Management Assistant				0	1	+1
PSA				6	6	0
Sector Patrol	102	139	+37			
Lieutenant	4	4	0			
Sergeant	15	19	+4			
Officer	83	116	+33			
Specialized Units	37	37	0			
Sergeant	2	2	0			
Officer (Foot/Bike Beat)	19	19	0			
Officer (Homeless Outreach)	4	4	0			
Officer (Housing)	4	4	0			
Officer (Plainclothes)	6	6	0			
Officer (Port)	2	2	0			
STATION TOTAL	145	180	+35	7	8	+1

Staffing Notes and Considerations

- **The vast majority of Central Station's staffing need is in Sector Patrol.** Based on the calls for service (CFS) workload-based methodology, Central Station needs 37 additional Sector Patrol Officers and Patrol Sergeant supervisors.
- **Central Station has heavily prioritized Foot/Bike Beat staffing.** The district has four beats, ranging from Fisherman's Wharf, to Chinatown, to North Beach, to Union Square, and given recent trends in retail theft, targeted theft and violence toward the Asian American Pacific Islander (AAPI) community, and auto break-ins and burglaries targeting tourists, these beats are fully staffed. Central Station has beat areas that have been prioritized in the Tourism Deployment Plan. Since September 2021, the Department received directive from the City to increase deployments in Union Square and is doing so primarily on overtime.

Co. B – Southern Station

Co. B - Southern Station						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Captain's Staff	4	4	0	5	6	+1
Captain	1	1	0			
Sergeant	1	1	0			
Officer	2	2	0			
Senior Clerk				1	1	0
Management Assistant				0	1	+1
PSA				4	4	0
Sector Patrol	107	146	+39			
Lieutenant	4	4	0			
Sergeant	16	20	+4			
Officer	87	122	+35			
Specialized Units	22	26	+4			
Sergeant	1	1	0			
Officer (Foot/Bike Beat)	5	7	+2			
Officer (Homeless Outreach)	8	8	0			
Officer (Plainclothes)	4	6	+2			
Officer (TJPA)	4	4	0			
STATION TOTAL	133	176	+43	5	6	+1

Staffing Notes and Considerations

- The vast majority of Southern Station's staffing need is in Sector Patrol. Based on workload-based methodology using calls for service, Southern Station needs 39 additional Sector Patrol Officers and Patrol Sergeant supervisors.
- Given the unique needs of the district, Southern Station has heavily prioritized staffing Homeless Outreach officers within the specialized units.
- Southern Station staffs the Transbay Terminal with officers that function generally as Foot/Bike Beat officers in this area. There are four beats including the Transbay terminal. To fully staff the other three, the Project Team recommends two additional Officers.

Co. D – Mission Station

Co. D - Mission Station						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Captain's Staff	6	4	(2)	8	9	+1
Captain	1	1	0			
Sergeant	1	1	0			
Officer	4	2	(2)			
Senior Clerk				1	1	0
Management Assistant				0	1	+1
PSA				7	7	0
Sector Patrol	113	144	+31			
Lieutenant	4	4	0			
Sergeant	13	20	+7			
Officer	96	120	+24			
Specialized Units	26	33	+7			
Sergeant	2	2	0			
Officer (Foot/Bike Beat)	11	12	+1			
Officer (Housing)	7	7	0			
Officer (Homeless Outreach)	6	6	0			
Officer (Plainclothes)	0	6	+6			
STATION TOTAL	145	181	+36	8	9	+1

Staffing Notes and Considerations

- **The vast majority of Mission Station's staffing need is in Sector Patrol.** Based on workload-based methodology using calls for service, Southern Station needs 31 additional Sector Patrol Officers and Patrol Sergeant supervisors.
- **Mission Station needs additional resources to staff specialized units.** Mission Station has no Plainclothes team according to the September 2021 signup, and would benefit from a district problem-solving team given the unique demands of the district.
- **Mission Station is one District Station that may benefit from a more innovative approach to Foot/Bike Beat staffing.** There are specific geographic areas within the district that may warrant fixed post positions or saturation from additional resources given the prevalence of crime incidents (e.g., narcotics). The Department should determine a strategy for addressing these unique locations throughout the city. Any fixed post response would be resource intensive and would require additional officers beyond the figures shown above.

Co. E – Northern Station

Co. E - Northern Station						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Captain's Staff	6	4	(2)	6	7	+1
Captain	1	1	0			
Sergeant	1	1	0			
Officer	4	2	(2)			
Senior Clerk				1	1	0
Management Assistant				0	1	+1
PSA				5	5	0
Sector Patrol	102	144	+42			
Lieutenant	4	4	0			
Sergeant	16	20	+4			
Officer	82	120	+38			
Specialized Units	30	32	+2			
Sergeant	1	1	0			
Officer (Foot/Bike Beat)	15	15	0			
Officer (Housing)	6	6	0			
Officer (Homeless Outreach)	3	4	+1			
Officer (Plainclothes)	5	6	+1			
STATION TOTAL	138	180	+42	6	7	+1

Staffing Notes and Considerations

- **The vast majority of Northern Station's staffing need is in Sector Patrol.** Based on workload-based methodology using calls for service, Northern Station needs 42 additional Sector Patrol Officers and Patrol Sergeant supervisors.
- **Northern Station has heavily prioritized Foot/Bike Beat staffing.** The district has six beats, ranging from Union Street, to Japantown and the Fillmore, to Hayes Valley, to City Hall, and these beats have coverage most days of the week. Northern Station has beat areas in which staffing has been prioritized via citywide initiatives such as the Tourism Deployment Plan and Union Square deployment and staffing for those initiatives is not included in this analysis.

Co. J - Tenderloin Station

Co. J - Tenderloin Station						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Captain's Staff	4	4	0	5	6	+1
Captain	1	1	0			
Sergeant	1	1	0			
Officer	2	2	0			
Senior Clerk				1	1	0
Management Assistant				0	1	+1
PSA				4	4	0
Sector Patrol	98	96	(2)			
Lieutenant	4	4	0			
Sergeant	15	14	(1)			
Officer	79	78	(1)			
Specialized Units	29	43	+14			
Lieutenant	1	1	0			
Sergeant	2	2	0			
Officer (Foot/Bike Beat)	25	35	+10			
Officer (Homeless Outreach)	0	4	+4			
Park Car/Shoplifting Car	1	1	0			
STATION TOTAL	131	143	+12	5	6	+1

Staffing Notes and Considerations

- Using the calls for service (CFS) workload-based methodology, Tenderloin Station does not need additional Sector Patrol officers at this time; however, this methodology does not account for factors that impact the Tenderloin specifically. A CFS-based methodology inherently prioritizes responding to community-generated calls for service over other methods of police work, such as self-initiated activity, that is likely more prevalent in the Tenderloin district. In fact, the Controller's Office conducted a workload-based CFS analysis in 2018 and similarly found that Tenderloin Station was adequately staffed with sector patrol officers, yet the Controller also noted that the Tenderloin may be subject to additional staffing considerations above and beyond responding to calls for service given the unique nature of the district. Moreover, Patrol Sergeant staffing differs slightly from the ratio-based methodology result in order to ensure operational coverage in Sector Patrol street-level supervision.
- On a citywide level, Foot/Bike Beat officers have been significantly prioritized in the mid-Market Street area due to the Mid-Market Vibrancy and Safety Plan. In May 2021, Mayor London Breed announced the Plan, "which is aimed at creating a safer and more welcoming environment in the Mid-Market and Tenderloin area. The plan includes both a visible increase in police presence to deter criminal activity and a community ambassador program to connect people in need with services, and provide a welcoming presence for residents, workers, visitors, and businesses."² Effective in May 2021, SFPD increased law enforcement in the area, which spans roughly "every block of the area from Powell Station (5th Street) to 8th Street on Market Street and adjacent areas just south of Market Street, UN Plaza, and the Tenderloin blocks bordered by Larkin Street

² Mayor's News Release on the Mid-Market Vibrancy and Safety Plan: <https://sfmayor.org/article/mayor-london-breed-announces-mid-market-vibrancy-and-safety-plan>.

and Eddy Street.” SFPD’s role in the Mid-Market Vibrancy and Safety Plan embodies the strategies discussed in the Department’s Community Policing Strategic Plan, such as interacting visibly with residents, businesses, and visitors; helping to connect individuals in need with appropriate services; and working collaboratively with other entities such as the community ambassadors to problem-solve.

- **SFPD’s increased deployment is in the Mid-Market, UN Plaza and Tenderloin areas.** There are 11 footbeat areas plus two floating areas and a roving shoplifting car; core beats are staffed consistently but others are staffed when possible, often on overtime. The additional foot/bike beat officers recommended represent the scenario in which all beats are staffed consistently, if the City and the Department determine that a visible increase in police presence in the mid-Market and Tenderloin area remains a priority. Staffing need does not consider the additional resources needed to fulfill Mayor London Breed’s proposed emergency declaration for the Tenderloin district.
- Tenderloin Station does not have a Plainclothes team because SFPD’s Narcotics investigative unit is focused in the Tenderloin area.
- According to the September 2021 signup, Tenderloin Station does not have a Homeless Outreach team. The Project Team recommends four Homeless Outreach officers, two on each side of the watch.

FOB Patrol – Golden Gate Division

Golden Gate Division District Stations are generally smaller in personnel than those in the Metro Division. These districts represent the outlying areas of San Francisco rather than the city center/downtown areas and represent relatively large geographic areas of the City in the west and the south.

Golden Gate Division: Recommended Staffing by District Station

Golden Gate Division						
	<i>SWORN</i>			<i>CIVILIAN</i>		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Co. C - Bayview Station	135	153	+18	6	7	+1
Co. F - Park Station	82	88	+6	5	6	+1
Co. G - Richmond Station	82	98	+16	5	6	+1
Co. H - Ingleside Station	116	155	+39	5	6	+1
Co. I - Taraval Station	96	118	+22	5	6	+1
DIVISION TOTAL	511	612	+101	26	31	+5

Summary and Trends

- **The majority of the staffing need identified for the Golden Gate Division is in Sector Patrol.** The results of the workload-based calls for service (CFS) analysis indicate that District Stations in the Golden Gate Division require additional Sector Patrol officers to handle the calls for service workload while retaining sufficient time for community engagement. However, the volume of need is not as great as for those District Stations in the Metro Division. This is due to the fact that the Metro Division stations have a higher volume of calls for service.
- **Given limited resources, District Stations in the Golden Gate Division have generally prioritized Sector Patrol and are hence running limited specialized units.** Given that the Golden Gate Division District Stations have smaller sworn workforces than those in the Metro Division, prioritizing Sector Patrol means that there are fewer officers available to staff specialized units. For example, most Golden Gate Division District Stations do not have the personnel to consistently staff their designated footbeat areas throughout the week. Generally, these District Stations are staffing the one to two specialized units that are most relevant and responsive to the unique needs of the respective district and doing without the other specialized unit assignments.
- **Generally, District Stations in the Golden Gate Division do not experience the same volume of events as those District Stations in the Metro Division and Captain's Staff should be staffed accordingly.** Aside from some major events in Golden Gate Park, these District Stations do not see the same volume of First Amendment events, parades, etc. as those in the Metro Division. The Project Team recommends that the Captain's Staff assignment be staffed with two Officers and one Management Assistant with support from PSAs. As these District Stations are generally less busy, with less walk up traffic, than those in the Metro Division, Golden Gate Division has fewer PSAs than the Metro Division. The addition of a Management Assistant to the Captain's Staff would reallocate some of the administrative and technical tasks to a civilian staff classification best suited for these job duties.

Co. C – Bayview Station

Co. C - Bayview Station						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Captain's Staff	3	3	0	6	7	+1
Captain	1	1	0			
Sergeant	0	0	0			
Officer	2	2	0			
Senior Clerk				1	1	0
Management Assistant				0	1	+1
PSA				5	5	0
Sector Patrol	103	118	+15			
Lieutenant	4	4	0			
Sergeant	13	16	+3			
Officer	86	98	+12			
Specialized Units	29	32	+3			
Sergeant	3	3	0			
Officer (Foot/Bike Beat)	7	8	+1			
Officer (Homeless Outreach)	1	1	0			
Officer (Housing)	12	12	0			
Officer (Plainclothes)	5	7	+2			
Officer (Cars)	1	1	0			
STATION TOTAL	135	153	+18	6	7	+1

Staffing Notes and Considerations

- The vast majority of Bayview Station's staffing need is in Sector Patrol. Based on workload-based methodology using calls for service, Bayview Station needs 15 additional Sector Patrol officers and Patrol Sergeant supervisors.
- Bayview Station currently has staffing distributed across all station specialized units; however, further prioritizing any specific specialized unit will require additional resources. For example, Bayview Station has only three beats. If additional beat areas are determined necessary, Bayview will require additional foot/bike beat officers to staff these areas.
- Bayview Station has one officer devoted to searching for and towing abandoned cars throughout the district.

Co. F – Park Station

Co. F - Park Station						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Captain's Staff	5	3	(2)	5	6	1
Captain	1	1	0			
Sergeant	0	0	0			
Officer	4	2	(2)			
Senior Clerk				1	1	0
Management Assistant				0	1	1
PSA				4	4	0
Sector Patrol	71	68	(3)			
Lieutenant	4	4	0			
Sergeant	12	12	0			
Officer	55	52	(3)			
Specialized Units	6	17	+11			
Sergeant	0	1	+1			
Officer (Foot/Bike Beat)	4	8	+4			
Officer (Park Car)	2	2	0			
Officer (Homeless Outreach)	0	2	+2			
Officer (Plainclothes)	0	4	+4			
STATION TOTAL	82	88	+6	5	6	+1

Staffing Notes and Considerations

- The calls for service workload-based methodology indicates that Park Station needs a reduction in Sector Patrol Officers; however, the calculated number does not provide adequate coverage to staff both sides of the watch, all shifts, and all of the district's car sectors. Therefore, the Project Team has determined the number of Sector Patrol Officers that are operationally viable. The calls for service analysis does not account for the reality of operational coverage. Similarly, Patrol Sergeant staffing differs slightly from the ratio-based span of control result. The designated number is the minimum needed for operational coverage and to provide sufficient street-level supervision.
- Park Station has four beats, three of which are not currently staffed due to staffing availability. Additional Foot/Bike Beat officers would enable Park Station to staff all four areas consistently.
- Park Station has no Plainclothes team. Four Officers and one Sergeant are recommended based on the ratio-based methodology based on Sector Patrol Officer numbers and the span of control needed to field a Plainclothes team.
- Park Station has no Homeless Outreach team. The Project Team recommends two Officers, one on each side of the watch, to ensure that this important position is consistently staffed.

Co. G – Richmond Station

Co. G - Richmond Station						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Captain's Staff	4	3	(1)	5	6	+1
Captain	1	1	0			
Sergeant	0	0	0			
Officer	3	2	(1)			
Senior Clerk				1	1	0
Management Assistant				0	1	+1
PSA				4	4	0
Sector Patrol	70	80	+10			
Lieutenant	4	4	0			
Sergeant	14	14	0			
Officer	52	62	+10			
4	8	15	+7			
Sergeant	0	1	+1			
Officer (Foot/Bike Beat)	4	6	+2			
Officer (Homeless Outreach)	4	4	0			
Officer (Plainclothes)	0	4	+4			
STATION TOTAL	82	98	+16	5	6	+1

Staffing Notes and Considerations

- **The majority of Richmond Station's staffing need is in Sector Patrol.** Based on workload-based methodology using calls for service, Richmond Station needs 10 additional Sector Patrol Officers. With this number of Sector Patrol Officers, Patrol Sergeant staffing is based on minimum coverage required to ensure adequate supervision across all watches and shifts rather than on span of control.
- **Richmond Station currently operates a significant number of one-person units.** The Project Team's call sign analysis indicates that only 49.5% of Richmond Station's Sector Patrol units are two-person, leaving 50.5% to be operated by one-person. This finding is also aligned with the information gained during interviews with Richmond Station supervisory personnel. Though this may be sufficient operationally in some areas and on some shifts, operating this proportion of one-person units deviates significantly from the Department's policy of staffing Sector Patrol units with two Officers. Additional Sector Patrol resources would ensure that Richmond Station is able run more two-person units, promoting officer safety and accountability.
- **Richmond Station could use some additional resources in specialized unit assignments.** Richmond Station has three beats that are subject to staffing availability and no Plainclothes team. Using the ratio-based methodology, the Project Team recommends the addition of one Sergeant and four Officers to staff a Plainclothes team in the district.

Co. H - Ingleside Station

Co. H - Ingleside Station						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Captain's Staff	6	5	(1)	5	6	+1
Captain	1	1	0			
Sergeant	1	1	0			
Officer	4	3	(1)			
Senior Clerk				1	1	0
Management Assistant				0	1	+1
PSA				4	4	0
Sector Patrol	100	128	+28			
Lieutenant	4	4	0			
Sergeant	11	18	+7			
Officer	85	106	+21			
Specialized Units	10	22	+12			
Sergeant	1	1	0			
Officer (Foot/Bike Beat)	0	6	+6			
Officer (Housing)	5	6	+1			
Officer (Homeless Outreach)	0	2	+2			
Officer (Plainclothes)	4	7	+3			
STATION TOTAL	116	155	+39	5	6	+1

Staffing Notes and Considerations

- The majority of Ingleside Station's staffing need is in Sector Patrol. Based on workload-based methodology using calls for service, Ingleside Station needs 28 additional Sector Patrol Officers and Patrol Sergeant supervisors.
- With limited resources, Ingleside Station has prioritized Sector Patrol and hence does not have staffing available for specialized units such as Foot/Bike Patrol. Within specialized units, Ingleside Station has prioritized the Housing Unit and is also staffing a limited Plainclothes team. Ingleside Station has three beats but at this time does not have a Foot/Bike Beat team and hence does not staff any of the district beats consistently. Ingleside Station also does not currently have a Homeless Outreach team and two Officers are recommended to cover this assignment.

Co. I – Taraval Station

Co. I - Taraval Station						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Captain's Staff	3	3	0	5	6	+1
Captain	1	1	0			
Sergeant	0	0	0			
Officer	2	2	0			
Senior Clerk				1	1	0
Management Assistant				0	1	+1
PSA				4	4	0
Sector Patrol	86	100	+14			
Lieutenant	4	4	0			
Sergeant	12	14	+2			
Officer	70	82	+12			
Specialized Units	7	15	+8			
Sergeant	0	1	+1			
Officer (Foot/Bike Beat)	0	6	+6			
Officer (Homeless Outreach)	2	2	0			
Officer (Plainclothes)	5	6	+1			
STATION TOTAL	96	118	+22	5	6	+1

Staffing Notes and Considerations

- **The majority of Taraval Station's staffing need is in Sector Patrol.** Based on workload-based methodology using calls for service, Taraval Station needs 14 additional Sector Patrol Officers and Patrol Sergeant supervisors.
- **Taraval Station needs additional resources to ensure that all specialized units are staffed.** Taraval Station is currently operating a Plainclothes team and a limited Homeless Outreach team; however, the staffing assignments received by the Project Team indicate that Taraval Station does not have any officers assigned to Foot/Bike Patrol. Taraval Station has three beats and additional resources would ensure that these three beats are consistently staffed with Foot/Bike Beat officers.

FOB – Other Units

The Field Operations Bureau includes additional units that provide centralized support in functions such as event planning, licensing and permitting, the City’s Healthy Streets Operations Center (HSOC) initiative, and community engagement. Recommended staffing is shown below and the following sections describe the duties, responsibilities, and staffing metrics for each unit.

Field Operations - Other Units						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Administration	3	3	0	2	2	0
FOB-HQ	22	19	(3)	1	2	+1
Alcohol Liaison Unit (ALU) and Permits	4	4	0	3	5	+2
Crisis Intervention Team (CIT)	5	5	0	0	0	0
Healthy Streets Operations Center (HSOC)	9	9	0	0	0	0
Community Engagement Division (CED)	16	15	(1)	4	5	+1
FOB - OTHER UNITS TOTAL	59	55	(4)	10	14	+4

Police Headquarters (FOB-HQ)

The Field Operations Bureau (FOB) includes specific units located at Police Headquarters that provide centralized operational support to the Bureau in areas such as creating staffing plans for City events such as protests, parades, and street fairs; managing contracts with vendors who wish to hire off duty personnel to work in uniform; and coordination of the Department’s Cadet program. Centralized FOB also manages staffing plan development, and sign-ups for the District Stations that occur twice annually. FOB provides general staffing guidelines and direction to the District Stations. FOB-HQ units are often tasked with special projects such as re-writing Department General Orders (DGOs) and working on initiatives related to calls for service. This section includes an overview of the services provided by FOB-HQ and recommended staffing. Assignments and sub-unit responsibilities shift amongst personnel based on Department priorities.

10B [Overtime] Police Law Enforcement Services (PLES)

The Police Law Enforcement Services (PLES) program allows outside vendors, such as Apple, Salesforce and Walgreens, to hire off duty police officers in full uniform to provide law enforcement services. The program has expanded dramatically over the past five years: in 2015, the Department recorded 105,000 billable hours, and in 2019, 200,000 billable hours (a 90% increase). The demand for vendor-sought law enforcement services is increasing and there is not sufficient staffing – off duty personnel available to work overtime – to fill the volume of requests that are received.

The unit provides scheduling, billing, and payroll for 200+ vendors per year. Coordination and communication with vendors represents the workload for the unit: emails, calls, and notifications come in at all hours and unit staff is responsible for filling, canceling, or changing shifts based on vendor requests. Two part-time retired officers work twice per week doing payroll, which consists of entering several hundred overtime cards into the Department’s Human Resources Management System (HRMS).

10B Retail/Plainclothes

To enhance customer service to retail vendors who engage with the PLES program, the Department recently created a sub-unit to manage vendor relations. Given recent trends in retail theft, requests for law enforcement services from retail vendors have increased, and the role of this sub-unit is to interface directly with retail vendors. This sub-unit is also working on re-developing the District Station Plainclothes assignment, including establishing the role and responsibilities of this unit at the District Stations and working with the District Stations to implement the re-envisioned unit. This sub-unit includes a Lieutenant and a Sergeant, positions that are not scalable to workload or other metrics. The Lieutenant serves as the centralized Officer in Charge (OIC) for the District Station Plainclothes units and also oversees the Department's 10B PLES program.

Events

The Events unit assists with staffing, guidance, and logistics with special events for all 10 District Stations. There are hundreds of First Amendment events (e.g., demonstrations) each year, in addition to scheduled parades, street fairs, and other events throughout the City. The Events unit is responsible for determining staffing plans for large citywide events, and for assisting the District Stations manage events in their district. At this time, there are no workload metrics for the unit and staffing is determined using the non-scaling methodology. The Project Team recommends that the unit track metrics such as the number of different types of events, and the preparation time for each type of event, to be used in future analyses.

Cadet Program

The Cadet program oversees all of the Police Cadets in the Department. This unit is responsible for training 18-22 year olds in departmental procedures, while utilizing them for various tasks at all District Stations and in other Bureaus. Most of the Cadets are continuing with a college education, and this is a paid position for them in which they gain clerical and logistical skills. Two sworn members – a Sergeant and an Officer – oversee the Cadets in the program. It is important to maintain sworn supervision and presence in this unit, as Cadets are gaining direct law enforcement experience.

Hospital Watch Patrol Special

This position is responsible for coordinating “on-duty” and overtime scheduling to watch prisoners who are not accepted into County Jail for medical reasons, as the Department is obligated to watch prisoners until they are booked. There are usually two to four hospital watches per week, and over \$1,000,000 in overtime spent annually on hospital watches. As discussed below, the Project Team recommends consolidating this function, which is conducted by a single position, with another unit in FOB-HQ.

Report Writing Unit

This unit takes “cold” reports from citizens after being transferred from dispatch. The unit was reconvened during the initial phase of Covid-19 to avoid exposure. The Department of Emergency Management has a set of criteria for dispatching calls to the Report Writing Unit. There are seven to eight individuals taking reports between the hours of 8:00am and 5:00pm, which results in approximately 15-20 reports per day. This unit is staffed by individuals who are on temporary modified duty (TMD); one challenge is that there is no permanent staffing and significant turnover. The Department should explore

if this unit could be staffed by Police Services Aides (PSAs) or professional staff; however, in the near-term, this role is productive for those sworn members who are temporarily able to perform other job duties, and the Department must determine other assignments for these members. This unit can be responsive to the public while enabling full duty officers to handle more serious calls for service.

Housing Liaison

The officer in this position is responsible for coordinating activities across public housing locations throughout the city, and attending meetings and community events. As discussed below, the Project Team recommends consolidating this position.

Night Captains

The Captains assigned to this role provide Captain-level supervisory duties to all District Stations throughout the city during the nighttime shift, when the regular District Station Captains are off duty.

Recommended staffing for FOB-HQ is shown below.

FOB - Police Headquarters						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Administration	1	1	0	1	1	0
Lieutenant	1	1	0			
Clerk				1	1	0
10B/Retail/Plainclothes	5	4	(1)	0	1	+1
Lieutenant	1	1				
Sergeant	2	2	0			
Officer	2	1	(1)			
Management Assistant				0	1	
Events	2	2	0			
Sergeant	1	1	0			
Officer	1	1	0			
Cadet Program	2	2	0			
Sergeant	1	1	0			
Officer	1	1	0			
Hospital Watch	1	0	(1)			
Officer	1	0	(1)			
Report Writing Unit	7	7	0			
Sergeant	2	2	0			
Officer	5	5	0			
Housing Liaison	1	0	(1)			
Officer	1	0	(1)			
Night Captains	3	3	0			
Captain	3	3	0			
FOB-HQ TOTAL	22	19	(3)	1	2	+1

Recommendations and Considerations

- With the recent formation of the 10B Retail/Plainclothes sub-unit within 10B PLES, it may be possible for the duties of the Hospital Watch Patrol Special and the Housing Liaison Officer to be consolidated within 10B Retail/Plainclothes. In developing and supervising the District Station

Plainclothes assignment, the Lieutenant and Sergeant in 10B Retail/Plainclothes would have significant contact with the District Stations in a centralized role. Given that the Housing Liaison position requires coordination at a citywide level, amongst the District Stations and external stakeholders alike, the Department should look into whether the responsibilities of this position, as well as those of the Hospital Watch Patrol Special Officer, could be incorporated into the newly formed 10B Retail/Plainclothes sub-unit. Moreover, given that all of the relevant District Stations have Housing Units, there is not sufficient volume of work to warrant a full-time Housing Liaison.

- **The Department should consider formalizing and expanding the Report Writing Unit, and staffing the unit with professional staff or Police Services Aides (PSAs).** A unit made up of professional staff and/or PSAs would have more continuity than sworn personnel on temporary modified duty (TMD) and would hence be better equipped to operate efficiently, provide excellent customer service, and utilize skills more appropriate to non-sworn classifications. This would serve to provide high-quality service to the public while also ideally removing workload from sworn members in the field. This is directly aligned with the Department's Strategic Goal of being responsive to the community in an innovative way.

Alcohol Liaison Unit (ALU) and Permits

The Alcohol Liaison Unit (ALU) is responsible for processing permit applications, which includes background checks on applicants and field inspections of permitted locations. The unit processes approximately 20-30 applications per month. The unit receives a license application from Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC) and conducts an investigation for the specific location, including running statistics like saturation and complaints, and then has 30 days to make a recommendation to ABC about how to proceed. The unit is also involved in any public hearings that occur; if licensee rejects terms, they can go before the Board of Supervisors (BOS).

The unit conducts enforcement on active license of which there are currently 4,495 Alcoholic Beverage Control licenses in San Francisco. The unit works with ABC on decoy programs and enforcement at venues during big City events. The sworn members in the unit are responsible for these decoy and enforcement efforts and the unit also enlists additional sworn personnel to assist with these efforts.

Previously, ALU and Permits were separate units but are currently merged into one unit. The unit handles approximately 40 types of permit applications for San Francisco businesses, including commercial parking lots, parking garages, tow operators, and secondhand dealers. For these types of applications, the business pays an application fee and the unit conducts background checks and an investigation. More work is often required for permits because an applicant submits an application and undergoes an intake process with the clerk, and depending on the type of permit, referrals may need to go out to other City agencies and/or District Stations. The unit processes over 800 permit applications per year, including both new applications and renewals. There is a six-week window for this process, as 95% of permits have to have a hearing. Hearings occur every Wednesday, during which the public can comment. The unit is unable to approve or deny permits until referrals are approved by all stakeholders and agencies. The unit is a year and a half behind in processing applications. The permit intake process as well as the background

check process is by appointment only, which creates challenges with scheduling and processing applicants.

Ideally, the unit would also provide enforcement services, which would include going out and checking on locations to make sure they are abiding by the regulations stipulated on permits. However, the unit is unable to currently do this based on the significant permit backlog and staffing levels.

The Sergeant in the unit supervises the Officers and the professional staff, and investigates matters pertaining to licensing or premises. The unit also has a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and work order agreement with the Department of Public Health (DPH) to conduct tobacco decoy operations, and the Sergeant is responsible for this work, as well as investigating complaints and collaborating with other City agencies. The Officers in the unit are responsible for investigating all matters regarding ABC licensing. The Management Assistant primarily handles the ALU side, maintaining reports, managing professional staff, and conducting data entry. The unit Clerks assist with daily duties including answering the phones, assisting applicants during the intake process, and coordinating with other City agencies (e.g., communicating with the Treasurer and Tax Collector on applicant information). Recommended staffing for ALU and Permits is provided below.

Alcohol Liaison Unit (ALU) and Permits						
	<i>SWORN</i>			<i>CIVILIAN</i>		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Sergeant	1	1	0			
Officer	3	3	0			
Management Assistant				1	3	+2
Clerk				2	2	0
ALU/PERMITS TOTAL	4	4	0	3	5	+2

Recommendations and Considerations

- Due to the heavily administrative nature of permit processing in ALU and Permits, the Project Team recommends an additional one to two Management Assistants (or similar classification) to take some of the administrative tasks such as data entry and report maintenance off of the rest of the unit, sworn personnel in particular.
- **Coordinating background checks with the ID Unit is a bottleneck in the current process.** One responsibility of the additional Management Assistant could be to sequence scheduling with these other entities that are critical to the permitting process, and providing customer service to permit applicants. The Department should explore strategies for providing a high level of service to permit applicants.
- **The Project Team recommends that the Department look into whether Police Services Aides (PSAs) or some other classification that may need to be created could assist with some of the duties in the unit.** Sworn members are necessary for decoy operations and enforcement, but there may be some licensing and permit tasks that currently require sworn expertise and authorization that could be transferred over to a professional staff classification with the appropriate skills and jurisdiction.

Crisis Intervention Team (CIT)

The Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) aims to improve police contacts with those individuals experiencing mental health and/or substance use crises by equipping officers with knowledge and providing techniques for reducing risk in the encounters. The Crisis Intervention Team operates a training program that provides comprehensive and relevant CIT training to all police personnel in the Department and responds to incidents in the field, facilitating practical applications of CIT alongside behavioral health professionals.

Training

The CIT Program provides a 40-hour Crisis Intervention Certification Course to Law Enforcement as well as a 10-hour CIT Field Tactics Course to patrol, both of which are certified by Police Officer Standards and Training (POST). The 40-hour CIT training focuses on crisis intervention and mental health awareness. As of mid-August 2021, approximately 62% of sworn members have received the 40-hour training, with the goal that all sworn members in the Department receive the training. Amidst the Covid-19 pandemic in 2020, the CIT Instructors designed a fully operational digital classroom for the 40-hour training. With this strong core of crisis intervention training, patrol has a wealth of capable and invested officers who are committed to the practices and principles of crisis intervention. The 10-hour CIT training – “Field tactics/CIT Course” – must be completed by all members assigned to patrol, investigative, and administrative units. As of December 2020, 99% of all sworn members have received 10-hour CIT training (only those on leave have not been trained).

Response – Partnership with Department of Public Health (DPH)

The Crisis Intervention Team has a partnership with DPH Comprehensive Crisis Services (CCS). The CIT Field Unit will respond to situations alongside DPH Crisis Specialists to provide supportive assistance when they need to engage higher risk subjects who pose public safety concerns and danger potential.

In this partnership, CIT and CCS work together to effectively assist subjects in crisis, with joint emphasis on scene safety and subject engagement. DPH CCS has an existing infrastructure to provide services and support to subjects who need assistance, and trained CIT officers are able to contribute on-scene support via practical applications of de-escalation, crisis negotiations, and safety protocols.

Response – CIT Liaisons

Department General Order (DGO 5.21) directs all 10 District Stations throughout San Francisco to have designated “CIT Liaisons” who specialize in matters pertaining to Crisis Intervention at their respective Station. The 20+ CIT Liaisons throughout the city act as an auxiliary CIT unit at their respective stations, facilitating CIT training and practices amongst patrol members, and working with the centralized CIT Field Unit to ensure that crisis subjects who are most concerning are identified, engaged, and/or connected effectively with programs and services.

CIT is a Department and City priority and staffing does not scale to workload or other metrics.

Crisis Intervention Team (CIT)						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Lieutenant	1	1	0			
Sergeant	2	2	0			
Officer	2	2	0			
CIT TOTAL	5	5	0	0	0	0

Recommendations and Considerations:

- The City and County of San Francisco is currently initiating various programs to provide assistance and services to individuals in the community who are experiencing mental health and/or substance use crises. Many of these programs are in development or in initial stages of implementation. **The City and the Department should determine the role of SFPD CIT response within these citywide programs and assess staffing need based on how trained law enforcement personnel fit within citywide priorities and San Francisco's vision for addressing crisis response.**

Healthy Streets Operations Center (HSOC)

The Healthy Streets Operations Center (HSOC) aims to address homelessness and unhealthy street behavior via coordination amongst the many City agencies that provide response and assistance to unsheltered persons experiencing homelessness on the streets of San Francisco. HSOC aims to ensure that San Francisco's streets are safe and clean, meet the shelter and service needs of individuals on the streets, and establish a unified City response to homelessness and street behavior. HSOC is structured as a unified command center: representatives from those City departments that have a role in addressing homelessness and street behavior convene in a singular location – the Emergency Operations Center (EOC) – and plan, triage, and coordinate responses to incidents of street behavior and homelessness. SFPD's role in HSOC is to provide representation at the command center and to provide engagement and, if necessary, enforcement, in those incidents where law enforcement presence is warranted.

HSOC – EOC

The City's Emergency Operations Center (EOC) is staffed by one Lieutenant and one Officer. The Lieutenant is the Officer in Charge (OIC) of the entire HSOC unit and also sits at the EOC, serving as the Department liaison and working collaboratively with the other City agencies to problem-solve. As the OIC, the Lieutenant is also responsible for scheduling, ensuring the Sergeant and Officers in the unit are addressing operational issues and completing trainings and all administrative tasks.

HSOC – Field

HSOC – Field is currently staffed with one Sergeant and six Officers. The Sergeant is the street-level supervisor; staffing is determined via a span of control ratio set at 1:6, in line with the rest of the patrol functions in the Department. Field Officers often work citywide and are generally responsible for addressing large-scale, citywide homelessness issues. HSOC Officers have the best knowledge of

homeless resources as well as established relationships with homeless community. Four of the Officers patrol mainly on Port-authority property and receive subsidized salaries from the Port. These Officers receive specialized training and are aware of resources for individuals experiencing homeless. One Officer serves as the citywide Vicious and Dangerous Dog specialist, working with Animal Care and Control and conducting investigations, interviews, follow up, and hearings related to any incident involving a vicious and dangerous dog.

SFPD's HSOC staffing has been scaled down dramatically over the past few years due to staffing availability and the City's shifting HSOC priorities. In 2018, when Matrix Consulting Group conducted its analysis, there were 45 sworn members assigned to HSOC, with Matrix recommending an additional five Officers. As of September 2021, SFPD is operating its HSOC presence at the bare minimum. This presents itself as staffing two representatives at the EOC and fielding one citywide response team comprised of a Sergeant and six Officers. Recommended staffing is determined using the non-scaling methodology, as HSOC is a citywide initiative. Current staffing is based on Department resource availability and citywide directive on SFPD's involvement in HSOC at this time.

Healthy Streets Operations Center (HSOC)						
	<i>SWORN</i>			<i>CIVILIAN</i>		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
HSOC-EOC	2	2	0	0	0	0
Lieutenant	1	1	0			
Officer	1	1	0			
HSOC-Field	7	7	0	0	0	0
Sergeant	1	1	0			
Officer	6	6	0			
HSOC TOTAL	9	9	0	0	0	0

Recommendations and Considerations:

- The City and the Department must determine what SFPD's HSOC involvement should look like **going forward**, based on HSOC's mission and vision, on City and Department resource allocation and agency responsibilities, and on the City's overall strategy for addressing unhealthy street behavior in San Francisco. This is necessary to determine staffing levels for HSOC in the future.

Community Engagement Division (CED)

The Community Engagement Division (CED) operates out of Mission Station and runs various programs and initiatives that promote engagement between the Department and citizens and youth in the community. CED is overseen by a Commander with a Lieutenant serving as the Officer in Charge (OIC) to manage day-to-day operations.

CED provides the strategy and framework for continuously developing the Department's relationships with San Francisco's many communities. Members assigned to CED work collaboratively to support the effort of all Stations, Bureaus and assignments in promoting community policing and community engagement policies; implementing Collaborative Reform Initiative (CRI) recommendations and projects; interfacing directly with residents, visitors, and youth; and conducting outreach to disadvantaged communities in San Francisco. **Given that the activities of the Division are driven largely by executive-level policy decisions, there are no specific staffing metrics. All positions in the unit are elective based on the unique roles they serve, and the Division's activities are scaled based on priorities and staff availability.** CED's units and activities are described below.

- **Youth and Community Engagement** includes the Police Activities League (PAL), which runs programs such as the Community Youth Academy, which provides youth instruction on the policing profession; and the youth football league. Youth and Community Engagement also runs a summer youth employment program, the annual holiday toy drive, and a wilderness program for disadvantaged youth.
- CED runs a **Limited English Proficiency (LEP)** program that aims to promote better services for and engagement with limited English speakers in the community. LEP establishes protocols for the Department for providing translation services while in the field, and conducts internal coordination for language training and certification with outside vendors.
- CED facilitates **direct stakeholder engagement** by providing oversight to the District Stations that run each run their own community policing advisory board. CED serves as the centralized conduit for these forums, providing administrative support and guidance in agendas, meeting minutes, and facilitation. CED also operates the Community Police Academy, which is an educational program about how the Department operates and serves as a recruitment tool for the Academy and Reserve Officers. CED also operates the Auxiliary Law Enforcement Response Team (ALERT), in which community members can partake in training to gain basic skills and knowledge in policing protocols so that the Department and the community can work together to coproduce public safety.
- The **Community Liaison Unit (CLU)**, created as a result of crimes against the AAPI community, ensures that all victims are receiving the resources they need. The aim of the unit is to provide guidance on resources and services to all communities throughout the City.

Recommendations and Considerations

- **There is significant opportunity for the development of professional staff positions and functions in the Community Engagement Division.** Until mid-2020, CED had a Manager-level Senior Advisor

who was responsible for organizing, implementing, and executing events and programs in the community; and engaging with citizens and youth via sports leagues and other community functions. There is opportunity for CED to develop this capability in the future. Professional staff members have the ability to interact with members in the community and to strengthen the relationship between the Department and the citizens it serves. The Department should explore opportunities for professional staff in CED and the Manager position recommended should lead strategy development and implementation. To this end, the Project Team recommends replacing the Lieutenant position with a Manager position, as both positions are mid-senior level. Professional staff in this role would be responsible for engaging with the community and also leading high-level CED strategic planning efforts under the direction of the Commander and/or Captain.

Recommended staffing for CED is shown in the table below.

Community Engagement Division (CED)						
	<i>SWORN</i>			<i>CIVILIAN</i>		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Commander	1	1	0			
Captain	1	1	0			
Lieutenant	1	0	(1)			
Sergeant	3	3	0			
Officer	10	10	0			
Manager				0	1	+1
Management Assistant				1	1	0
Senior Administrative Analyst				1	1	0
Police Services Aide				1	1	0
Clerk				1	1	0
DIVISION TOTAL	16	15	(1)	4	5	+1

Investigations Bureau

Overview

The Investigations Bureau includes Divisions and units that are responsible for investigating potentially solvable cases³ for major crimes, general crimes, and person crimes. The Bureau is also responsible for developing and implementing multi-disciplinary proactive investigative work such as coordinating with other state-wide agencies to monitor and respond to regional and national trends in retail theft. The Bureau is constantly evolving in order to be responsive to current crime trends in, for example, shootings, homicides, and narcotics. The Investigations Bureau continuously innovates on how units within each Division work together to problem-solve, interface with the District Stations to address crime at the hyper-localized level, and collaborate with other regional and national agencies in response to increasingly complex organized criminal activity.

Effective September 4th, 2021, the Department reorganized the Investigations Bureau “to better align units to improve communication, solvability, and pool resources” (Department Notice 21-131). The current organizational structure of the Investigations Bureau is shown on the following page.

Recommended Staffing

The Project Team conducted thorough interviews with all investigative units in the Bureau to obtain both qualitative and quantitative data to analyze staffing needs. Using the methodologies developed by Matrix Consulting Group with input and direction from the Staffing Task Force, the Project Team determined recommended staffing levels based on current data and the ever-evolving roles and responsibilities of each unit as the Bureau develops and implements strategies to address current crime trends.

The table below shows recommended staffing for the Investigations Bureau.


Investigations Bureau						
Division or Unit	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Investigations - Admin	3	3	0	6	5	(1)
Strategic Investigations	49	54	+5	2	2	0
Major Crimes	71	83	+12	2	2	0
General Crimes	53	67	+14	8	11	+3
Special Investigations	31	32	+1	1	1	0
Special Victims	47	61	+14	4	4	0
Forensic Services	21	21	0	65	80	+15
Crime Strategies	3	1	(2)	10	31	+21
BUREAU TOTAL	278	322	+44	98	136	+38

³ Matrix Consulting Group also defined cases as those that are potentially solvable in their analysis.

Organizational Chart



Investigations Bureau



Methodologies Used to Determine Staffing

Workload-based Methodology

Most investigative units in the Department consist of a Lieutenant who serves as the Officer in Charge (OIC) of the unit, supervising Sergeant Investigators whose primary responsibility is to investigate assigned cases. Generally, Sergeant Investigators are the predominant classification in each unit. In some units, Officers perform law enforcement functions (e.g., surveillance and video retrieval) that directly contribute to the casework and/or activities of the unit.

Workload Hours

Sergeant Investigator staffing is determined using a workload-based methodology in which the *number of cases assigned* is the significant metric in determining workload. Potentially solvable cases are assigned to an investigator, who then spends time and effort “working” the case. Therefore, an additional key metric in the workload-based methodology used to determine staffing for Investigators is the *time spent* working the case, with utilization rates applied to account for proactive and administrative duties. Workload hours can therefore be represented by the following equation:

$$\text{Workload Hours} = [\text{Number of cases assigned}] \times [\text{Time spent working each case}]$$

Staffing Availability

The calculated amount of time needed for the unit’s Investigators to work the unit’s caseload can be represented by workload hours plus a utilization rate time factor to account for administrative and proactive time. This number of required hours is then assessed against the unit’s staffing levels, which is represented by the net available work hours (NAWH) of the individuals in the unit. The following table shows net available work hours for each Investigator in the unit.

Definition	Explanation	Number of Hours
Max # work hours per year	40 hours/week x 52 weeks/year	2,080
Leave hours	Estimated usage of paid leave (FH, SP, VA)	(270)
Training hours	On duty training allotment per year	(50)
Net Available Work Hours (NAWH)	Time balance available for on-duty work	1,760

Utilization

As described in the Field Operations Bureau – Patrol section, the workload-based methodology must account for proactive and administrative time. Similar to FOB – Patrol, administrative time includes tasks such as reading and signing off on Department Bulletins and other Department email correspondence that is not directly case-related. All investigative units have administrative time in the 10-20% range, which is the industry standard also used by Matrix Consulting Group.

Proactive time varies by unit. Some investigative units, such as Homicide and Special Victims Unit (SVU), follow the “traditional” investigative model: cases are assigned to the unit and subsequently to a lead investigator, who then works independently and with other unit investigators on the various component

tasks that comprise “working” a case. These units have little or no proactive time incorporated into the utilization rates accounted for in determining recommended staffing levels.

Other units similarly investigate assigned cases, but devote significant time to proactive law enforcement functions in their designated area of expertise. One such unit is the Crime Gun Investigations Center (CGIC), which investigates specific gun-related cases but also conducts, for example, surveillance for illegal firearm tracing. These tasks are considered proactive efforts because they may contribute to effective casework in the future. The Project Team used a workload-based methodology based on caseload to determine staffing levels for CGIC, but with a utilization rate that accounts for the proactive investigative efforts required in the unit’s operations.

The following table shows NAWH with a 10% utilization rate to account for administrative time incorporated into the staffing availability calculation.⁴

Definition	Explanation	Number of Hours
Max # work hours per year	40 hours/week x 52 weeks/year	2,080
Leave hours	Estimated usage of paid leave (FH, SP, VA)	(270)
Training hours	On duty training allotment per year	(50)
Net Available Work Hours (NAWH)	Time balance available for on-duty work	1,760
Utilization rate (10% Admin)	On duty time spent on administrative duties	(176)
NAWH (with Utilization Rate)	Time balance available for casework	1,584

The table below shows the figures needed to determine staffing.

Workload Hours		Staffing Availability	Utilization
Workload	Time per Task		
Number of cases per year	Amount of time it takes to work each case	Net available work hours (NAWH), representing staffing hours available after leave and training	% of time spent on Administrative tasks % of time spent on Proactive tasks (e.g., working with other units)

Subsequently, the calculation to determine staffing can be shown with this equation:

$$\frac{\text{Workload Hours}}{\text{Time per Task}} = \text{Number of staff required}$$

NAWH, with utilization rate(s) incorporated

This workload-based methodology is used for almost all investigative units to determine staffing levels for Sergeant Investigators. Again, Sergeant Investigators are the primary personnel in most units in the Investigations Bureau.

⁴ Please note that the example included here is for the Homicide Unit in the Strategic Investigations Division.

Ratio-based Methodology

Span of control is the ratio-based methodology utilized most frequently in determining recommended staffing for the Investigations Bureau and represents industry standard best practices in how many direct reports each supervisory position should oversee.

Non-scaling Methodology

The non-scaling methodology is utilized to determine staffing for those positions that provide the Department with a unique function or capability, such as a leadership position that does not scale based on workload or a role that directly supports a Department initiative or priority.

Some investigative units such as the Community Violence Reduction Team (CVRT) are entirely proactive, with activities directed by City leadership and the Department based on current trends and priorities. A non-scaling methodology is used to determine staffing levels for these units.

Recommended Staffing by Division and Unit

Investigations – Administration

The Investigations Bureau is overseen by a Deputy Chief who reports directly to the Assistant Chief of Operations. A Commander reports directly to the Deputy Chief and oversees the Investigations Divisions: Strategic Investigations, Major Crimes, General Crimes, and the Special Victims Unit. The Investigations Bureau executive team is supported by a Sergeant, an Executive Secretary, and a Clerk. Police Services Aides (PSAs) are assigned to the administrative branch of the Bureau but are shared amongst the units in the Bureau, providing critical support in data entry and analysis and operational case support. One PSA supports the Traffic Collision Investigations Unit (TCIU); TCIU has since been reorganized under the Special Operations Bureau (SOB) and this PSA position is now categorized under SOB, hence the recommended reduction shown in the table below. Given the unique leadership and support roles of these positions, staffing is determined using the non-scaling methodology.

Investigations - Administration						
	<i>SWORN</i>			<i>CIVILIAN</i>		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Administration	3	3	0	6	5	(1)
Deputy Chief	1	1	0			
Commander	1	1	0			
Sergeant	1	1	0			
Clerk				1	1	0
Executive Secretary				1	1	0
Police Services Aide (PSA)				4	3	(1)

Strategic Investigations Division

The Strategic Investigations Division includes the Homicide Unit, the Community Violence Reduction Team (CVRT), and the Crime Gun Investigations Center (CGIC). Strategic Investigations was created in September 2021 to realign Homicide, CVRT, and CGIC together to improve communication and pool resources amidst current trends in gun violence. In 2021, the number of non-fatal shootings as well the number of homicides with a firearm both increased over prior year figures. A Captain oversees the Strategic Investigations Division, a leadership role that is not scalable to any workload measures.

Strategic Investigations Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Administration	1	1	0			
Homicide Unit	16	22	+6	1	1	0
Violence Reduction Team	25	24	(1)	1	1	0
Crime Gun Investigations	7	7	0			
DIVISION TOTAL	49	54	+5	2	2	0

Homicide Unit

The Homicide Unit is responsible for investigating all homicides and deaths that are classified as suspicious by the SF Medical Examiner's office; in-custody deaths, which were previously investigated by SFPD Internal Affairs (IA) and the SF District Attorney's Office; officer-involved shootings (OIS) committed by an external agency, such as the Federal Bureau of Investigations (FBI); and assisting with SFPD OIS investigations. Due to the complex and significant nature of these cases, homicide investigations require extensive investigative work up and time-intensive documentation. One lead Sergeant Investigator is assigned to each homicide case and is generally assisted by one to two other Investigators.

Caseload & Current Trends

Homicide Data, 2018 – 2021					
	2018	2019	2020	2021	2020 vs. 2021
Total Homicides as of Dec 31	46	41	48	56	+17%

Over the past three years, the number of cases has remained relatively constant for the unit; however, the number of homicides increased in 2021. Moreover, the number of tasks per case and the amount of time required has increased slightly due to some key factors. First, the unit has experienced policy and procedural changes that dictate updated guidelines for working with the District Attorney's office. Homicide Investigators are now responsible for scanning all case files and documentation to send to the District Attorney's office, time-consuming tasks that were previously handled by Clerks in the District Attorney's office prior to 2020. Second, Homicide Investigators now collaborate more closely with the Investigators in CVRT and CGIC, particularly in cases of homicide with a firearm; this collaboration is necessary and must be factored into the time that it takes to work a case.

Strategic Investigations Division						
	<i>SWORN</i>			<i>CIVILIAN</i>		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Homicide	16	22	+6	1	1	0
Lieutenant	1	1	0			
Sergeant	14	20	+6			
Officer	1	1	0			
Secretary				1	1	0

Staffing Methodologies by Position

- The Lieutenant position serves as the Officer in Charge (OIC) of the Homicide Unit. Given the unique supervisory duties of the position, staffing is determined using the non-scaling methodology.
- The Sergeant Investigator position is responsible for the core investigative functions of the unit. Staffing is determined using the workload-based methodology based on 48 cases and 655 hours per case (one lead Investigator with others assisting).
- The Officer position is solely responsible for all video retrieval related to all cases assigned to the Homicide Unit. This position also provides support to the District Attorney's office regarding video requests for cases. Given the unique responsibilities of this position, staffing is determined using the non-scaling methodology.
- The Secretary position handles a variety of administrative responsibilities, including but not limited to scheduling, overtime and payroll, case tracking, incident recaps, and unit requests. Given the unique responsibilities of this position, staffing is determined using the non-scaling methodology.

Community Violence Reduction Team (CVRT)

The Community Violence Reduction Team (CVRT) investigates high violence incidents and gang-related crimes in San Francisco communities. CVRT also works closely with state and federal law enforcement in multi-agency efforts to address complex, highly-organized local criminal activities and crime syndicates from abroad. CVRT also works extensively with other units in SFPD, leading the Department's shooting review board with Crime Gun Investigations Center (CGIC) and the Crime Strategies Division to provide weekly enforcement recommendations to the Field Operations Bureau. Significantly, CVRT provides extensive support in gang-related investigations that are led by other SFPD investigative units such as Homicide. These cases are not assigned to CVRT and hence are not reflected in the CVRT caseload.

A significant portion of CVRT's work differs from the "traditional" investigative model in which cases are assigned to a unit and the unit's Investigators workup potentially solvable cases to determine a resolution. Much of CVRT's work is proactive and the unit includes Officers who focus specifically on field surveillance and field investigations, proactively searching for and investigating gang encounters and violent criminal activity based on pre-existing knowledge and research. Given the increasing complexities of organized crime, the Officers in this unit must maintain extensive working knowledge of gang-related dynamics in the city, region, and state via ongoing surveillance of social media websites and attending events such as concerts. Field investigations and field surveillance result in extensive documentation of gang members, gang activity, and any other information gathered. Moreover, CVRT spends a significant amount of time on surveillance and intel support for investigations assigned to other units. Surveillance and intel support are very time consuming, often taking weeks on end to gather information.

CVRT also provides court testimony for SFPD and outside agencies, conducts probation and parole searches, conducts search warrants, holds informant debriefs, and maintains a gang member registry in compliance with court order. Additionally, due to a recent internal policy change, CVRT now investigates shootings that *may* be gang-related as opposed to only those that are *known* to be gang-related.

Strategic Investigations Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Violence Reduction Team	25	24	(1)	1	1	0
Lieutenant	1	1	0			
Sergeant	13	12	(1)			
Officer	11	11	0			
Clerk				1	1	0

Staffing Methodologies by Position

- The Lieutenant position serves as the Officer in Charge (OIC) of CVRT. Given the unique supervisory duties of the position, staffing is determined using the non-scaling methodology.
- The Sergeant Investigator position is responsible for the core investigative functions of the unit. Investigators in CVRT investigate assigned cases but also perform extensive proactive work such as directing the field surveillance activities of the Officers in the unit and providing assistance in surveillance and intel to other units. Staffing for this position is determined using a workload-

based methodology based on 240 cases, 36 hours per case, and a 40% proactive time utilization rate to account for the unit's extensive surveillance efforts.

- The Officer positions are responsible for assisting Sergeant Investigators in surveillance and search warrants on an Enforcement Team sub-unit. SFPD introduced this team based on the finding from the California Partnership Program data and study (2021) that recommended additional staffing to support field and street enforcement. There is also one Officer position solely responsible for all video retrieval related to all cases assigned to CVRT. Given the unique functions of the Officers in the unit, staffing is determined using the non-scaling methodology.

Crime Gun Investigations Center (CGIC)

The Crime Gun Investigations Center (CGIC) is responsible for a variety of functions related to crime gun intelligence, firearm tracing, case investigation, and proactive surveillance related to illegal firearm tracing. CGIC interfaces with the National Integrated Ballistic Information Network (NIBIN) through various channels. One such way is producing crime gun intelligence through coordination with the federal Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives ("ATF") and the SFPD Crime Lab and SFPD Property Control to get results through a gun and/or casings used in a crime. Gun intelligence data is entered into NIBIN, which identifies whether the particular gun corresponds with other criminal activity or homicides in the network. Using NIBIN, the unit investigates different cases involving firearms, including firearm trafficking; data analysis on potential shots fired (the Shot Spotter program); and proactively investigates potential cases such as identifying illegal firearm trafficking through firearm tracing, social media surveillance, and/or undercover work. Over the past few years, the number of cases has been increasing in addition to the various tasks required to investigate each case with the use of NIBIN. CGIC and CVRT also partner to run the Department's weekly shooting review, providing data analysis and areas of focus for the Department's enforcement efforts.

Strategic Investigations Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Crime Gun Investigations	7	7	0			
Lieutenant	1	1	0			
Sergeant	3	3	0			
Officer	3	3	0			

Staffing Methodologies by Position

- The Lieutenant position serves as the Officer in Charge (OIC) of CGIC. Given the unique supervisory duties of the position, staffing is determined using the non-scaling methodology.
- Staffing for the Sergeant Investigator position is determined using the workload-based methodology based on 158 cases, 12 hours per case, and a 33% proactive time utilization rate to account for the unit's extensive surveillance efforts.
- Staffing for the Officer position is determined using the workload-based methodology based on 158 cases and 12 hours per case. Casework is split collaboratively Sergeants and Officers; however, Officers conduct designated casework tasks such as search warrants and surveillance.

Major Crimes Division

The Major Crimes Division includes Robbery, Burglary/Organized Retail Theft, and Narcotics. Major Crimes is responsible for investigating significant and serious crimes. Unit case assignments have shifted dynamically in recent years between Robbery, Burglary, and the Station Investigations Teams (SIT) in the General Crimes Division to be responsive to current trends and case volume. A Captain oversees the Major Crimes Division, a leadership role that is not scalable to any workload measures.

Major Crimes Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Administration	1	1	0			
Robbery	17	23	+6			
Burglary/Retail Theft	27	33	+6	2	2	0
Narcotics	26	26	0			
DIVISION TOTAL	71	83	+12	2	2	0

Robbery

The Robbery Unit is responsible for investigating serious robbery cases that meet specific criteria and that generally require lengthy and extensive investigations due to their complexity (e.g., series robberies). Department Bulletin 17-246 (DB 17-246), effective December 2017, listed the protocols for Robbery investigations and stated that the Robbery Unit would take most Robbery cases, review all robbery reports, and consult with the Station Investigations Team (SIT) regarding which unit will investigate a robbery case. DB 17-246 directs that the Robbery Unit will investigate cases such as bank and armored transport robberies, home invasions, carjacking incidents, robberies where hostages are taken, robberies where the victim is injured, and robbery series involving multiple districts or jurisdictions.

Since 2017, Robbery Unit case criteria and assignment between the Robbery Unit, Station Investigations Team (SIT), and the Burglary Unit has continued to evolve based on current trends and case volume. Over the last two years, robberies as well as the complexity of robbery cases have increased and the Robbery Unit is unable to investigate all robbery cases. For example, there has been an increase in Estes robberies in which store employees or other personnel focused on loss prevention pursue and try to stop a shoplifter who then uses force or threat of force to avoid apprehension and get away with the merchandise. The use of force component in an Estes robbery elevates shoplifting to the more serious crime of robbery. Initially, the Robbery Unit would investigate Estes robberies and basic street robberies with no significant injuries, but the unit has become overwhelmed.

Given the volume of cases, the Robbery Unit now addresses only the most serious and complex robbery cases and SIT and the Burglary Unit now take many of the cases that previously may have been assigned to the Robbery Unit. SIT now takes Estes robberies cases due to the volume of these cases. SIT also investigates basic street robberies with no significant injuries and robberies with known suspects. With improved video retrieval and localized knowledge, Investigators and Officers focused on the District Stations can more effectively identify and arrest known suspects. The Burglary Unit now has a dedicated

Organized Retail Theft sub-unit. Retail theft cases were sometimes handled by Robbery prior but are now all assigned to Burglary/Retail Theft. Though SIT and Burglary now investigate specific case types that were previously assigned to the Robbery Unit, the Robbery Unit workload has increased because assigned cases are highly complex, serious robberies.

Major Crimes Division							
		SWORN			CIVILIAN		
		Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Robbery		17	23	+6			
	Lieutenant	1	1	0			
	Sergeant	14	20	6			
	Officer	2	2	0			

Staffing Methodologies by Position

- The Lieutenant position serves as the Officer in Charge (OIC) of Robbery. Given the unique supervisory duties of the position, staffing is determined using the non-scaling methodology.
- The Sergeant/Investigator position is responsible for the core investigative functions of the unit. Staffing is determined using the workload-based methodology based on 585 cases and 48 hours per case.
- The Officer positions assigned to the Robbery unit are responsible for video retrieval and review related to *all* robbery cases. Given the unique responsibilities of this position, staffing is determined using the non-scaling methodology.

Burglary/Organized Retail Theft

The Burglary Unit is responsible for investigating auto, residential, and commercial burglaries that occur in San Francisco. Prior to late 2017, there was no centralized Burglary Unit and since then case criteria have changed and case assignments have shifted dynamically amongst Robbery, Burglary, and SIT, as mentioned above.

Auto Burglaries

In August 2017, following a sharp year-over-year increase in the number of auto burglaries, SFPD expanded the number and locations of foot and bicycle patrols in areas most impacted by this trend, and engaged with community groups in an aggressive educational component. A dramatic decrease in the number of incidents was seen right away – a 17% drop when comparing 2018 numbers to those of 2017. However, as the City emerges from the pandemic, in the first six months of 2021, there has been a 9% increase when compared to the same time in 2020.

Commercial Burglaries

According to documents received from the Burglary Unit, citywide burglaries have increased, and commercial burglaries increased; as of December 2020, the Burglary Unit estimated that commercial burglary cases handled by the unit (some cases are handled by SIT) increased 112% from December 2019 YTD to December 2020 YTD. Burglaries are up 300% in some districts and there is more organized crime,

requiring more search warrants, trackers, and more time per case. These trends are prevalent especially in the Golden Gate Division. In the Metro Division, retail thefts in particular have increased significantly.

Organized retail theft crimes are greatly impacting retailers, both national corporations and locally owned businesses. According to a recent survey by the National Retail Federation, organized retail crime is a \$30 billion problem nationwide and rising. The same survey also identified Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Sacramento among the top ten metropolitan areas for organized retail crimes in the country.

Addressing Organized Retail Theft

On September 22nd, 2021, Mayor London Breed announced the details of San Francisco's Organized Retail Crime Initiative, a focused plan to increase reporting, investigating, and solving of retail theft cases and the upstream criminal enterprises that enable them. The Organized Retail Theft Initiative is led by the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) in partnership with local retailers and regional law enforcement agencies. The Plan aims to expand and reallocate SFPD investigative resources, strategically restructure publicly and privately funded deployments, and facilitate public-private partnerships aimed at reporting, investigating and solving cases.

The Burglary/Retail Theft Unit is central to the Plan, which increased the SFPD Organized Retail Crime Unit from two to five investigators under the command of a dedicated Lieutenant. Unit members will investigate cases locally within their citywide purview as well serve as full partners to the California Highway Patrol's Organized Retail Crime Task Force, which Governor Gavin Newsom reauthorized on July 21, 2021.

Other Tasks

The Burglary Unit spends a significant amount of time on rebookings. At the time of interview, Burglary Unit OIC noted that the unit had completed 278 rebookings for burglaries only in the last 90 days. Each investigative unit is responsible for several different tasks, including but not limited to cases assigned for investigation and rebookings. Rebookings are time-consuming and difficult to schedule because they must be completed under specific time constraints and the amount that comes in on any given day is unpredictable. Records indicate that between April – June 2021, the Burglary Unit handled 21% of all felony rebookings (278 out of 1,350).

Major Crimes Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Burglary/Retail Theft	27	33	+6	2	2	0
Lieutenant	1	1	0			
Sergeant	24	30	6			
Officer	2	2	0			
Police Services Aide (PSA)				1	1	0
Clerk				1	1	0

Staffing Methodologies by Position

- The Lieutenant position serves as the Officer in Charge (OIC) of Burglary. Given the unique supervisory duties of the position, staffing is determined using the non-scaling methodology.
- The Sergeant Investigator position is responsible for the core investigative functions of the unit. Staffing is determined using the workload-based methodology based 1,346 cases and 30 hours per case.
- The Officer positions assigned to the Burglary unit are responsible for video retrieval and review related to *all* burglary cases. Given the unique responsibilities of this position, staffing is determined using the non-scaling methodology.

Narcotics

The Narcotics Unit is an entirely proactive unit that investigates mid- and street-level narcotic incidents that occur in San Francisco. Narcotics operates in a manner similar to District Station Plainclothes teams in that much of the work is directed enforcement, targeting hot spot areas in the city based on citywide crime trends and leads from confidential informants. Narcotics operates primarily in the Tenderloin area; however, the unit also focuses on other parts of the city such as the Mission, Bayview, and Ingleside. Unlike some of the other investigative units in the Department that primarily work assigned cases, Narcotics is actively conducting search warrants, making arrests, and booking offenders. Narcotics also rebooks cases for the District Attorney's office.

The Sergeant Investigators in the unit primarily work on cases, with tasks including authoring search warrants, arrest warrants, and memos; and conducting rebookings, arrests, and stakeouts. Sergeants lead investigative teams within the unit that generally work collaboratively on proactive, longer-term investigative efforts. The Sergeant positions also supervise the Officers in the unit, directing the Officers in conducting law enforcement activities that are critical to working cases. Therefore, the Officers in the unit primarily focus on proactive law enforcement in various situations related to casework.

For example, Officers conduct buy-bust operations and hundreds of hours are utilized when a mid- to high-level trafficker is identified and an investigation is initiated. Law enforcement operations that must be undertaken include surveillance, buys, meeting with informants, locating residence(s), and authoring various search warrants. Depending on how many locations are identified, a significant amount of time may be utilized on search warrant days. Narcotics also includes three Task Force Officers (TFOs) who are assigned to liaise with federal agencies such as the Department of Homeland Security and the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) on various initiatives.

As Narcotics is an entirely proactive unit, its staffing level and focus should align with Department priorities and community needs. Matrix Consulting Group noted that tracking key performance indicators (KPIs) is beneficial for proactive units to monitor systems for decision-making, internal accountability, and operations. If Narcotics does not already have some key indicators identified, this is an area that the unit should explore in the future.

Major Crimes Division							
		SWORN			CIVILIAN		
		Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Narcotics		26	26	0			
	Lieutenant	1	1	0			
	Sergeant	4	4	0			
	Officer	21	21	0			

Staffing Methodologies by Position

- The Lieutenant position serves as the Officer in Charge (OIC) of Narcotics. Given the unique supervisory duties of the position, staffing is determined using the non-scaling methodology.
- The Sergeant position leads teams that conduct proactive, long-term investigative efforts. As the Sergeant position is responsible for leading these teams and supervising the Officers in the unit, it is appropriate to use a ratio-based methodology with span of control set at 1:7.
- The Officer position conducts proactive law enforcement activities as directed by the needs of the cases. Staffing is determined using the non-scaling methodology.

General Crimes Division

The General Crimes Division includes the Station Investigation Teams (SIT) and Night Investigations Unit (NIU). SIT is responsible for investigating general crimes incidents throughout the 10 District Stations that do not meet the criteria for assignment to other investigative units such as Robbery and Burglary. Night Investigations is responsible for responding to crime scenes after-hours when no other investigative units are regularly scheduled to be on-duty. NIU generally investigates serious cases and may carry out the full investigation if specific criteria are met. Otherwise, NIU initiates the investigation at the crime scene and directly after before the case is assigned to another investigative unit.

Caseload data for SIT indicates a significant resource need. Retirements coupled with increasing caseload volume – from both an increase in general crime incidents in the City and case assignment changes – have impacted SIT’s ability to handle the workload. As of February 2022, the Department is considering options for re-organizing SIT and NIU; this analysis addresses General Crimes in its current structure and with any re-organization, the Department should continue to monitor caseloads and adapt to changes in workload and resource availability.

General Crimes is overseen by a Captain, a leadership position that does not scale based on workload. Recommended staffing for the General Crimes Division is shown below.

General Crimes Division						
	<i>SWORN</i>			<i>CIVILIAN</i>		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Administration	1	1	0			
Station Investigation Teams	42	56	+14	7	10	+3
Night Investigations	10	10	0	1	1	0
DIVISION TOTAL	53	67	+14	8	11	+3

Station Investigation Teams (SIT)

The Station Investigation Teams (SIT) are responsible for investigating general crimes incidents throughout the 10 District Stations that do not meet criteria for assignment to other investigative units such as Special Victims, Community Violence Reduction Team (CVRT), Robbery, and Burglary. As described in the Robbery and Burglary sections, case assignment has shifted somewhat between SIT, Robbery, and Burglary over the past few years; SIT is now responsible for case types previously assigned to Robbery and Burglary, as the latter two units now investigate the most complex cases in their respective focus areas. Generally, the types of cases assigned to SIT include, but are not limited to, aggravated assaults, possession of a firearm (felony/non-gang related), some terrorist threats, non-domestic violence related kidnappings, and missing persons (first 30 days). Given current crime trends as well as case reassignment protocols, SIT experiences a significant case volume and the workload-based analysis indicates that SIT’s caseload across all District Stations warrants additional resources. This finding corresponds with the qualitative information that the Project Team received during interviews.

SIT's organization and structure within the Bureau – whether command is centralized in Investigations or decentralized at the District Stations – has switched over the years to be responsive to current priorities and staffing levels. Currently, command is centralized in the Investigations Bureau under the Captain that oversees General Crimes. There are five centralized Lieutenants who each oversee the SIT function at two District Stations. Sergeants serve as the Investigators and SIT unit size varies based on the caseload of the respective District Station. The Sergeant Investigators primarily spend their time working cases with time allotment for court and minimal administrative time. Generally, the busier District Stations in the Metro Division have higher caseloads than the smaller District Stations in the Golden Gate Division. There are two Officers that are assigned to SIT as video retrieval officers and are utilized by all 10 District Stations.

Recommendation: Each SIT team should be staffed with a Police Services Aide. This non-sworn classification can perform a variety of different tasks, including but not limited to data entry, authoring crime alert emails, answering report requests, tracking caseload metrics, supporting research for investigative staff, and providing rebooking support where appropriate. This position provides valuable administrative support to each SIT unit and enables sworn Investigators to focus on specialized casework. Given the supportive duties and responsibilities of the PSAs, it is appropriate to use the ratio-based methodology and assign one PSA for every 5-8 Sergeants, with a minimum of one PSA per station.

SIT handles a significant number of the Department's rebookings. Over the 90-day period from April – June 2021, SIT handled 35% of rebookings (469 out of 1,350). Rebookings account for substantial workload as they must be done under specific time constraints and the number that come in on a day-to-day basis is unpredictable.

General Crimes Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Station Investigation Teams	42	56	+14	7	10	+3
Lieutenant (A - J)	5	5	0			
Sergeant (A - J)	35	49	+14			
Officer (A - J)	2	2	0			
Police Services Aide (PSA)				7	10	+3

Staffing Methodologies by Position

- There are five SIT Lieutenants that each serve as the Officer in Charge (OIC) for two District Stations. Due to the unique responsibilities of these positions, staffing is determined using the non-scaling methodology.
- Staffing for the Sergeant Investigator position that investigates cases for their respective District Station is determined using a workload-based methodology based on 6,629 cases citywide and 10.5 hours per case. While individual District-level caseload data is available, the Department may operationally wish to follow general allocation guidelines for consistency (e.g., larger District Stations have six Sergeant Investigators, and smaller have three to four) and to smooth small variations in caseload over time.
- The Officer positions serve as video retrieval officers for all of SIT. Given the unique responsibilities of this position, staffing is determined using the non-scaling methodology.

Night Investigations Unit

The Night Investigations Unit (NIU) is responsible for providing after-hours detective response to major crimes. NIU responds to active crime scenes and investigates cases that meet specific criteria or conducts preliminary investigative work before the case is assigned to another investigative unit for completion. NIU is responsible for initiating the investigative effort for after-hours crime scenes even if the case is subsequently assigned to another unit. In 2020, NIU's days and hours changed such that the unit is now considered active all day on Saturday and Sunday (previously the unit ran limited hours on weekends). More cases now occur within NIU's jurisdiction and this has increased caseloads for the unit. As noted above, the Department is currently exploring options for re-organizing structure and assignment amongst SIT and NIU.

NIU is overseen by a Lieutenant who serves as the Officer in Charge (OIC). Sergeant Investigators are responsible for conducting the unit's investigative work: assisting with cases throughout the night, triaging cases based on criteria, responding to crime scenes, interviewing witnesses and victims, coordinating with other Sergeants and Officers and Crime Scene Investigations (CSI), and collecting and reviewing video. These Investigators manage active crime scenes to provide oversight regarding the protocols and procedures that must be followed to initiate an investigative effort.

General Crimes Division						
	<i>SWORN</i>			<i>CIVILIAN</i>		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Night Investigations	10	10	0	1	1	0
Lieutenant	1	1	0			
Sergeant	9	9	0			
Clerk				1	1	0

Staffing Methodologies by Position

- The Lieutenant position serves as the Officer in Charge (OIC) of Night Investigations. Given the unique supervisory duties of the position, staffing is determined using the non-scaling methodology.
- Sergeant Investigator staffing is determined using a workload-based methodology based on 167 cases, 38 hours per case, and a 35% "responding time" utilization factor to account for those investigations in which NIU initially responds to and manages the active crime scene and initial investigation before the case is subsequently assigned to another investigative unit based on case assignment criteria.

Special Investigations Division (SID)

The Special Investigations Division (SID) is responsible for a variety of unique investigative efforts and responsibilities that support regional initiatives, service internal and external stakeholders, and provide dignitary protection. SID has several specialized sub-units including Dignitary Protection, Hate Crimes, and Arson, as well as other sub-units that liaise with regional and national initiatives.

Special Investigations is overseen by a Lieutenant. The sub-units in the Special Investigations Division all serve unique functions, with assignments and unit size dictated by factors such as requests from City leadership, commitments to provide a dedicated level of interagency support, or Department policy or directive. Due to the specialized functions of units within the Special Investigations Division, staffing for these units is determined using the non-scaling methodology. Recommend staffing is provided below followed by a brief overview of the responsibilities of each sub-unit.

Special Investigations Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Administration	1	1	0	1	1	0
Lieutenant	1	1	0			
Clerk				1	1	0
Designated Investigations	7	8	+1			
Sergeant	6	7	+1			
Officer	1	1	0			
Dignitary Protection	9	9	0			
Sergeant	2	2	0			
Officer	7	7	0			
Technical Services	8	8	0			
Sergeant	3	3	0			
Officer	5	5	0			
Arson Task Force	3	3	0			
Sergeant	3	3	0			
NCRIC	2	2	0			
Sergeant	1	1	0			
Officer	1	1	0			
US Marshall's Task Force	1	1	0			
Sergeant	1	1	0			
DIVISION TOTAL	31	32	+1	1	1	0

- Designated Investigations** investigates crimes and threats such as hate crimes, threats to elected officials, violent threats against schools and workplaces, public corruption, crimes against foreign dignitaries, confidential cases referred from Internal Affairs or Command Staff, threats against sworn Department members, and threats of mass shootings. In recent times, there has been a significant increase in the number of cases assigned to SID by Command Staff, and workplace shooting threats. Moreover, there has been an increase in hate crimes targeting specific groups such as the Asian American Pacific Islander (AAPI) community. These investigations have added additional workload to Designated Investigations and one additional Investigator is recommended to focus on investigating hate crimes specifically.

- ***Dignitary Protection*** serves as the liaison to the State Department, Capitol Police, Secret Service, and various Consulates, and provides physical security to dignitary officials, including the Mayor. This unit is also responsible for protest intel.
- ***Technical Services Unit*** assists other Investigative units such as Homicide, Robbery, Burglary and the Community Violence Reduction Team in locating suspects. Technical Services conducts physical surveillance and electronic surveillance (phones) to locate and arrest suspects. Unit personnel are experts on cell phone tracking regulations and laws and assist other investigators in writing warrants. The unit's workload is based on that of other units.
- ***Arson Task Force*** is responsible for investigating criminal fire-related incidents including explosions, major fire scenes, accidental fatalities during fires, and fires three-alarm and larger. Once the San Francisco Fire Department determines that a fire was intentionally set, Arson Task Force initiates an investigation.
- ***Northern California Regional Intelligence Center (NCRIC)*** liaises with the regional law enforcement intelligence group, providing information regarding threats to public safety. NCRIC serves as an information clearinghouse, disseminating information to multiple local agencies.
- ***US Marshall's Task Force*** consists of one Sergeant assigned to the US Marshall's that is responsible for locating and arresting fugitives all over the state. This position is also responsible for extradition of prisoners from other jurisdictions and physically works out of the Federal building with a team of US Marshall's.

Special Victims Unit

The Special Victims Unit (SVU) investigates various types of person crimes including sex assault, domestic violence, child abuse, elder abuse, and financial crimes. SVU follows the traditional investigative model in which Sergeant Investigators work assigned cases, without significant proactive time like some of the other units in the Bureau. SVU is overseen by one Captain and three Lieutenants and an administrative team that is responsible for various tasks related to case assignment and case tracking.

SVU staffing is down significantly due to retirements and assignment to other investigative units. The Project Team recommends additional staffing in SVU based on the caseload volume experienced by many of the sub-units. Recommended staffing for SVU is shown below followed by a description of each sub-unit.

Special Victims Unit						
	<i>SWORN</i>			<i>CIVILIAN</i>		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Administration	8	8	0	4	4	0
DV, Child Abuse, Sex Assault	18	26	+8			
Financial Crimes	6	9	+3			
Elder Abuse	1	1	0			
Stalking	1	1	0			
Human Trafficking	3	3	0			
Missing Persons	2	2	0			
ICAC	3	6	+3			
290 Sex Offenders	3	3	0			
Cold Case	2	2	0			
UNIT TOTAL	47	61	+14	4	4	0

Given the size of the unit and the volume of various case types that are assigned to the unit, SVU has an administrative team that consists of both sworn and non-sworn personnel. The administrative team is responsible for assigning and tracking cases within the unit, video retrieval, payroll, external requests/inquiry, and special projects. Due to the unique responsibilities of the positions within the SVU administrative subunit, staffing is determined using the non-scaling methodology.

SVU sub-units consist of Sergeant Investigators who investigate cases in their respective area. Sub-units are designated as follows:

- One team of large team of Sergeants investigates Domestic Violence, Child Abuse, and Sex Assault.
- One team of Sergeants investigates Financial Crimes cases, which are time-consuming and are becoming increasingly complex given financial innovations (e.g., cryptocurrency).
- Two single Sergeant sub-units investigate Elder Abuse, designated as either physical or financial, and Stalking.
- Another team of Sergeants investigates Internet Crimes Against Children (ICAC).
- The remaining sub-units, each staffed with two to three Sergeants, investigate Human Trafficking, Missing Persons, Cold Cases, and Sex Offenders.

It should also be noted that SVU handles a significant number of rebookings for the Bureau. Over the period April – June 2021, SVU handled 21% of the Department’s rebookings (246 out of 1,350). Many of these cases are high liability and require quick turnaround, with close monitoring by the District Attorney’s Office.

Special Victims Unit						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Administration	8	8	0	4	4	0
Captain	1	1	0			
Lieutenant	3	3	0			
Sergeant	3	3	0			
Officer	1	1	0			
Clerk				2	2	0
Police Services Aide				2	2	0
DV, Child Abuse, Sex Assault	18	26	+8			
Sergeant	18	26	+8			
Financial Crimes	6	9	+3			
Sergeant	6	9	+3			
Elder Abuse	1	1	0			
Sergeant	1	1	0			
Stalking	1	1	0			
Sergeant	1	1	0			
Human Trafficking	3	3	0			
Sergeant	3	3	0			
Missing Persons	2	2	0			
Sergeant	2	2	0			
Internet Crimes (Children)	3	6	+3			
Sergeant	3	6	+3			
290 Sex Offenders	3	3	0			
Sergeant	3	3	0			
Cold Case	2	2	0			
Sergeant	2	2	0			
UNIT TOTAL	47	61	+14	4	4	0

Staffing Methodologies for Sergeant Investigators

The workload-based methodology is used to determine staffing for the Sergeants in Domestic Violence, Child Abuse, and Sex Assault (1,698, 240, and 607 cases, respectively); Financial Crimes (1,675 cases filed and 110 cases worked/rebooked); Elder Abuse (96 cases); Stalking (100 cases); Human Trafficking (221 cases); and ICAC (220 cases).

The non-scaling methodology is used to determine staffing for some Sergeant positions, given the unique nature of the work (e.g., there are no consistent workload metrics associated with cold case investigations). These sub-units include Missing Persons, Cold Cases, and 290 Sex Offenders.

Forensic Services Division

The Forensic Services Division includes the Crime Lab, Crime Scene Investigations, and the ID Unit (referred to as ID-ABIS). Forensic Services is overseen by a professional staff Director who reports directly to the Deputy Chief of the Investigations Bureau. The Crime Lab and the ID Unit are both staffed exclusively with professional staff members and are each overseen by a professional staff Manager. Crime Scene Investigations (CSI) is overseen by a Lieutenant and staffed predominantly with sworn members; this section includes a discussion of how the Department might initiate the process of civilianizing CSI in the future. Recommended staffing levels for the Forensic Services Division are shown below followed by a description of each unit.

Forensic Services Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Administration				1	1	0
Crime Lab				32	39	+7
Crime Scene Investigations	21	21	0	3	3	0
ID-ABIS				29	37	+8
DIVISION TOTAL	21	21	0	65	80	+15

Crime Lab

The Crime Lab is responsible for scientifically analyzing the nature, origin, and significance of physical evidence in criminal investigations. It is overseen by the Crime Lab Manager and organized into four subunits, with supervisors in each area: Forensic Biology/DNA, Firearms/Toolmark, Forensic Breath Alcohol/Chemical Analysis, and Quality Assurance/Gun Shot Residue. A significant change that will impact Crime Lab workload is the planned reopening of the Chemical Analysis unit within Forensic Breath Alcohol, which will require hiring and training new Criminalists as well as validating new equipment.

The Forensic Biology/DNA Unit is responsible for examining evidence for the presence of biological materials such as blood, semen, and saliva. The Unit performs DNA analysis on biological materials and reference samples, issues reports, and testifies to findings when needed. The Unit is led by a DNA Technical Lead Manager, which is required to maintain the lab's accreditation. The Criminalist III position predominantly supervises Criminalist IIs, who perform most of the DNA analysis investigations. The Unit uses a batch method to process significantly more samples and has a low backlog.

The Firearms and Toolmark Unit is responsible for microscopically comparing shell casings, bullets and toolmarks to verify their origination to a source; restoring obliterated serial numbers; determining the distance from which a gun was fired; and issuing reports and testifying as needed. When eligible, shell casings are entered into the National Integrated Ballistic Information Network (NIBIN) database for searching across agencies, which is performed by the NIBIN technical Examiners. The Unit is staffed with a supervising Criminalist III, Criminalist II positions that perform the casework, and two Examiners.

The Forensic Breath Alcohol/Chemical Analysis Unit maintains breath alcohol instruments, provides training to officers on instruments, and testifies to intoxication levels in court. The Forensic Breath Alcohol Unit has planned to bring the chemical analysis service back which will require additional staffing. The work is currently outsourced to Alameda County. In order to be fully operational, validate instruments, and conduct the work currently outsourced, it is estimated that the Unit would need an additional five Criminalist II positions and one additional Criminalist III supervisor. Going forward, the Project Team recommends that the Chemical Analysis Unit capture data on chemical analysis cases, validating and maintaining instruments, and training provision.

Quality Assurance/Gun Shot Residue is performed by one Criminalist who divides their time between the different sub-units, and supervises a lab technician who also performs duties across all sub-unit disciplines. Quality Assurance is responsible for ensuring compliance during audits for lab accreditation.

Crime Lab						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Crime Lab - DNA				19	20	+1
Manager V				1	1	0
Manager IV				1	1	0
Criminalist Supervisor				3	3	0
Criminalist				13	14	+1
Clerk				1	1	0
Crime Lab - Firearms				8	8	0
Criminalist Supervisor				1	1	0
Criminalist				5	5	0
Forensic Latent Examiner				2	2	0
Crime Lab - Forensic Alcohol				3	9	+6
Criminalist Supervisor				1	2	+1
Criminalist				2	7	+5
Crime Lab - Quality				2	2	0
Criminalist Supervisor				1	1	0
Laboratory Technician				1	1	0
UNIT TOTAL	0	0	0	32	39	+7

Staffing Methodologies by Position

The sub-units in the Crime Lab are all organized in a similar structure, with the same classifications performing similar job duties across all sub-units, each with a specific focus based on the specialized nature of the respective unit. Therefore, the methodologies utilized to determine recommended staffing levels are relevant at the classification level.

- Any Manager-level positions are determined using a non-scaling methodology due to their unique responsibilities. For example, the Forensic Biology/DNA Unit is overseen by a DNA Technical Lead Manager, a position that is required in the unit to maintain the lab's accreditation.
- All sub-units include Criminalist III positions that are responsible for some casework (e.g., DNA analysis investigations), but the predominant responsibility of these positions is to directly supervise Criminalist IIs in casework and other unit activities. Therefore, Criminalist III staffing is primarily determined using a ratio-based methodology using a span of control of 1:6. Few

Criminalist III positions use the non-scaling methodology based on specialized job duties that do not include supervision.

- Criminalist II positions are responsible for performing the casework relevant to the specific unit. For example, in Forensic Biology/DNA, cases are DNA analysis investigations; in Firearms and Toolmark, cases are firearms investigations. Therefore, Criminalist II staffing in each unit is determined using a workload-based methodology based on the number of investigations and the time per investigation.
- Some positions serve unique roles for their respective sub-units and therefore staffing is determined using the non-scaling methodology, including:
 - Examiners in the Firearm and Toolmark Unit, who are responsible for input and Department maintenance of NIBIN
 - Criminalist II staffing in the newly added Chemical Analysis section of Forensic Breath Alcohol
 - The two positions that provide Quality Assurance and Gun Shot Residue services and comprise that unit

Crime Scene Investigations (CSI)

Crime Scene Investigations (CSI) is responsible for supporting and responding to requests for any special forensic process needs, including fingerprints, DNA and digital evidence collections, and examinations. CSI also responds to crime scenes for evidence processing. CSI includes the Media Evidence Unit (MEU), a Photo Lab, a Forensic Artist, and SFPD members staffed at the Silicon Valley Regional Computer Forensics Laboratory (SVRCFL). There are four CSI teams organized across two day shifts and two night shifts, with five members on each shift. The whole unit is scheduled to move in to the new SFPD crime facility, along with the Crime Lab units, in early 2022. CSIU anticipates that there will be significant benefits to co-location in terms of internal communications and processes.

CSI staffing levels have declined in recent years due to retirement, transfer, and promotion. CSI is currently comprised of predominantly sworn members and has vacancies for specific professional staff positions, but has not hired personnel to fill these positions due to the 2020 hiring freeze. For example, CSI anticipated hiring a civilian fingerprinting technician to take these duties from an Officer who is currently performing fingerprinting tasks but was unable to hire the technician during the hiring freeze.

Recommendation: The Project Team recommends that the Department initiate the process of civilianizing CSI, while recognizing that this change will take significant time and that current staffing must remain as-is during the initial stages in order to maintain service levels and accreditation. Police Executive Research Forum (PERF) made a similar recommendation in its 2008 report. One critical consideration is that it is likely that new professional staff classification(s) will need to be created in order to ensure that the unit is staffed with well-trained civilian specialists. This process is possible but not timely. The Department should explore civilianization options for the unit while maintaining current staffing to provide continuity of operations and service. As the staffing analysis is conducted on a bi-annual basis, this long-term civilianization process is recommended yet staffing remains as-is in this assessment to maintain accreditation.

Crime Scene Investigations (CSI)						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Crime Scene Investigations	17	17	0	1	1	0
Lieutenant	1	1	0			
Sergeant	5	5	0			
Officer	11	11	0			
Clerk				1	1	0
CSI - Media Evidence	2	2	0			
Sergeant	1	1	0			
Officer	1	1	0			
CSI - SVRCFL	2	2	0			
Sergeant	1	1	0			
Officer	1	1	0			
CSI - Photo Lab				1	1	0
Photographer				1	1	0
CSI - Forensic Artist				1	1	0
Graphic Artist				1	1	0
UNIT TOTAL	21	21	0	3	3	0

Staffing Methodologies

Staffing for all sub-units in CSI is determined using the non-scaling methodology; this sections details the unique duties and responsibilities of each sub-unit. The Project Team has used current staffing as a baseline with the recommendation for a significant shift in sworn versus non-sworn personnel ahead.

Generally, sworn members in CSIU are serving in the forensic examiner capacity, providing technical expertise in video, computer and cellphone evidence. Though there may be specific instances in which sworn expertise and jurisdiction is necessary (e.g., going out on search warrants), the Department should explore the possibility of creating or utilizing civilian classifications that are authorized and trained to conduct forensic examination. CSI is operating with minimum staffing currently and this may be an opportunity to hire civilian classifications that already exist to supplement operational need now and to create additional civilian classifications to civilianize the unit in the long-term. Additionally, the Project Team recommends that workload metrics be tracked and utilized to determine staffing in future analyses.

The Media Evidence Unit (MEU) is responsible for collecting, documenting, examining, analyzing, clarifying, and archiving forensic media (video and audio) evidence. The unit provides technical support to the Department in cell phone, video, sketch, and photography mediums. MEU interfaces with the various video retrieval positions throughout the Investigations Bureau, providing support in casework, archived evidence, and equipment. With CSIU's move to the new crime lab, all CSIU video technicians will be co-located, and the Department should explore whether or not this presents an opportunity to consolidate video retrieval more generally to serve the Bureau in a centralized unit.

MEU consists of a supervising Sergeant and three Officers, each of whom has their own area of expertise (video, computer, cellphone), as well as a Forensic Artist and a Photographer. Most critically, the unit has a resource need in cellphone examiner positions due to technological advancements and cultural shifts. Cellphones are more resource intensive than computers to examine.

The Photographer performs all Photo Lab functions, including taking and processing photos of Academy graduations and other Department events and processing and archiving photos of news conferences, court cases, and homicide investigations. The Photographer also answers questions related to camera usage from investigators, maintains camera equipment, and manages the CSIU photo storage system in Crime Data Warehouse.

The Forensic Artist performs all forensic duties for the Department including creating freehand art sketches of victims and witnesses using composite art sketches as investigative tools to aid in the identification, apprehension and/or elimination of suspects, victims, and witnesses; altering or modifying likenesses to aid in the identification of victims, witnesses, or suspects; creating three-dimensional reconstruction (sculptures) from physical data of decomposed or partially decomposed human remains for the purposes of forensic identification; and conducting interviews with crime victims and witnesses to create freehand drawings or sculptures of criminal suspects.

The Regional Digital Crime Lab – Silicon Valley Regional Computer Forensics Laboratory (SVRCFL) is a regional, multi-agency laboratory and as such, workload measures for individual positions are not attributable to independent agencies.

ID-ABIS

ID-ABIS conducts identification procedures (“ID”) and operates Automated Biometric Identification Systems (“ABIS”). The primary responsibilities of ID-ABIS (also referred to as the ID Unit) are to conduct fingerprinting for the City and County of San Francisco, identify criminal suspects, identify applications, and verify records and criminal history. The ID Unit services the entire City on a 24/7 basis. In 2015, Records Management moved from the Hall of Justice to the Public Safety Building (Police Headquarters), and subsequently the work of verifying and editing criminal history was transitioned from Records to the ID Unit. As dictated by the Department of Justice, this work includes processing bookings and restraining orders. In this transition of work, the ID Unit grew from only including Fingerprinting Technicians to also including Clerks, who are responsible for processing restraining orders.

Given these changes and the fact that ID Unit staffing has steadily declined due to retirements and transfers, the Project Team recommends some additional staffing in the ID Bureau. Moreover, the ID Unit has a digitization case backlog and the statewide policy changes such as the September 2020 expansion of the sex offender law is anticipated to increase applications. Over the last year, the Department has made an effort to transfer relevant positions into the ID Unit after significant staffing declines.

ID-ABIS						
	<i>SWORN</i>			<i>CIVILIAN</i>		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
ID-ABIS						
Manager V				1	1	0
Manager I				1	1	0
Forensic Latent Exam. Supervisor				0	1	+1
Forensic Latent Examiner				0	4	+4
Fingerprint Technician Supervisor				2	3	+1
Fingerprint Technician				12	14	+2
Clerk				12	12	0
IS Engineer				1	1	0
UNIT TOTAL	0	0	0	29	37	+8

Staffing Methodologies by Position

- The ID Bureau has one Manager and one supervising Fingerprint Technician Manager. Given the specialized supervisory nature of these positions, staffing is determined using the non-scaling methodology.
- Recommended staffing for Fingerprinting Technician Supervisors is determined using a ratio-based methodology using 1:7 span of control. Fingerprinting Technician Supervisors do perform fingerprinting work but serve as the supervisor on each shift.
- Recommended staffing for Fingerprinting Technicians is determined using a workload-based methodology based on the total number of cases of fingerprints processed, including applicants, adult criminal suspects, juvenile criminal suspects, registrants, adult citations, and deceased subjects for the Medical Examiner.
- Recommended staffing for Clerks in the ID Bureau is determined using a workload-based methodology based on the number of misdemeanor citations entered and updated in the content management system. Clerks work different shifts to ensure coverage.
- Recommended staffing for the Latent Examiner Supervisors and Latent Examiners is determined using a non-scaling methodology based on data availability. This is a new position for the ID Bureau whose hiring process began just prior to the 2020 hiring freeze. These positions perform fingerprint examination and classification of prints and impressions, and in the future, it may be possible to quantify workload. These positions are already included in the Department's budget.
- The IS Engineer position is funded through a federal Automated Fingerprinting Identification Systems (AFIS) program. Recommended staffing for the IS Engineer is determined using the non-scaling methodology based on the unique duties of the position, which include maintaining the Department's automated biometric identification systems.

Crime Strategies Division

The Crime Strategies Division (CSD) supports the Operations branch of the Department and provides crime analysis and conclusive intelligence to the Field Operations, Investigations, and Special Operations Bureaus; and provides strategic analysis and intelligence to other agencies (e.g., Naval Criminal Investigative Service) and community-based organizations (CBOs). CSD is both strategic and analytical in nature, promoting data-driven policing by providing crime analysis and actionable summaries and insight for tactical and operational efforts, and by providing insight and analysis for strategic initiatives and community collaboration.

Prior to 2018, the unit was called Crime Analysis and strictly supported the Investigations Bureau, providing case support and data analysis, and had little interface with the 10 District Stations. In 2019, the unit became the Crime Strategies Division and adopted a broader scope of duties, including case support, operational data analysis, and strategic analysis through a multitude of platforms and programs.

On the strategic side, CSD Analysts are responsible for running and preparing for Crime Strategies meetings every other week; preparing weekly reports such as the Shooting Log and the Gun Violence Report to support community initiatives; fulfilling requests for conclusive intelligence and crime analysis and summaries for the Board of Supervisors, Police Commission, and Command Staff; and preparing reports and crime analysis data for community initiatives. Recurring weekly reports such as the Shooting Log and the weekly Shooting Report require significant time and resources. The strategic scope of CSD also has a strong community component: community members are actively engaged with the data and analysis received from CSD, and are often interested in looking at the data along different crosstabs such as age, demographic group, and specific communities (e.g., AAPI). CSD assists CBOs in formulating strategies based on data and intelligence, and is engaged in special projects such as a community violence prevention joint partnership and gun violence program under the Mayor's Office and other grant-funded initiatives.

CSD also performs significant tactical and operational analyses, including case support. For example, CSD receives interagency requests from organizations like the Naval Criminal Investigative Service that require extensive reporting beyond providing crime stats; the prepared reports serve as conclusive intelligence and include temporal and spatial analysis, trends, summaries, and actionable strategy. On the case support side, CSD defines work in terms of an operation ("op"), and an op consists of cases linked to multiple individuals (e.g., organized retail theft). From 2018 to mid-summer 2021, there were five major ops that were 6-8 months-long projects. In 2020, the unit received 81 requests on the strategic side, aside from cases and ops. Through 2021 mid-summer, the unit received 31 requests for strategic support, and 11 requests for case support. Tactical analyses are on a case by case basis.

Case support requires a specialized skillset so that Analysts can testify in court. Some of this specialized skillset is gained officially through trainings on specific areas such as forensics and some expertise is gained through on the job training. One major challenge is that there is currently no clear separation between tactical, operational and strategic analyses within the unit, in terms of both skillset and the

nature of the reporting. This is due primarily to limited staffing: CSD does not have the bandwidth to devote Analysts specifically to certain focuses within CSD.

On the project side, some of these major ops are ongoing, others are ad hoc and urgent, and still others are scheduled and recurring (e.g., three Analysts work on the Shooting Log, due every Monday, that supports the Mayor's gun violence initiative). Given the volume and sequencing of work product expected from CSD, the unit is often overwhelmed with competing deadlines. On the personnel side, subject matter experts (SMEs) who are able to testify in court have a specialized skillset that supports the Department in a unique way. However, due to certified analyst staffing, CSD is providing limited support to the Investigations Bureau at this time.

Recommendations

- **The Department should explore splitting Crime Strategies Division into two separate units, one devoted to strategic analyses, and the other specifically focused on tactical and/or operational analyses and case support.** Given the different workflows for these separate types of projects, and the different skillsets required (e.g., certifications and case/court knowledge), this shift may enable the units to support the Department more efficiently. Additionally, projects can be planned versus unplanned, and may often have competing deadlines (e.g., providing case support based on court date). Moreover, the Investigations Bureau has somewhat limited and inconsistent analytical support currently. The Project Team learned during interviews that some investigative units rely on PSAs for analysis, while others interface with Crime Strategies when possible; developing and centralizing analytical support for Operations (Investigations, Field Operations, Special Operations) may ensure that all investigative units and the District Stations are able to access analytical information consistently and timely.
- **The Department should determine how to bring more Crime Analysts who are certified to testify in court into CSD.** This may require creating a new classification, a Crime Analyst, or at the very least, maintaining and developing positions in the City's 1820 series, but ensuring that the sub-unit is structured such that there is room for advancement. If an Analyst comes into the unit and subsequently seeks additional training (official and on the job) to gain certification, they must be compensated and given promotional opportunity given their newly acquired responsibility and skillset. Moreover, there may be potential for certified Analysts to testify instead of sworn members, enabling professional staff to undertake traditionally sworn duties and allowing sworn members to use their expertise elsewhere. This is beyond the scope of this analysis, but something that the Department should consider in the future.

Despite increased responsibilities, CSD staffing has decreased over the last few years. At the end of 2019, the unit analysis team was two Principal Administrative Analysts and 10 Senior Administrative Analysts/Administrative Analysts; as of September 2021, unit staffing was two Principal Administrative Analysts and seven Senior Administrative Analysts/Administrative Analysts.

Crime Strategies Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
	3	1	(2)	10	31	21
Director				1	1	0
Principal Admin Analyst				2	2	0
Senior Admin Analyst				1	6	5
Admin Analyst				6	22	16
Officer	3	1	(2)			
DIVISION TOTAL	3	1	(2)	10	31	+21

Staffing Methodologies by Position

- CSD is overseen by a Director. Given the unique leadership duties of this position, staffing is determined using the **non-scaling methodology**.
- CSD has two Principal Administrative Analyst positions. One position manages and coordinates all aspects of the program, including training and managing the SharePoint platform; and coordinating with all Department units, District Supervisors, and Captains. This position also reviews all work product for the unit, and creates and goes over reports and presentations for Command Staff, the Mayor's Office, and the Board of Supervisors. This position also manages training at the Academy and manages the community-based violence prevention program. The other Principal Administrative Analyst position is devoted to grant writing. Given the unique duties of these positions, staffing is determined using the non-scaling methodology.
- CSD has Senior Administrative Analyst positions and Administrative Analyst positions. These Analyst positions are grouped together in determining staffing numbers, but the functions are delineated such that the Senior Administrative Analysts are responsible for supervising the Administrative Analysts in the tactical, operational, and strategic branches of the Division; and this classification also serves as the promotional classification for Administrative Analysts that become certified for court testimony, hence gaining additional SME skills. Administrative Analysts are the primary analytical classification for CSD. The International Association of Crime Analysts (IACA) recommends using a ratio of one Crime Analyst for every 70 officers in an organization to determine staffing. Staffing levels for Senior Administrative Analyst/Administrative Analyst positions were therefore determined using the ratio-based methodology of one crime analyst for every 70 sworn officers (citywide, excluding the Airport).
- The Officer position in the unit is assigned to the Violence Reduction Initiative under the Community Intervention Strategies program. Sworn personnel/expertise is needed for this particular assignment as it relates to building community trust and legitimacy of SFPD with the community. This position also looks at the data regarding gun violence and helps develop strategies as it relates to community intervention with decreasing gun violence in the hot spot areas. One sworn member is needed for this position. Staffing is determined using the non-scaling methodology.

Special Operations Bureau

Overview

The Special Operations Bureau (SOB) supports the other Bureaus and units in the Department by providing specialized expertise and equipment when operationally necessary. Examples of this support include the Special Weapons and Tactics (SWAT) Team safely arresting a barricaded suspect, the Bomb Squad checking out a suspicious package, the Marine Unit rescuing a person from the Bay, the Traffic Company monitoring driving behavior in school zones, or the Homeland Security Unit planning for the safety of a large parade.

Recommended Staffing

Through extensive interviews and quantitative data analysis, the Project Team identified specialized sworn staffing need in the Bureau's Traffic and Tactical Divisions. The Project Team also identified areas where the Department could initiate civilianization efforts in the Department Operations Center (DOC) within the Homeland Security Division.


Recommended staffing for the Special Operations Bureau is shown below.

Special Operations Bureau						
Division or Unit	<i>SWORN</i>			<i>CIVILIAN</i>		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Special Operations - Admin	1	1	0	1	1	0
Traffic Division	60	88	+28	5	6	+1
Tactical Division	61	79	+18	6	7	+1
Homeland Security Division	27	29	+2	10	9	(1)
Urban Areas Security Initiative	2	2	0	1	1	0
BUREAU TOTAL	151	199	+48	23	24	+1

Organizational Chart



Special Operations Bureau



Methodologies Used to Determine Staffing

Workload-based Methodology

The Project Team used a workload-based methodology to determine staffing levels for specific units in the Special Operations Bureau, based on unit workload metrics and available data. Examples include:

- **Traffic Enforcement:** The number of traffic violations, and the amount of time it takes to process each violation, serve as the workload metrics for this unit. These metrics, in addition to an assessment of operational need regarding dignitary escort and the team-based structure of the unit, serve the basis for staffing determination.
- **Traffic Collision Investigations Unit (TCIU):** TCIU functions as a traditional investigative unit that conducts workups on assigned cases. The number of assigned cases, and the average number of hours required to conduct a workup for each case, serve as the workload metrics for this unit.

Fixed-post Methodology and Operational Analyses

The Project Team used a fixed-post framework coupled with an assessment of operational needs to determine staffing levels for units such as the Special Weapons and Tactics (SWAT) Team in the Tactical Division. In the specific context of SOB staffing, the term “fixed-post” does not necessarily reflect an actual posted area of assignment, but rather the essential coverage needed for an assignment. In order to provide full coverage across all days every week, the SWAT Team must be staffed with four teams. Operationally, each team should be staffed with one Sergeant and seven Officers to remain within industry standards for span of control (1:7) and to fulfill the operational needs of the Department.

Ratio-based Methodology

As in other Bureaus, staffing levels for many supervisory positions in the Special Operations Bureau are determined using industry standard span of control metrics.

Non-scaling Methodology and Grant Funded Positions

The Project Team used the non-scaling methodology to determine staffing levels for positions that provide the Department with unique functions, and particularly in the Special Operations Bureau, specialized expertise. Moreover, the Special Operations Bureau has a number of positions that are funded and staffed through grant agreements. Examples of these grant-funded positions include:

- **Muni Task Force (MTF):** These positions are funded via two-year grants with the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA).
- **Homeland Security/Urban Areas Security Initiative (UASI):** These units have positions that are grant-funded through various regional and national programs.

Additional methodological detail is provided in each Division and unit section.

Recommended Staffing by Division and Unit

SOB – Administration

The Special Operations Bureau is overseen by a Deputy Chief that reports directly to the Assistant Chief of Operations. The Deputy Chief is supported by an Executive Secretary. Both positions are unique and are not scalable to any workload measures.

Special Operations - Administration						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Administration	1	1	0	1	1	0
Deputy Chief	1	1	0			
Executive Secretary				1	1	0

Traffic Division

The objectives of the Department's Municipal Transportation Agency (MTA) Traffic Division (referred to hereafter as the "Traffic Division" so as not to confuse with the City agency SFMTA) is to increase safety for all pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists who use the City's streets. Education and various enforcement strategies are deployed throughout San Francisco to ensure safe driving practices. Other responsibilities include responding to major traffic collisions, coordinating special events (e.g., motorcades), and responding to stunt driving incidents.

Traffic Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Administration	4	5	+1	5	5	0
Traffic Enforcement	32	50	+18			
Commercial Vehicle	2	2	0			
Stunt Driving Response	2	2	0			
Traffic Collision Investigations	7	10	+3	0	1	+1
Muni Enforcement	1	1	0			
Muni Response Team (MRT)	5	5	0			
Muni Task Force (MTF)	2	8	+6			
MTA K9 Team	5	5	0			
DIVISION TOTAL	60	88	+28	5	6	+1

Traffic Division and Traffic Company – Administration

The Traffic Division operates under the direction of a Commander who is supported by a Clerk who also serves as the Secretary for the Collision Board of Review, a group of various members within the Department who come together to review cases to determine disciplinary action regarding member-involved collisions. Leadership and administrative support positions for the Traffic Division are unique and not scalable to any workload metrics.

The Traffic Company is organized within the Traffic Division and works collaboratively with other personnel in the Department to review collision data and employ strategies to increase traffic safety for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists. The Traffic Company includes Traffic Enforcement, Commercial Vehicle Unit, Stunt Driving Response Unit, and Traffic Collision Investigations Unit (TCIU). The Traffic Company is overseen by a Captain who receives administrative and analytical support from one Clerk and one Analyst. There are no workload measures directly related to these positions, so they are considered non-scalable for the purpose of this assessment.

The Traffic Company is also responsible for managing the Hall of Justice’s STOP Window, the tow release window where members of the public come to claim their towed vehicles. Currently there are two Police Services Aides (PSAs) assigned to the STOP Window who receive support from one sworn member who is primarily assigned to the Commercial Vehicle Unit. The STOP Window requires the addition of one Sergeant to supervise the public-facing window, to investigate tow hearings with appropriate law enforcement training, and to ensure proper handling of City funds and vouchers. This position requires supervisory jurisdiction and law enforcement expertise and is a Vehicle Code requirement.

The Traffic Company also has two Officers assigned to Red Light Enforcement and driving under the influence (DUI) misdemeanor rebookings. There are no workload measures associated with these positions, so they are classified as non-scalable for this assessment. The Project Team recommends implementing an analyzable tracking system for Red Light violations and misdemeanor DUI rebookings in order to utilize a workload-based methodology to assess staffing in future analyses.

Traffic Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Administration	4	5	+1	5	5	0
Commander	1	1	0			
Captain	1	1	0			
Sergeant	0	1	+1			
Officer	2	2	0			
PSA				2	2	0
Clerk				2	2	0
Analyst				1	1	0

Traffic Company – Traffic Enforcement

The Traffic Enforcement unit collects data and implements traffic enforcement for all ten District Stations. Based on data collected, police officers are assigned to specific areas to conduct proactive traffic enforcement with the primary objective of reducing the occurrence of fatal and major injury vehicular collisions. Areas of enforcement are determined via a multi-departmental data analysis project that identifies high injury corridors and by instances of citizen complaints. In addition to traffic enforcement, the unit provides additional support to the District Stations by saturating specific areas to increase visibility and deter crime.

The City and County of San Francisco adopted the Vision Zero policy in 2014, committing to build better and safer streets, educate the public on traffic safety, enforce traffic laws, and adopt policy changes that save lives. One strategic goal of Vision Zero is to create a culture that prioritizes traffic safety and to ensure that mistakes on the roadways do not result in serious injury or death. The Vision Zero initiative aims to eliminate all traffic-related fatalities and reduce severe and fatal injury to pedestrians, motorists, and cyclists by 2024. To facilitate San Francisco’s “Vision Zero,” proactive efforts are dedicated to enforcing traffic laws. Using multi-year collision data, the Traffic Company focuses on enforcing the five violations that are the primary collision factors in most fatal collisions (e.g., speeding, illegal right turns, etc.). Fifty percent of traffic citations issued by the Traffic Company are related to violations identified by Vision Zero.

The Traffic Enforcement unit is also assigned to all escort details involving dignitaries, parades, demonstrations, and funerals. Dignitary escorts for heads of states, including the President of the United States, require a large number of sworn personnel for safe execution. A safe number of motorcycle officers, referred to internally as “Solos”, for a presidential escort is 50. The Solos also get requests from the Field Operations Bureau and District Stations to assist with traffic for events, demonstrations, marches, and parades. For many large events that span multiple districts, Traffic Company will plan and execute the event planning, deployment, and facilitation. Solos are also used as the primary units for incidents of stunt driving.

The Project Team employed a workload-based methodology based on the number of traffic violations issued in combination with an operational assessment based on escort staffing and Traffic Enforcement’s team-based deployment strategy to determine recommended staffing for Officers in the unit. Based on 2019 traffic violation data that includes 42,971 citations issued by SFPD, and operational need for escorts and deployed teams, the Project Team recommends additional Officers for the Traffic Enforcement Unit. For appropriate supervision across days and shifts, the Project Team recommends additional Sergeants using the ratio-based span of control methodology.

Traffic Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Traffic Enforcement	32	50	+18	0	0	0
Lieutenant	3	4	+1			
Sergeant	2	6	+4			
Officer	27	40	+13			

Traffic Company – Commercial Vehicle Unit (CVU)

The Commercial Vehicle Unit (CVU) is responsible for enforcing commercial vehicle laws throughout the City and investigates commercial vehicle collisions resulting in death or serious bodily injury. The unit also reviews hit and runs, performs vehicle inspections, and collaborates with outside agencies on related commercial vehicle issues. Unit members also handle forensic reconstruction on serious collisions as well as most officer-involved shootings (OIS) and assists other investigative units with reconstructing crime scenes. The unit also serves as the Department's subject matter experts for traffic-related Department General Orders (DGOs) and Department Notices (DNs).

Conducting commercial vehicle enforcement has been difficult due to lack of staffing and other responsibilities. CVU is currently staffed with one Sergeant and one Officer and both positions are on-call 24/7. Currently there are no tracked workload measures so these positions are considered non-scalable for this assessment.

Traffic Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Commercial Vehicle	2	2	0	0	0	0
Sergeant	1	1	0			
Officer	1	1	0			

Traffic Company – Stunt Driving Response Unit (SDRU)

The Stunt Driving Response Unit was established in 2020 to address the increasing number of informal demonstrations of automotive stunts in San Francisco. Stunt driving occurs when vehicles and/or pedestrian spectators block intersections to perform vehicle maneuvers such as donuts, figure eights, and ghost driving while crowds gather to watch. SDRU is responsible for the Department's response to stunt driving events which have become far more frequent and gained a great deal of media attention over the last year. When necessary, the unit pulls personnel and resources from multiple District Stations when such events occur. Other unit responsibilities include investigating incidents related to street racing, reckless driving, and evasion.

SDRU is currently staffed with two Lieutenants (primarily assigned to Traffic Enforcement to oversee Solos, so not represented below) and two fully dedicated Sergeants. There are currently no workload measures directly related to these positions and they are considered non-scalable for this assessment.

Traffic Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Stunt Driving Response	2	2	0	0	0	0
Sergeant	2	2	0			

Traffic Company – Traffic Collision Investigations Unit (TCIU)

The Traffic Collision Investigations Unit (TCIU) is responsible for investigating vehicle collisions resulting in death or serious injury. The unit also focuses on high-profile collisions and conducts review for hit and run incidents. As part of a September 2021 Department-wide restructuring, TCIU is now under the command of the Deputy Chief of the Special Operations Bureau. TCIU was moved from the Investigations Bureau to SOB to improve communication and solvability and to pool resources.

The unit is currently staffed with one Lieutenant, five Sergeants, and one Officer who is responsible for conducting all video retrieval duties for the unit. The unit also receives support from one Police Services Aide (PSA) assigned to the Investigations Bureau. The Project Team recommends transferring the PSA currently assigned to the Investigations Bureau to the Special Operations Bureau under TCIU, which is reflected in the table below and in the relevant Investigations Bureau section. The Lieutenant serves as the Officer in Charge (OIC) of the unit and the Officer and PSA both provide unique support functions; these positions are classified as non-scalable for this purpose of this assessment.

On average, each Sergeant is assigned a minimum of five collision reports to investigate every week which involves reviewing and gathering information for rebooking cases. The Project Team used a workload-based methodology to determine the recommended number of Sergeants needed to adequately staff the unit; TCIU functions as an investigative unit and so recommended staffing is determined using the number of cases and the amount of time it takes to work each case. In 2019, there were 266 cases assigned, each taking approximately 48 hours to complete (including case workup and rebooking). Based on these measures, TCIU needs three additional Sergeants to handle the unit's caseload.

Traffic Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Traffic Coll. Investigations	7	10	+3	0	1	+1
Lieutenant	1	1	0			
Sergeant	5	8	+3			
Officer	1	1	0			
Police Services Aide (PSA)				0	1	+1

Muni Enforcement

Muni Enforcement is overseen by one Lieutenant who manages the Muni Response Team (MRT), the Muni Task Force (MTF), and the MTA K-9 Unit. All units operate in close coordination with the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's (SFMTA) Security, Investigations, and Enforcement Section. The SFMTA directly funds personnel assigned to SFPD's Muni Enforcement Division via Work Order budget agreements. There are two types of work orders between SFPD's Muni Enforcement and SFMTA: Operational-Funded Work Orders and Grant-Funded Work Orders. Operational Work Orders are fee-based agreements where SFPD is paid – meaning, positions are funded – following services rendered. Grant-Funded Work Orders are agreements where SFPD makes an upfront commitment to provide specific services via funded positions; funds for positions that are not actually staffed may ultimately be paid back to SFMTA. Although the Muni Enforcement Team is funded by SFMTA, staffing has been limited due staffing shortages throughout the Department. The Lieutenant position is a leadership position and therefore it is considered non-scalable for this assessment. Recommended staffing for the remaining positions in Muni Enforcement is shown in this section.

Traffic Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Muni Enforcement	1	1	0	0	0	0
Lieutenant	1	1	0			

Muni Response Team (MRT)

The Muni Response Team (MRT) provides a uniformed presence in the transit system and assists with transit enforcement and special events. The unit is currently staffed with one Sergeant and four Officers who primarily focus on enforcement in the downtown corridor and along Market Street, but are also frequently deployed throughout the City based on areas of increased ridership. Uniformed presence is used to deter crime by conducting high visibility patrol. MRT is responsible for writing initial investigation reports for incidents that occur on SFMTA property (e.g., metro stations and yards) and officers in the unit work closely with Muni agents to assist in Muni investigations.

During special events, Muni Enforcement writes operational orders for officer deployment on SFMTA public transit; MRT officers assigned to these operations aim to protect life and property, maintain law and order, facilitate the flow of traffic if needed, and provide a highly visible uniformed presence to deter any potential acts of terrorism within the SFMTA transit system.

The Officer positions within the Muni Response Team are funded through an Operational Work Order in which SFMTA pays for services rendered by SFPD. This is the main driving “metric” for staffing and deployment. Additionally, Matrix Consulting Group previously identified a ratio-based methodology based on officers per ridership figure as a relevant staffing metric for MRT. In this staffing analysis, the Project Team uses a ratio based on daily ridership in the transit system to determine recommended staffing

levels. In 2019, the average weekday ridership was estimated at 700,000⁵, and the table below shows the various ratios that can be utilized based on the sworn officer-to-ridership ratio desired.

SFMTA - MRT Sworn Staffing Analysis	
Daily Ridership Ratio	# of Sworn Staff
1:175k	4
1:150k	5
1:125k	6
1:100k	7

The Project Team recommends maintaining current staffing levels based the existing SFMTA Work Order and an officer-to-ridership ratio of 1:175,000. This level can be changed based on Department priorities and staffing availability, citywide initiatives, and changes in SFMTA ridership figures.

Traffic Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Muni Response Team (MRT)	5	5	0	0	0	0
Sergeant	1	1	0			
Officer	4	4	0			

Muni Task Force (MTF)

The Muni Task Force (MTF) is the plainclothes investigative unit that specifically addresses criminal activity in the transit system through proactive and reactive investigative efforts. MTF focuses on investigations regarding Muni-related incidents, yet also works closely with other units in the Investigations Bureau and at the District Stations. On average, MTF has approximately 19 to 30 active cases, each taking roughly two to four weeks to close.

Positions within MTF are paid through a Grant-Funded Work Order with SFMTA. In prior years, Muni Task Force included one Sergeant and seven Officers; however, due to shifting priorities and SFPD resource availability, MTF staffing has been significantly reduced. One Sergeant and one Officer are currently assigned to MTF and grant funds have been repurposed for overtime to support the Muni Task Force. The Project Team recommends the addition of six grant-funded Officers to staff the Muni Task Force with a team of one Sergeant and seven Officers per the level specified in the Grant-Funded Work Order.

Traffic Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Muni Task Force (MTF)	2	8	+6	0	0	0
Sergeant	1	1	0			
Officer	1	7	+6			

⁵ Per published SFMTA ridership numbers available here: <https://www.sfmta.com/reports/muni-ridership>

MTA K-9 Unit

The MTA K-9 Unit is the explosive threat assessment and detection resource that serves the City's transit system. Canine handlers with their canine partners trained in explosive detection patrol the Muni transit environment, conducting spot checks of metro stations, cable car turnarounds, Muni historic sites, maintenance facilities, and warehouses. MTA K-9 Unit teams are deployed in the transit system during special events and commute hours as a terrorism deterrent. The MTA K-9 Unit also provides support to the Tactical K-9 Unit and the Airport K-9 Unit as needed. Due to the MTA K-9 Unit's advanced training, they may support other jurisdictions that do not have access to these resources. Similar to the Muni Response Team, the positions within the MTA K-9 Unit are funded through an Operational Work Order in which SFMTA pays for services rendered by SFPD, and the canines in the unit are owned by the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) and paid for by SFMTA. Funding, ownership, and canine availability are the metrics that determine staffing for the MTA K-9 unit. Given the current operational funding and resource arrangements and the unique duties of this unit, the non-scaling methodology is used to determine staffing. The unit is currently staffed with one Sergeant, four Officers, and five dogs.

Traffic Division						
	<i>SWORN</i>			<i>CIVILIAN</i>		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
MTA K-9 Team	5	5	0	0	0	0
Sergeant	1	1	0			
Officer	4	4	0			

Tactical Division

The Tactical Division is comprised of the Special Weapons and Tactics (SWAT) Team, the Explosive Ordinance Disposal Unit (EOD), the Honda Unit, the Mounted Unit, and the Canine (“K-9”) Unit. The Tactical Division also oversees the Specialists Team and the Crisis/Hostage Negotiation Team (C/HNT), which include members who possess specialized training and hold other full-time assignments in the Department, yet are utilized in situations that warrant specific expertise. Recommended staffing for the Tactical Division is shown below followed by a description of each unit and its role and function within the Department.

Tactical Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Administration	1	1	0	1	1	0
SWAT	28	34	+6			
EOD	8	8	0			
Honda	14	25	+11			
Mounted	5	5	0	5	6	+1
Citywide K-9	5	6	+1			
DIVISION TOTAL	61	79	+18	6	7	+1

Tactical Division – Administration

The Tactical Division is overseen by a Captain that reports directly to the Deputy Chief of Special Operations. The Captain is supported by one Clerk. Both positions are unique and are considered non-scalable for the purpose of this assessment.

Tactical Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Administration	1	1	0	1	1	0
Captain	1	1	0			
Clerk				1	1	0

Special Weapons and Tactics (SWAT) Team

SWAT provides a variety of tactical-related and support services to the Department during critical incidents, high-risk search warrants, protection of officers and civilian during high-profile events, dignitary protection, and demonstrations. SWAT is tasked with leading crowd control events. On a weekly basis, SWAT is deployed to patrol designated hot spot areas of San Francisco based on current trends in violent crime such as shootings, homicides, and narcotics activity. SWAT also assists units in the Investigations Bureau with surveillance and with arresting violent wanted suspects.

SWAT provides training in crowd control, critical incidents, and chemical agents to officers and Academy recruits. In addition, SWAT assists in training officers in the Critical Mindset Coordinated Response (CMCR) Course, provides schools and private companies with trainings (e.g., active shooter trainings), and

is called out to provide expertise in addressing incidents with barricaded suspects. Increased Department-wide training that facilitates “time and distance” in these critical situations have increased SWAT callouts and the need for specialized expertise. One SWAT team is always on call 24/7.

The Project Team determined SWAT Team recommended staffing levels using the fixed-post methodology and an assessment of operational need. The SWAT team is divided into four teams that should consist of one Sergeant and seven Officers based on industry standard span of control and on required duties of the unit. Based on this methodology, the Project Team recommends six additional Officers to field a fourth SWAT team and fulfill operational coverage needs of the Department.

Tactical Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
SWAT	28	34	+6	0	0	0
Lieutenant	2	2	0			
Sergeant	4	4	0			
Officer	22	28	+6			

Explosive Ordinance Disposal Unit (EOD)

EOD provides explosive and ordinance identification, removal, and detonation. EOD responds to critical incidents and calls of suspicious devices and conduct sweeps during parades and concerts and in areas where large crowds gather such as political events and dignitary visits. EOD also provides training on explosives to Department members.

The Project Team determined the recommended EOD staffing levels using the fixed-post methodology given the unique expertise that the EOD unit provides to Department operations.

Tactical Division							
		SWORN			CIVILIAN		
		Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
EOD		8	8	0	0	0	0
	Sergeant	1	1	0			
	Officer	7	7	0			

Honda Unit

The Honda Unit is primarily responsible for patrolling the downtown corridor, Golden Gate Park, and other City parks and beaches throughout San Francisco on dual sport motorcycles. The Hondas are a critical part of SFPD’s directed enforcement. Like the SWAT Team, the Hondas are on weekly rotating assignment amongst the ten District Stations and are deployed to areas with higher rates of vehicle burglaries, for example. The Hondas play a key role in crowd control and enforcement for demonstrations and special events such as Outside Lands, Pride, and other parades.

Like SWAT, the Honda Unit operates in a team format. A Lieutenant serves as the Officer in Charge (OIC) of the unit. Staffing for this leadership position is determined using the non-scaling methodology. Over

the last two to three years, the Honda Unit has downsized from four full teams to three modified teams. The Project Team determined Honda Unit recommended staffing levels using the fixed-post methodology in which there are four teams that each consist of five Officers and one Sergeant (based on span of control). Department priorities and resource availability should determine the total size of the Honda Unit and number of teams going forward.

Tactical Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Honda	14	25	+11	0	0	0
Lieutenant	1	1	0			
Sergeant	3	4	+1			
Officer	10	20	+10			

Mounted Unit

The Mounted Unit is responsible for patrolling Golden Gate Park around the stables and for the upkeep and maintenance of the horses in the unit. The Mounted Unit is also detailed to ceremonial duties and parades, swearing in for City officials, color guard for funerals, National Night Out events, and school field trips. The Mounted Unit (equine) is a voter-approved legislative directive and thus its existence is mandated (though not its size). The Mounted unit is supported by civilian Stable Attendants who are responsible for the care and maintenance of the stable itself must provide 24/7 coverage; one additional Stable Attendant is recommended so that this position is staffed across the week on all shifts. The Project Team determined recommended staffing levels using the non-scaling methodology given the unique duties and responsibilities of the unit and the legislative directive that requires the Department to maintain a Mounted Unit.

Tactical Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Mounted	5	5	0	5	6	+1
Sergeant	1	1	0			
Officer	4	4	0			
Stable Attendants				5	6	+1

Citywide Canine ("K-9") Unit

The Citywide K-9 Unit supports patrol and provides canine resources to assist in searches by tracking and locating suspects in conditions where normal searches are higher-risk. Canines are only authorized to search for suspects who are wanted for a felony. The K-9 Unit conducts building sweeps as necessary in residences, warehouses, and schools. Additionally, canines are trained to detect bombs, narcotics, and other contraband in secret areas in which canine searches are most appropriate. Moreover, the City is potentially exposed to weapons of mass destruction (WMD) opportunities given its high profile and geographic locale; therefore, the use of "bomb dogs" is considered best practice. The Project Team determined recommended Citywide K-9 Unit staffing levels using the non-scaling methodology given the

unique duties and responsibilities of the unit. Furthermore, the Project Team recommends the addition of one Sergeant to supervise the unit, using the ratio-based span of control methodology.

Tactical Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
K-9 Citywide	5	6	+1	0	0	0
Sergeant	0	1	+1			
Officer	5	5	0			

Specialists Team

Note: Specialists and members trained in Crisis/Hostage Negotiation are assigned to the District Stations in the Field Operations Bureau. These members possess specialized skills and training and are utilized by the Special Operations Bureau as necessary.

Specialists are patrol officers assigned to District Stations who are trained to support the SWAT Team. Specialists work part-time in Special Operations in that they can be redeployed when on duty for a specific call out that warrants their skills and expertise. Specialists assist with search warrants, critical incidents, and special events, and support SWAT in dignitary protection. Specialists provide rapid response teams for demonstrations and mass arrests and have trained snipers. Since Specialists are assigned to District Stations, they assist patrol with everyday operations that may not necessarily activate SWAT. Specialists go through an application, testing, and interview process to garner their credentials.

Crisis/Hostage Negotiation Team (C/HNT)

Similar to Specialists, C/HNT members are assigned to other units in the Department and work in a part-time capacity as negotiators. C/HNT are on call and respond to situations with barricaded suspects and critical and non-critical incidents, and assist in search warrants and in California Highway Patrol (CHP) calls. C/HNT members respond to incidents where subjects are not responsive or are not cooperating with law enforcement. When dealing with barricaded suspects, increased training to create time and distance has also increased C/HNT callouts.

On any given day, there are 6 to 25 C/HNT members working. There are currently 40 active members total who are C/HNT trained due to an increase in these types of calls for service. Over the last three years, C/HNT callouts have increased: in 2018 there were 29, in 2019 there were 40, and in 2020 there were 79. It appears that this trend will continue; as of August 2021, there were 56 year-to-date.

Homeland Security Division

The Homeland Security Division includes the Homeland Security Unit (HSU), the Marine Unit, and the Department Operations Center (DOC). A Captain oversees the Homeland Security Division; this position is funded through a grant with Urban Areas Security Initiative (UASI). The Captain is supported by one Clerk to assist with the administrative functions of the Division. Both positions are unique and are not scalable to any workload measures.

Homeland Security Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Administration	1	1	0	1	1	0
HSU	3	3	0	1	0	(1)
Marine Unit	6	8	+2			
DOC	17	17	0	8	8	
DIVISION TOTAL	27	29	+2	10	9	(1)

Homeland Security Unit (HSU)

The Homeland Security Unit (HSU) is a vital component in the safekeeping and protection of the City and County of San Francisco. The unit conducts site safety surveys and inspections for key buildings, locations, transit hubs, events, stadiums, arenas, high profile public spaces and structures, areas of large public gatherings, government facilities, consulates, embassies, houses of worship, potential soft target locations, and other notable areas.

HSU gathers intelligence and disseminates it through Department channels and provides weekly briefings to SFPD's Command Staff. HSU is also the Department's liaison with State and Federal Fusion Centers, communicating information to further prevent and respond to all threats and hazards. Furthermore, the unit participates in Silicon Valley Homeland Security Coordination meetings to improve its efforts by collaborating with other nearby Homeland Security agencies.

As part of the unit's responsibilities, HSU plans events throughout the City and supports the Field Operations Bureau's event planning initiatives. For these special events, HSU staffs Command Centers to monitor events and provide intelligence support, command van deployment, and radiological detection. The staffing and security for all events at Oracle Park and Chase Center are also managed through HSU. Additionally, the unit provides training as needed to other SFPD members in topics such as the utilization of radiological detection devices.

The Homeland Security Unit also oversees the Terrorism Liaison Officer (TLO) program, managing and reviewing all TLO incident reports and communicating information through all proper channels.

There are no workload measures associated with these positions, so they are considered **non-scalable** for the purpose of this assessment. As discussed further in the Administration Bureau section of this report, the Project Team recommends centralizing Automotive Service Workers into one unit and therefore the reduction of the Automotive Service Worker is noted here. The position would continue to support the

vehicles within the Homeland Security Division as well as other vehicles throughout the Department as needed.

Homeland Security Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
HSU	3	3	0	1	0	(1)
Lieutenant	1	1	0			
Sergeant	1	1	0			
Officer	1	1	0			
Automotive Service Worker						
				1		(1)

Marine Unit

The San Francisco Police Department Marine Unit is responsible for patrolling over 64 square miles of San Francisco County waterways, overlapping jurisdiction with the United States Coast Guard (USCG) – but the responsibilities and capabilities differ. The USCG is responsible for enforcing Federal laws, while the Marine Unit is responsible for enforcing State and local laws. The mission of the Marine Unit is to support maritime homeland security, law enforcement, and search and rescue operations with local, state, and federal partners. In the course of their duties, Marine Unit members regularly engage in search and rescue missions with the USCG and San Francisco Fire Department as well as other Bay Area law enforcement and fire rescue agencies. These operations include vessels in distress, boating accidents/collisions, and rescue of recreational sports enthusiasts who often get into distress due to the dynamic conditions both on the San Francisco Bay and outside of the Golden Gate. The Marine Unit also responds to investigate or mitigate any criminal activity and maritime-related incidents on San Francisco Bay waters, such as Boating Under the Influence (BUI), theft, vandalism, burglaries in the marinas or piers, drownings, suicides and other deaths, trespassing, unlawful discharge of oil or sewage, and any Port of San Francisco property waterside-related incident. The Marine Unit has a long tradition of being the primary law enforcement agency in the San Francisco Bay Region and is a primary responder in case of major catastrophes including, but not limited to, earthquakes and tsunamis. The Marine Unit is prepared to assist in disaster mitigation and resumption of commerce/transportation through sub-surface sonar inspection of piers and docks and first-responder trans-Bay transport via water.

In addition to the Marine Unit's primary responsibilities, the unit provides safety oversight and assistance at numerous, large waterfront events, including fireworks shows, Fleet Week, US Naval vessel security detail, POTUS security and waterside screenings, and various large-scale swim events across the Bay each year. Additionally, the Unit maintains vessels outfitted with highly specialized gear for low-visibility search missions on the surface and comprise the Department Dive Team for underwater victim/evidence search and recovery missions through use of highly technical underwater robots, sonar equipment, and SCUBA dive operations.

The current staffing for the Marine Unit consists of two Sergeants and four Officers divided into two separate teams to cover all seven days in the week. For proper officer safety and operation of each Marine vessel and to promote readiness of the Dive Team, protocols dictate that each boat should be

staffed with three Officers and one Sergeant supervisor. Due to the unique duties and responsibilities of these positions, they are considered non-scalable for the purpose of this assessment. Department priorities and resource availability should determine the total size of the Marine Unit and number of teams going forward. Based on the current number of teams and required staffing on each team, the Project Team recommends two additional Officers.

Homeland Security Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Marine Unit	6	8	+2	0	0	0
Sergeant	2	2	0			
Officer	4	6	+2			

Department Operations Center (DOC)

The primary function of the Department Operations Center (DOC) is to coordinate activity, information, and requests for assistance between patrol and investigative units. In addition, the unit provides timely notifications to Command Staff for their situational awareness and functions as an Emergency Operations Center (EOC) during planned and spontaneous events/incidents.

The Project Team recommends that the Department explore options for civilianizing the Department Operations Center (DOC). A large portion of DOC staffing does not require law enforcement expertise. Currently DOC is staffed with sworn members who are less than full duty (and therefore not fully deployable to other assignments) based on some sort of temporary modified duty (TMD) classification or a pending disciplinary investigation. Therefore, sworn members in this assignment are often temporarily assigned to provide call center services and may not provide a high level of customer service based on the transitional nature of the assignment and other dynamics between the member and the Department. For both continuity and to promote high quality service, the Department should consider the implications of staffing DOC with civilian staff such as Police Services Aides (PSAs) or another call center-oriented classification and utilizing sworn members on TMD in areas such as Written Directives in the Strategic Management Bureau that may require sworn insight and expertise.

For those members with pending disciplinary cases, the Department should consider either staffing these members in a unit that does not have a customer service component or not utilizing these members at all until their investigations have reached a resolution. Civilianizing the unit will require that the Department determine how to address the less than full duty sworn members who currently hold a DOC assignment.

Homeland Security Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
DOC	17	17	0	8	8	0
Lieutenant	1	1	0			
Sergeant	4	4	0			
Officer	12	12	0			
Police Services Aide (PSA)				8	8	0

Urban Areas Security Initiative (UASI)

The Urban Areas Security Initiative (UASI) unit was implemented in 2013 within the Homeland Security Division, but later reorganized as a separate Division that reports directly to the Special Operations Bureau Deputy Chief. The unit works closely with the Bay Area UASI to enhance public safety and security throughout the Bay Area, and is comprised of local, state, and federal subject matter experts working to achieve Homeland Security goals and objectives. The unit works on special projects for the Department, such as upgrading Police Intercommunications (PIC) radio, Personal Radio Nuclear Detector (PRND), as well as grant writing for equipment, training, and infrastructure funding.

Within UASI, there is one Lieutenant who serves as the liaison between SFPD and the Department of Emergency Management (DEM). The liaison assists with ensuring that policy and procedural issues are resolved, coordinating with DEM for the Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) project, and acting as the Department's Disaster Coordinator. The liaison also works closely with HSU and DOC to respond to various special events and disasters. Due to the unique duties and responsibilities of this position, it is considered non-scalable for the purpose of this assessment.

Similar to the Muni Task Force, the positions within UASI aside from the DEM/EOC Liaison are grant-funded. The existing grant agreement and funding determines staffing levels and therefore the Project Team recommends maintaining current staffing as agreed upon with the Department's regional partners in the existing work order.

Urban Areas Security Initiative						
	<i>SWORN</i>			<i>CIVILIAN</i>		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
UASI	2	2	0	1	1	0
Captain	1	1	0			
Lieutenant	1	1	0			
Principal Admin Analyst				1	1	0

Administrative Services Bureau

Overview

The Administrative Services Bureau (also referred to as the Administration Bureau) consists of three Divisions and one Unit: Administration Division, Academy Division, Staff Services Division, and Crime Information Services Unit (CISU). The Administration Division includes the Department's Fleet and Facilities units and the Academy Division manages training, certification, and professional development for both Recruit Officers and Department personnel. The Staff Services Division includes units that oversee a broad range of administrative functions that support the Department, including recruiting and backgrounding Police Officer applicants, processing payroll and medical accommodations, and conducting analyses on staffing and deployment. The Crime Information Services Unit is responsible for a wide range of functions in Department recordkeeping, information provision, and property control.

Recommended Staffing


The table below shows recommended staffing for the Administration Bureau by Division. The Bureau has sufficient sworn staffing and the Project Team recommends civilianizing Records Management in CISU. The Bureau has demonstrated need for professional staff in key areas including the Fleet and Facilities unit in the Administration Division, in the Staff Services Division, and in CISU to support Records Management civilianization efforts.

Administrative Services Bureau						
Division or Unit	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Administration - Executive	2	2	0	1	1	0
Office of Equity and Inclusion	2	3	+1	0	1	+1
Administration Division	2	2	0	29	39	+10
Academy Division	42	42	0	7	7	0
Staff Services Division	19	19	0	49	54	+5
Crime Information Services	17	12	(5)	35	46	+11
BUREAU TOTAL	84	80	(4)	121	148	+27

Organizational Chart



Administrative Services Bureau



Methodologies Used to Determine Staffing

Staffing for the Administrative Services Bureau is determined using the following methodologies.

Workload-based Methodology

A workload-based methodology is used to determine staffing for certain units such as Background Investigations, for which the number of potential applicant cases multiplied by the time per case is calculated to generate workload hours and subsequently the number of staff required.

Ratio-based Methodology

A ratio-based methodology is used to determine staffing for many units in the Administration Bureau. Examples include Fleet and Facilities, where a ratio based on the number of Department vehicles and Department facilities, respectively, is used to determine recommended staffing; the Range, where a ratio based on the number of sworn members in the Department is used; and various units in the Academy Division, where Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) mandates instructor-to-trainee ratios in training classes.

Non-scaling Methodology

An elective or non-scaling methodology is used to determine staffing for leadership positions that do not scale based on any metrics and for units that fulfill specific Department objectives such as Force Tactics Field Options.

Recommended Staffing by Division and Unit

Administrative Services – Administration

The Administration Bureau is overseen by a Deputy Chief who reports directly to the Assistant Chief (Chief of Staff). A Commander reports directly to the Deputy Chief and provides assistance in the management of the Administration Bureau and also directly oversees the Office of Equity and Inclusion (OEI). The Deputy Chief is supported by an Executive Secretary who manages emails, scheduling, and other administrative support assignments. Given the unique leadership and support functions of these positions, staffing is determined using the non-scaling methodology.

Administrative Services Bureau - Administration						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Bureau Admin	2	2	0	1	1	0
Deputy Chief	1	1	0			
Commander	1	1	0			
Executive Secretary				1	1	0

Office of Equity and Inclusion (OEI)

The Office of Equity and Inclusion (OEI) was established in March 2021 to create and sustain an equitable, supportive, and professional environment for all Department members. OEI was created per the Mayor's mandate to implement racial equity and action plan initiatives at the department level. To ensure that OEI is vested with the appropriate level of importance and influence to drive significant Department initiatives, the unit reports directly to the Commander of the Administration Bureau. OEI works in collaboration with all units, Divisions, and Bureaus in the Department and undertakes activities to promote racial equity at the line staff level. OEI interfaces with internal and external stakeholders – Command Staff, various Commissions, Board of Supervisors – to share activity results. OEI is a result of and a continuing component of the Department's Collaborative Reform Initiative (CRI).

The unit undertakes special projects such as working with external vendor BiasSync, a science-based solution for conscious management of unconscious bias, to administer the program to all Department members. OEI is also tasked with overseeing the Department's retention program and carrying out various other policy and reporting functions related to racial equity impact. In the field, OEI visits District Stations and other Department assignments and shares information about the unit, holding small group discussions and follow ups with individual members as needed.

The Office of Equity and Inclusion is currently managed by a Lieutenant with a support from one Officer who represents OEI in the field and is responsible for all presentation-related follow up. The Project Team recommends the addition of one Sergeant and one Senior Administrative Analyst to align the growing workload of OEI with the appropriate job classifications. The Sergeant position would manage all administration for OEI, enabling the Lieutenant to focus on high-level strategic planning and oversight. Moreover, OEI interfaces regularly with executive-level City leadership including SFPD Command Staff and

Commissioners; a Sergeant would be the appropriate rank to interface with these stakeholders. Many of OEI's current and planned initiatives are data-driven, and a Senior Administrative Analyst would be responsible for all research and data analysis required for OEI's projects.

Administrative Services Bureau						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
OEI	2	3	+1	0	1	+1
Lieutenant	1	1	0			
Sergeant	0	1	+1			
Police Officer	1	1	0			
Senior Administrative Analyst				0	1	+1

Administration Division

The Administration Division includes the Bureau's Administrative Office and two units that are responsible for managing the Department's physical assets: Fleet and Facilities. Fleet and Facilities are responsible for managing the Department's vehicles and buildings and facilities, respectively.

Although the Department has its own staff to monitor and record maintenance needs for its physical assets, significant maintenance is generally performed by other City departments. Fleet and Facilities both currently operate under a decentralized model in which line-level staff do not report directly to Fleet or Facilities, but rather to their respective station Commanding Officer (e.g., Vehicle Maintenance personnel at the District Stations report to the respective Captain).

Recommended staffing for the Administration Division is shown below, followed by a discussion of the units in the Division.

Administration Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Fleet and Facilities Admin	2	2	0	2	2	0
Fleet				14	18	+4
Facilities				13	19	+6
DIVISION TOTAL	2	2	0	29	39	+10

Office and Fleet and Facilities Administration

The Administration Division Office is overseen by a Sergeant with support from a Management Assistant. The Sergeant reports directly to the Captain of Fleet and Facilities Administration and also provides a high-level administrative support as needed to the Deputy Chief of the Administration Bureau. The Management Assistant is responsible for managing requests, monitoring workflows, and assisting with special projects. Both roles are unique and are classified as non-scalable. Centralized Fleet and Facilities are overseen by a Captain, with administrative support from a Secretary. Both roles are unique and are classified as non-scalable.

Administration Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Office	1	1	0	1	1	0
Sergeant	1	1	0			
Management Assistant				1	1	0
Fleet and Facilities	1	1	0	1	1	0
Captain	1	1	0			
Secretary				1	1	0

Fleet

The Fleet unit is responsible for managing the Department's vehicles. The Fleet Manager is responsible for managing the whole unit and overseeing its projects. The Auto Service Worker Supervisor provides direct supervision to the Auto Service Workers who perform the functional maintenance work of the unit. Both leadership roles are unique and are classified as non-scalable.

Auto Service Workers maintain DMV records, oversee the writing of vehicle and equipment specifications, direct the outfitting of marked and unmarked vehicles, transport vehicles to and from their assigned stations for maintenance and repair, and respond to service requests. There are two Auto Service Workers who report directly to the centralized Fleet unit. Generally, each of the 10 District Stations are assigned an Auto Service Worker⁶, and some additional Divisions and units such as the Academy and Homeland Security Unit (HSU) are also assigned Auto Service Workers at this time.

Recommendation: The Department should consider realigning the reporting structure so that all Auto Service Workers report directly to the Fleet Manager. Currently, the majority of Auto Service Workers are assigned to and physically report to the District Stations. Centralized command would consolidate span of control over this technical service line and improve the Fleet Manager's ability to manage the Department's fleet support needs and improve coordination with Auto Service Workers to support other areas more effectively. For example, some District Stations are less busy than others and there may be instances in which a Station does not need a full-time Auto Service Worker. Centralized management would allow effective reallocation of resources when needed.

Administration Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Fleet				14	18	+4
Fleet Manager				0	1	+1
Auto Srv. Worker Supervisor				1	1	0
Auto Service Worker				13	16	+3

⁶ As of September 2021, one District Station is not officially assigned an Auto Service Worker.

Staffing Methodologies by Position

- Fleet Manager and Auto Service Worker Supervisor are supervisory positions that are classified as non-scalable.
- Auto Service Worker staffing is determined using the ratio-based methodology.
 - One Auto Service Worker is assigned to each District Station. Each District Station has multiple vehicles that require servicing and maintenance and therefore one dedicated Auto Service Worker is appropriate.
 - For vehicles not assigned to the District Stations, a ratio of one Auto Service Worker to 150 vehicles is appropriate. Approximately half (506 out of 1,041) of vehicles currently supported by an Automotive Service Worker are assigned to the District Stations, and there are 405 vehicles that are currently unsupported by an Automotive Service Worker.

Auto Service Worker Staffing	
# Supported Non-District Station Vehicles	535
# Unsupported Vehicles	405
Total Non-District Station Vehicles to Support	940
Total Hours to Staff	940
Ratio: Auto Service Worker per Vehicle	150
Full-time Positions Required <i>(in addition to District Station support)</i>	6

At the time of the study, there were 13 Auto Service Workers; three additional Auto Service Workers are required based on the ratio-based methodology and calculations shown above.

Facilities

Facility Coordinators inspect and monitor the Department's facilities for preventative and corrective maintenance needs and work with San Francisco Public Works and the San Francisco Real Estate Division to coordinate all maintenance work, in addition to a range of other activities necessary to manage the Department's facilities and physical assets. The Facilities unit is responsible for maintaining 37 buildings used by the Department. Currently, there are 10 Facility Coordinators assigned to each of the 10 District Stations and the remaining 27 facilities are supported primarily by the Building and Grounds Maintenance Superintendent and Maintenance Planner. An eleventh Facility Coordinator/Assistant Materials Coordinator was added in 2018 to assist the Building and Grounds Superintendent and Maintenance Planner in supporting the 27 other facilities previously unsupported by a Facility Coordinator.

In the Facilities unit, the Building and Grounds Maintenance Superintendent manages memoranda of understandings (MOUs) and facility projects and the Maintenance Planner provides indirect oversight to the Facility Coordinators; however, only one of the Facility Coordinators (Assistant Materials Coordinator) reports directly to the Facilities unit. The other 10 positions report to the respective Commanding Officer at the District Station to which they are assigned.

Recommendation: The Department should consider realigning the reporting structure so that all Facility Coordinators report directly to the Building and Grounds Maintenance Superintendent and/or the Maintenance Planner. Similar to the Fleet reporting structure, the majority of the Facility Coordinators report to the Commanding Officer of their respective assigned District Station. Centralized command would consolidate span of control and promote efficiencies in managing all facilities across the Department.

Administration Division						
	<i>SWORN</i>			<i>CIVILIAN</i>		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Facilities				13	19	+6
Maintenance Superintendent				1	1	0
Maintenance Planner				1	1	0
Assist. Materials Coordinator				1	1	0
Facilities Coordinator				10	16	+6

Staffing Methodologies by Position

- Given the leadership roles and unique project-based duties of the positions, the Building and Grounds Maintenance Superintendent and the Maintenance Planner position are classified as non-scalable.
- Facility Coordinator staffing is determined using a ratio-based methodology. A ratio of one Facility Coordinator per District Station is adequate to oversee the asset management program for those facilities. Since the remaining 27 facilities are not as active as the 10 District Stations, a Facility Coordinator has greater capacity to support multiple non-District Station facilities.
 - The Project Team estimates that a ratio of one Facility Coordinator per four non-District Station facilities is adequate to manage the Department's asset management program. This will enable the Building and Grounds Superintendent and Maintenance Planner to focus on high-level project management and planning for the Department instead of conducting regular preventative and corrective monitoring and maintenance. This ratio infers that six Facility Coordinators are needed to adequately support the non-Station facilities. Altogether, the Project Team estimates that 16 Facility Coordinators (and one Assistant Materials Coordinator) are required to support the Facilities Division.

Academy Division

The Academy Division (referred to as the Academy) includes the Professional Development Office, the Field Training Office (FTO), Field Tactics Force Options unit, and the Basic Recruit Course. The mission of the San Francisco Police Department's Regional Training Academy is to develop and deliver comprehensive, innovative, and timely education and training to Recruit Officers and Department members. The Academy also aims to inspire leadership, enhance mindsets and skillsets, and manifest mastery in members' professional and personal development.

Recommended staffing for the Academy is shown below, followed by a discussion of the units in the Division.

Academy Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Administration	1	1	0	1	1	0
Professional Development Office	6	6	0	5	5	0
Field Training Office	4	4	0	1	1	0
Field Tactics Force Options	5	5	0			
Range	12	12	0			
Basic Recruit Course	14	14	0			
DIVISION TOTAL	42	42	0	7	7	0

Academy – Administration

The Academy Division is overseen by a Captain with administrative support from a Secretary. Both roles are unique and are classified as non-scalable.

Academy Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Administration	1	1	0	1	1	0
Captain	1	1	0			
Secretary				1	1	0

Professional Development Office

The Professional Development Office includes the Professional Development Unit (PDU), the Video Production Unit, and various other assignments staffed with single individuals that are responsible for functions such as managing Advanced Officer (AO) training in the Department.

The Professional Development Office monitors and coordinates the ongoing in-service training needs of the Department, which entails providing instruction to in-service members, Recruit Officers, and Police Services Aides (PSAs). The Professional Development Unit also serves as a resource for Department members who are conducting their own training needs identification and implementation, but need assistance related to course identification, professional development, and training follow up.

Academy Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Professional Development Office	6	6	0	5	5	0
Lieutenant	1	1	0			
Sergeant	4	4	0			
Officer	1	1	0			
Management Assistant				3	3	0
Media Production Technician				2	2	0

Staffing Methodologies by Position

Staff responsibilities are assigned as follows:

- The Professional Development Office is overseen by a Lieutenant; due to the leadership responsibilities of the position, it is classified as non-scalable.
- Sergeant positions:
 - One Sergeant is a manger position with staffing based on span of control set at a ratio of roughly 1:7.
 - One Sergeant is responsible for all coordination and logistics for Advanced Officer – Continued Professional Training (AO/CPT). This is a mandatory training all sworn members must take on a regularly basis per Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) and Department of Justice (DOJ) guidelines.
 - One Sergeant serves as the Leadership Development Institute (LDI) Program Coordinator. This position is non-scaling with staffing based on the Department’s objectives for administering this cohort-based, yearlong leadership program for sworn and civilian staff.
 - One Sergeant is responsible for Reserves/Roll Call; staffing for this position is determined using the non-scaling methodology.
- The Officer position serves as a POST/College Liaison Coordinator whose primary duties are to manage the POST certifications for the entire Department. This position also teaches booking and detention as a co-instructor, assists with AO training, and manages the billing for training courses. This position is non-scalable and electively staffed based on operational need.
- The Management Assistant positions are described below. As there are no workload metrics associated with these positions, staffing is determined using the non-scaling methodology. The Department should develop and monitor workload metrics so that in future analyses, staffing can be determined using a workload-based or ratio-based methodology.
 - One Management Assistant is the AO training manager and monitors Continuing Professional Training (CPT) records for the Department to ensure ongoing compliance.
 - On Management Assistant is the outside training manager and reviews, approves, and processes all outside training requests for the Department.
 - One Management Assistant is the internal training manager and processes billing for the unit and monitors City-mandated training requirements.
- Media Production Technicians in the Video Production Unit are responsible for producing digital media used in a range of trainings for the Department, from Academy training to ongoing in-

service training. The work of a Media Production Technician is complex: staff must script productions, coordinate with subject matter experts and other stakeholders to verify script content, cast, coordinate with staff for productions, record the production, and edit productions for release. Staffing for these positions is classified as non-scalable given the unique skillset required for the role.

- One Sergeant serves as the liaison to the Institute of Criminal Investigation (ICI), a regional POST training program. This position serves as the Institute's administrator and is responsible for managing the logistics of hosting this regional training event periodically throughout each year. Pursuant to a contract with the State to administer this POST program, the current deployment of a Sergeant to run the Institute satisfies minimum staffing requirements. Due to the contract requirement, this position is elective and non-scalable.

Field Training Office (FTO)

The Field Training Office (FTO) manages and coordinates the Department's field training program in which Recruit Officers who graduate from the Basic Recruit Course are then assigned to a training-designated District Station and are paired with a Training Officer to gain experience and training in the field. FTO oversees the progress of trainees and acts as the departmental liaison with the Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) on program compliance issues; the program is administered at the seven training District Stations. FTO consults with other City Departments such as the Department of Human Resources and Americans with Disabilities Act Unit and internally with the Behavioral Sciences Unit and sub-units in the Basic Recruit Course including Report Writing, Physical Training and Defensive Tactics, and Emergency Vehicle Operation Course to conduct remediation on any training and protocol-related deficiencies.

The critical and primary responsibility of FTO is to document and evaluate trainee progress and to address any issues that arise in a timely and effective manner. FTO staff ensures that all the administrative evaluation documents (Daily Observation Reports and Sergeant Weekly Reports) are completed for each trainee. Reviewing Daily Observation Reports (DOR) amounts to a workload average of approximately 30 per day with an additional 30 weekly supervisor reviews, each of which is estimated to approximately 16 to 34 minutes. This includes reviewing trainee ratings and ensuring that ratings are consistent with the standardized evaluation guidelines established by POST. FTO subsequently notes any deficiencies in performance and conducts bi-weekly meetings to problem-solve the trainee's issues.

The FTO Office is responsible for maintaining the rolls of eligible Field Training Officers and Sergeants. The FTO Office ensures program compliance with POST by ensuring all FTO Officers and Sergeants complete the 40-hour certification course, refresher 24-hour course, and Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) training. FTO is also responsible for tracking the Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) monthly evaluations for every probationary officer and coordinating the re-entry of permanent officers from administrative assignments to field work. Every month, the probationary officers have an appraisal completed, consisting of eight pages and six categories. The Field Training Office estimates that each monthly appraisal takes approximately 30 minutes to review and file for compliance. As of September 2021, there

were approximately 60 probationary officers; this number changes dynamically throughout the year based on officers moving from field training to probation and probation to permanent status.

At reporting time, there are 146 certified FTO trainers; however, only 113 are assigned to District Stations that are eligible to receive trainees. As of September 2021, there were 27 trainees in the FTO program, which constitutes a ratio of approximately four eligible trainers for every trainee.

Since 2019, FTO's responsibilities have increased due to additional administrative tasks required to develop policy and training materials. As the number of Recruit Officers graduating from the Basic Recruit Course has declined, FTO has redoubled efforts to monitor trainee progress and remediate performance issues where possible while working to ensure that POST standards and guidelines are being met. Hence, FTO has conducted more bi-weekly performance counseling sessions in an effort to mitigate performance deficiencies reported in FTO reports.

Academy Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Field Training Office	4	4	0	1	1	0
Lieutenant	1	1	0			
Sergeant	2	2	0			
Officer	1	1	0			
Clerk				1	1	0

Staffing Methodologies by Position

- The Lieutenant serves as the Officer in Charge (OIC) of the unit. Due to the unique leadership role, this position is classified as non-scaling.
- The Sergeant and the Officers in the unit conduct all of the coordination and evaluative work of the unit, and the Sergeant can direct and supervise work as necessary. Staffing levels are determined using a ratio-based methodology using a ratio of one staff member for every 10-15 trainees, based on the estimated time needed to review DORs, Weekly Sergeant Reports, PIPs, and other documentation; coordinate with District Stations and POST; ensure Training Officers have updated certifications, etc. Current staffing is appropriate with approximately 30 – 45 trainees in the FTO program; throughout 2021, there have been approximately 27 – 35 trainees at any given time.
- The Clerk position manages all administrative duties of the unit and staffing is classified as non-scaling.

Force Tactics Field Options (FTFO)

Force Tactics Field Options was formed in November 2018 to promote the Department's objective of promoting timely and relevant training so that members are equipped to utilize force tactics and field options that are aligned with the principles of 21st Century Policing. FTFO administers all field tactic and force options trainings, hence providing oversight, consistency, and guidance in sworn members' application of field tactics and force options during encounters with suspects. FTFO provides instruction to members and enhances officers' basic tactical knowledge, skills, and abilities.

FTFO is also responsible for participating in incident review boards as necessary and subsequently preparing training-related analysis and recommendations. Staff are also responsible for conducting reviews of all officer-involved shootings (OIS), in-custody deaths, and other force-related incidents as requested. In 2019 there was a total of 19 force-related incidents reviewed, and 18 in 2020. Each review takes 40 hours on average and results in a written report outlining observations and recommendations for changes in Department policy and training.

It is important to note that a Field Tactics Force Options unit is not typical in other law enforcement agencies, yet SFPD has prioritized a training program that equips members with best practices in field tactics and force options and a concurrent review program to promote a continuous improvement loop. FTFO is a Department priority and directive, and staffing is classified as non-scaling based on the subject matter and the unique service FTFO provides to the Department's sworn workforce.

Academy Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Field Tactics Force Options	5	5	0			
Lieutenant	1	1	0			
Sergeant	2	2	0			
Officer	2	2	0			

Range

Range is responsible for managing and administering firearms training and qualification which all sworn members (including Reserve Officers) in the Department must complete twice per year. Range staff also teaches the initial rifle training courses for all personnel assigned rifles and host other agencies at the range (e.g., San Francisco Sheriff's Department).

Unit workload is based on firearms qualification and training duties for Department members, and therefore, required Range staffing scales based on Department size: the larger the department, the greater the workload. As a result, the staffing methodology used for Range personnel scales based on the number of sworn members in the Department (as civilian-related workloads are minor). Staffing is set as a ratio of 1 FTE for every 200 sworn positions in the Department. The ratio was developed by comparing range-master functions in other large metropolitan agencies.

For Range-related training at the Academy, POST certification requirements mandate an instructor-to-recruit ratio of 1:3. For in-service firearms qualification and training, a ratio of 1:5 is required. Testing and training is scheduled and does not occur concurrently, and so staffing for the Range unit is based upon the number of sworn members in the Department. However, it is important to note that the workload of the Range fluctuates based on Academy classes.

Academy Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Range	12	12	0			
Sergeant	1	1	0			
Officer (Lake Merced)	8	8	0			
Officer (Airport)	3	3	0			

Staffing Methodologies by Position

- One Sergeant oversees the unit. Due to the leadership duties of this position, it is classified as non-scaling in this analysis.
- Staffing for Officers that manage Range operations and train and certify members is established based on a ratio of 1 Range staff member to 200 sworn members in the Department. As of September 2021, there were 2,124 sworn members citywide and at the Airport (both full duty and less than full duty). Using the ratio-based methodology, the Project Team determined that 11 Officers are needed to staff the Range. These Officers are split between the citywide Range at Lake Merced and the Airport Range.
- There is a part-time retiree that assists with administrative tasks in the unit.

Basic Recruit Course

The Basic Recruit Course operates all components of the training academy for Recruit Officers. Basic Recruit Course includes the Recruit Training Office (RTO) as well as the two specific training sections: Physical Fitness/Defensive Tactics (PT/DT) and Emergency Vehicle Operations Course (EVOC).

SFPD runs multiple training classes per year, with the full Basic Recruit Course for new Officers lasting 1,240 hours (roughly 10 months) and the course for lateral officers lasting eight weeks. In fiscal year (FY) 2020, SFPD ran four Basic Recruit Courses and in FY 2021, SFPD ran two Basic Recruit Courses. FY 2020 and FY 2021 in particular were both heavily impacted by the 2020 hiring freeze. In FY 2019, SFPD ran four Basic Recruit Courses and it may be reasonable to assume that this is the best representation of the number of classes the Department will hold going forward. Staffing figures for the units in this section are generally determined using the number of Academy classes operating concurrently and/or the number of Recruit Officers currently in the Academy.

Recommended staffing for Basic Recruit Course is below, followed by a discussion of each unit. Basic Recruit Course is overseen by a Lieutenant (denoted in the Administration section below) who serves as the Officer in Charge (OIC) of the unit and is hence classified as a non-scaling position in this analysis.

Basic Recruit Course						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Administration	1	1	0			
Recruit Training Office (RTO)	6	6	0			
PT/DT	4	4	0			
EVOC	3	3	0			
BRC TOTAL	14	14	0			

Recruit Training Office (RTO)

Recruit Training Office (RTO) is responsible for coordinating, managing, and operating the training academy for all new sworn personnel. In addition to overseeing all training- and qualification-related activities, RTO includes specific training academy sections: Scenarios and Reporting Writing.

Over the past four years 2017 – 2020, the average number of Recruit Officers in each Recruit Class has declined from roughly 50-55 in 2017 and 2018 to roughly 30-35 in 2019 and 2020. This is due partly to the 2020 hiring freeze and partly due to various social, regional, and economic factors that have presented challenges in hiring and recruiting potential law enforcement candidates. For the purpose of this analysis, the Project Team uses a Recruit Class size of 35 entering Recruit Officers and approximates four Recruit Classes per year, with the potential for two Academy classes to be run concurrently. These figures align with current trends and with historical data from the last four years.

Basic Recruit Course						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Recruit Training Office	6	6	0			
Sergeant	2	2	0			
Officer	4	4	0			

Staffing Methodologies by Position

- Two Sergeants serve in leadership roles. One Sergeant is the Basic Coordinator and is responsible for managing and supervising both the training officers and the Recruit Officers as well as instructing when needed. One Sergeant serves as both the Scenario Manager and the Report Writing Instructor, overseeing the programs, the training Officers within, and the Recruit Officers when they are receiving instruction in these specific areas. Due to the unique managerial responsibilities of these roles, they are classified as non-scalable.
- Officers serve as the Scenario Evaluators and Report Writing Instructors. These duties occur periodically throughout the year when testing occurs and are scheduled far in advance; these Officers are also responsible for assisting with instruction. The current POST-approved safety policy mandates one training officer per 25 Recruits. Therefore, Officer staffing is determined using a ratio-based methodology. One Officer provides assistance in the management of Recruit Officers, instructs courses as needed, and is responsible for all data entry and coordination with POST. This position is classified as non-scalable in this analysis.

Physical Training and Defensive Tactics (PT/DT)

PT/DT manages physical training and defensive tactics training for Recruit Officers and manages and coordinates ongoing physical testing and training for in-service members.

Unit responsibilities in defensive tactics training for Recruit Officers includes researching, generating, and implementing lesson plans on arrest and control; staying current on and instructing POST-mandated topics and procedures in physical training/defensive tactics, impact weapon, weaponless defense, and force options; and reviewing reported uses of force to update or amend training, study trends, and report findings. Standards for instructor-to-student ratios for most defensive tactics techniques are mandated in POST guidelines, requiring one training officer for 17 Recruit Officers in physical training and one training officer for 16 Recruit Officers for defensive tactics. Some high intensity defensive activities require a 1:1 ratio; however, each course is broken down and rotated accordingly such that all Recruit Officers are receiving the necessary attention and training. To account for these ranges, the Project Team utilizes a ratio of one training officer to 12 Recruit Officers for the purpose of this analysis.

For in-service personnel, the unit provides continued professional training (CPT). The unit is responsible for developing the curriculum, which incorporates updates to case law, force case studies, and resultant changes to the defensive tactics techniques and protocols instructed to and used by sworn members in the Department.

On the physical training side, the unit coordinates and administers physical fitness exams for both Recruits and in-service personnel. For Recruits, the POST battery outlines five different tasks that must be completed successfully within a certain timeframe: a 1.5-mile run, 500-yard sprint, climbing over a six-foot wall and sprinting 50 yards, climbing over a six-foot fence and sprinting 50 yards, and completing an obstacle course. For in-service personnel, vacation time is awarded based on individual score and members are tested twice per year.

Basic Recruit Course						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
PT/DT	4	4	0			
Sergeant	1	1	0			
Officer	3	3	0			

Staffing Methodologies by Position

- A Sergeant serves as the Officer in Charge (OIC) of the unit and staffing is determined using the non-scaling methodology.
- Officers instruct on defensive tactics and administer physical fitness testing and training. Staffing is determined using a ratio-based methodology of one training Officer per 12 Recruit Officers and approximately 35 Recruit Officers per class.

Emergency Vehicle Operation Course (EVOC)

EVOC trains all Recruit Officers on the POST- and state-mandated EVOC course and conducts all in-service EVOC training. Roughly five years ago, Recruit Officers began to experience difficulty passing the EVOC component of the Basic Recruit Course due to generational shifts in driving and other factors. Since then, EVOC has expanded its curriculum and instruction and now the Department's EVOC course is 104 hours, above the state minimum of 40 hours. The EVOC unit also develops and administers training for the Department's in-service members, including developing additional training on pursuits. As of January 1, 2022, Advanced Officer (AO) training for in-service members will require a minimum of four hours of behind the wheel training.

The EVOC unit is managed by a Sergeant and includes two full-time Officers. Given the current course structure and resource demands, the unit utilizes overtime: 8-10 part-time instructors teach Recruit Officers the EVOC course, which includes skill instruction and testing in a variety of techniques that must be completed within time limits to simulate high stakes situations, such as completing safe U-turns, forward and backward slalom, reverse parking in stalls, and T-turns.

Utilizing part-time staff is efficient for many reasons: additional Recruit Officer practice and re-testing is often conducted outside of regular work hours, on weekends, and same for some in-service training, in order to accommodate members on midnight shifts. Moreover, there are specific training and testing time periods for EVOC over the course of the Basic Recruit Course and it may not be necessary to have full-time trainers assigned to EVOC. On the other hand, trainer availability is dependent on member schedules and using overtime may not be a viable or desired solution. For the purpose of this analysis, the

Project Team assumes the current model, with the recommendation that the Department continue to assess the full-time versus part-time staffing model for administering mandated EVOC training.

Basic Recruit Course						
	<i>SWORN</i>			<i>CIVILIAN</i>		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
EVOC	3	3	0			
Sergeant	1	1	0			
Officer	2	2	0			

Staffing Methodologies by Position

- One Sergeant serves as the Officer in Charge (OIC) of the unit, supervising the Officers and trainers. Staffing is determined using the non-scaling methodology.
- Officers are responsible for coordinating and administering training for Recruit Officers and in-service training for members as well as subject matter expert (SME) tasks such as reviewing pursuits and Code 3 driving responses and reviewing all officer-involved collisions. Within the current unit structure and model, staffing is determined using the non-scaling methodology based on the unique expertise these members provide to Department training and operations.

Staff Services Division

The Staff Services Division includes several units that provide a broad range of administrative functions that support the Department. Staff Services contains the following units:

- **Medical Liaison**, which reviews and processes all Department member health and medical claims and serves as liaison and coordinator for a range of medical support services;
- **Background Investigations (“Backgrounds”)**, which manages and conducts background investigations for candidates seeking employment with the Department and for vendors seeking to do business with the Department;
- **Payroll**, which conducts payroll for the Department, including bi-weekly payroll processing and payroll adjustments;
- **Behavioral Science**, which coordinates a range of mental health services to support Department staff by responding to critical incidents, consulting on disciplinary actions, and managing peer support programs to assist staff in managing stress, depression, and alcohol dependency;
- **Recruitment**, which performs various activities including conducting outreach in the community, administering workshops, and providing education services in order to recruit quality applicants to apply for the Police Officer position;
- **Personnel**, which provides human resources support for the Department in collaboration with the City’s Department of Human Resources, with tasks including processing the onboarding and termination of employees;
- **Staffing and Deployment**, which conducts special projects and analysis on a broad range of topics including high-level Department staffing indicators and Department operations in order to drive data-driven decision-making amongst Department and City leadership.

Recommended staffing for the Staff Services Division is shown in the table below, and the following sections provide an overview of the duties and responsibilities of each unit.

Staff Services Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Administration	2	2	0	1	1	0
Medical Liaison	1	1	0	4	5	+1
Background Investigations	4	5	+1	23	23	0
Payroll				9	9	0
Behavioral Science	5	5	0			
Recruitment	4	3	(1)	1	3	+2
Personnel				9	9	0
Staffing and Deployment	3	3	0	2	4	+2
DIVISION TOTAL	19	19	0	49	54	+5

Staff Services – Administration

The Staff Services Division is overseen by a Captain with assistance from a Lieutenant who directly manages the units in the Division. The Captain is supported by a Secretary position. Given the unique leadership duties of the Captain and Lieutenant and the administrative role of the Secretary, staffing for these positions is determined using the non-scaling methodology.

Staff Services Division - Administration						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Administration	2	2	0	1	1	0
Captain	1	1	0			
Lieutenant	1	1	0			
Secretary				1	1	0

Medical Liaison

The Medical Liaison unit is responsible for managing medical and health claims for Department members. This entails reviewing, processing, and monitoring medical claims, medical records, substance abuse testing, and disability leave. The Project Team learned during interviews with the unit that well over 100 employees are on some sort of medical leave or temporary modified accommodation at any one point and that this number has increased due to the ongoing Covid-19 pandemic.

Medical Liaison						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Administration	1	1	0	1	2	+1
Sergeant	1	1	0			
Management Assistant				0	1	1
Clerk				1	1	0
Physician Specialist				1	1	0
Police Physician				1	1	0
ADA Coordinator				1	1	0
EO Programs Senior Specialist				1	1	0
Benefits				1	1	0
Benefits Technician				1	1	0

Medical Liaison is overseen by a Sergeant who has previously received assistance from an Officer (though at the time of this analysis the Officer position remains vacant). The Project Team recommends that Medical Liaison utilize a professional staff member in the Management Assistant classification to assist the Sergeant with day-to-day management of the unit. Per the Management Assistant job requirements, someone in this classification would have the skills necessary to assist with record keeping and reporting, to manage office operations, and conduct special projects as needed.

Other than the Sergeant, Medical Liaison is staffed with professional staff: Clerk, Police Physician, Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) Specialist, and Benefits Technician. Based on the specialized functions of each position in the unit, staffing is determined using the non-scaling methodology. The Department should look evaluate sworn versus non-sworn supervision for this unit of specialty medical staff. There is

no legal requirement or best practice for sworn supervision and this is an area simply for Department consideration. Moreover, the Project Team recommends that the Medical Liaison unit monitor and record data and information on service delivery so that workload metrics may be utilized in future analyses.

Background Investigations

Background Investigations (“Backgrounds”) conducts background investigations on all applicants, sworn and non-sworn, who are seeking employment with the San Francisco Police Department. Backgrounds also conducts investigations on external parties (e.g., consultants) that seek to do business with the Department. The unit relies heavily on part-time retired sworn members who serve as investigators and hence these members are included in the discussion here, whereas in other sections part-time retirees are not addressed specifically in the analysis. Generally, background investigations for potential sworn hires are conducted by sworn members in the unit, supplemented with assistance from part-time retirees. Background investigations of potential non-sworn hires are often conducted by an external backgrounding company. Clerks in the unit generally take on background investigations for contractors and vendors in addition to their administrative duties.

The City and the Department have worked jointly to initiate an increased non-sworn presence in Background Investigations. The Department of Human Resources and SFPD worked together to create the non-sworn classification “Background Investigator,” and this classification became officially active in October 2019. The unit conducted interviews and was in the process of hiring some full-time individuals into the Background Investigator classification, but due to the Covid-19 pandemic and the 2020 hiring freeze, no full-time professional staff were hired. All part-time retirees that join the unit are now hired into this classification and the unit consists of primarily part-time Background Investigators with minimal sworn presence.

Background Investigations						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Administration	1	2	+1	3	3	0
Sergeant	1	2	1			
Principal Clerk				1	1	0
Clerk Typist				2	2	0
Background Investigations	3	3	0	20	20	0
Officer	3	3	0			
Part-time Investigator				20	20	0

Staffing Methodologies by Position

Supervisor(s): Background Investigations is overseen by a Sergeant who is responsible for supervising sworn and non-sworn investigators; triaging, assigning, and reviewing all cases; attending hiring meetings; and approving all conditional offer of employment (COE) letters. For this supervisory position, staffing can be determined using the ratio-based span of control methodology set at 1:7. If part-time Background Investigators are considered 0.5 FTE, the calculated number of investigators is 13, warranting an

additional supervisor in the unit. The Department should assess the implications of sworn versus non-sworn supervision in the future.

Investigators: Staffing for sworn and non-sworn investigators is determined using a workload-based methodology based on the number of sworn candidate background packets received annually and the time required to work each background packet.

- In 2019, Background Investigations received 567 sworn background packets. In 2020, the unit received 201 packets, a significant reduction due to the Covid-19 pandemic, the hiring freeze, and the George Floyd civil unrest and continually changing public perception of law enforcement. For the purposes of this analysis, it makes sense to develop a composite figure. Over the past five years, law enforcement applications have been trending downward, yet given the unprecedented events of 2020, it seems unlikely that applications will remain at that level. Therefore, the Project Team uses the estimate of 450 applications in this analysis, and the calculations for Investigation staffing is shown below.

Background Investigations Staffing	
# of Background Cases	450
Average Hours per Case	40
Workload Hours	18,000
Total Hours to Staff	18,000
Average Net Available Hours/Part-time	600
# Part-time Investigators	20
Total Part-time Net Available Hours	12,000
Workload Balance after Part-time	6,000
Average Net Available Hours/Full-time	1,760
Full-time Positions Required (in addition to part-time)	3

Clerks: The unit clerks undertake a broad range of administrative responsibilities related to tracking candidate information. Moreover, the Principal Clerk is responsible for conducting background investigations on external vendors. Given the unique responsibilities of these positions, staffing is determined using the non-scaling methodology.

Recommendations and Considerations

- **The Department should determine a comprehensive plan for employee classifications and long-term priorities and structure of the unit.** There are advantages and disadvantages to utilizing part-time Background Investigators. On one hand, staffing can be relatively easily scaled up or down based on caseload volume. On the other hand, part-time investigators inherently work reduced workweeks and this may impact the unit's ability to conduct investigations timely. Moreover, this structure necessitates having multiple investigators working on one background, which requires additional coordination and supervisory effort. Under the current model, a comprehensive candidate tracking system is imperative.

- The Department should prioritize the implementation of a comprehensive information management system for tracking caseloads, candidate progress, and unit performance metrics. Such a system will enable multiple investigators to work on a single case if necessary without disrupting operations as well as enable the unit supervisor to seamlessly monitor candidate progress through the system. In the highly competitive applicant pool, such a system will enable the unit to understand pain points in conducting timely investigations and identify situations in which more resources are needed to adhere to service delivery standards. Such a system will facilitate internal tracking and coordination and enable decision-making as needed.

Payroll Unit

Clerks in the Payroll unit are responsible for processing the bi-weekly payroll and making manual adjustments to time and payroll records for the whole Department. Payroll audits records, resolves problems, and facilitates solutions to all payroll-related questions and issues.

Payroll Unit						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Administration				2	2	0
Manager				1	1	0
Clerk Typist				1	1	0
Payroll				7	7	0
Chief Payroll Clerk				1	1	0
Payroll Clerk				6	6	0

Staffing Methodologies by Position

- The Payroll unit is overseen by a Manager and supported by a Clerk Typist. Both positions provide specialized expertise – leadership and administrative duties for the unit, respectively – and staffing is therefore determined using a non-scaling methodology.
- Payroll Clerks conduct the key work of the unit. There is one Chief Payroll Clerk, who supervises the Payroll Clerks but also conducts direct payroll-related work and is therefore include in the Clerk count. In line with previous studies, staffing for Clerks is determined using a ratio-based methodology that scales based on the size of the Department: one Payroll Clerk per 400 employees. As of September 2021, there were 2,865 active employees in the Department, indicating that staffing for Payroll is sufficient to handle the unit's workload.

Behavioral Science Unit (BSU)

The Behavioral Health Science Unit (BSU) is available 24/7 to both sworn and non-sworn Department members to provide support and assistance in both work-related and off-duty health and wellness. BSU staff manages mental health and peer support programs, including services to help staff manage stress, depression, or unhealthy habits, such as alcohol dependency. Workload for the unit has increased significantly over the last few years due to the Covid-19 pandemic and the George Floyd civil unrest. The City has an Employee Assistance Program (EAP) for general City employees that serves as a resource for Department members; the SFPD BSU program provides law enforcement-specific support, services, and insight, which is why sworn members are necessary in these positions.

Behavioral Science Unit						
	<i>SWORN</i>			<i>CIVILIAN</i>		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
BSU	5	5	0			
Sergeant	1	1	0			
Officer	4	4	0			

BSU serves a unique role for the Department and therefore staffing is determined using the non-scaling methodology. The Department should periodically assess current events and how external factors impact the BSU workload. The Project Team recommends that BSU implement a system for tracking caseloads and average time spent on each case, as well as time spent providing proactive support (e.g., support groups), so that a workload-based methodology may be utilized in future analyses.

Recruitment Unit

The SFPD Recruitment Unit (RU) conducts outreach to potential candidates and participates in annual recruitment events locally and outside of San Francisco/Bay Area. The unit recruits Entry-Level Police Officers, Lateral Police Officers, Reserve Police Officers, Police Interns, Police and PAL Cadets. The focus of many recruitment efforts is to establish a diverse and equitable Police Department that mirrors the local San Francisco environment and population. In tandem with the overall goal of recruiting qualified and diverse candidates, the RU has prioritized mentorship and applicant outreach efforts that improve success rates in the initial testing components of the Police Officer application process. This process is administered by the City's centralized Department of Human Resources (DHR).

The high-level mission of a recruitment unit is to increase the number of potential candidates available to fill positions in a department that are vacant or anticipated to become vacant. If a department had zero vacancies and an extremely low rate of attrition, few if any staff would likely be needed to keep those positions filled. Conversely, a department with significant number of vacancies has a much greater need to fill, which requires a more robust approach to attracting new candidates.

Given these considerations, staffing for officers in this unit are determined using a ratio of staff to the sum of two variables:

- The number of sworn vacancies in the department, and
- The three-year average total of sworn resignations, terminations, and retirements.

As of September 2021, there were approximately 150 sworn vacancies in the Department and over the past three fiscal the average attrition figure is 100 per year (retirements, resignations, and terminations, not including training attrition), which sums to a figure of 250. In order adequately address these needs, the staffing target ratio is set at 1 FTE per 50, where the ultimate figure is 250, the sum of vacancies and average attrition (resignations, terminations, and retirements). This ratio indicates that RU should be staffed with five individuals, a mix of sworn and non-sworn recruiters. It is important that the Department staff the unit with sworn members so that potential recruits can ask sworn, uniformed personnel about the experience of being a police officer at the many events and points of contact that RU has with potential applicants. For some events, RU can utilize sworn members from outside the unit, but it is important that the unit have core sworn members for coverage and continuity.

Recruitment Unit						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
RU	4	3	(1)	1	3	+2
Sergeant	1	1	0			
Officer	3	2	(1)			
Recruiter				1	2	+1
Media Programming Specialist				0	1	+1

It is also important to highlight that the effectiveness of recruitment extends beyond staffing. Recruiting for law enforcement positions, particularly in recent years, is an especially competitive hiring market.

Police departments face additional challenges that are rare in the private sector, including long hiring processes. Best practice recruiting operations utilize digital marketing effectively to reach younger generations. SFPD is working with an outside vendor to increase its media presence. The Project Team learned through interviews that RU has a need for a Media Programming Specialist to interface with the vendor, conduct in-house media productions, and manage social media for the unit.

Human Resources/Personnel

Personnel staff are responsible for administering a range of human resources related processes, including processing new hires, promotions, leaves of absence, separations, personnel file maintenance, and custodian of secondary employment application documents. This Unit also participates in and advises upon negotiations and implementation of Collective Bargaining Agreements with various local employee representative groups covering Department employees; however, in the last few years, the Department created a Labor Relations Office in the Office of the Chief of Staff to lead negotiations and interface with unions that represent Department members.

The Academy to Innovate HR (AIHR) describes various factors in determining best practice HR to employee ratio, including organizational size, the role of the organization's HR unit, and industry. A ratio of one HR employee to 300 full-time equivalent positions is appropriate for SFPD given these considerations. First, SFPD is considered a large organization, and there are economies of scale gained through standardized processes and automation. Second, HR/Personnel is not directly responsible for some functions that HR units in other organizations are often responsible for, including professional development, retirement and benefits administration, labor relations, and recruitment. Other units in the Department and the City's centralized Department of Human Resources (DHR) are tasked with leading these functions. All staff members in HR/Personnel serve unique functions in the human resources space and are considered in the ratio-based calculation. As of September 2021, there were 2,725 full-time equivalent (FTE) employees in the Department (not including part-time or temporary employees). Using the ratio-based methodology to determine staffing indicates that the HR/Personnel time is adequately staffed to provide the designated personnel services to the Department.

Human Resources/Personnel						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Human Resources				1	1	0
Manager				1	1	0
Personnel				8	8	0
Senior Personnel Analyst				3	3	0
Personnel Analyst				1	1	0
Personnel Technician				1	1	0
Personnel Clerk				1	1	0
Clerk				2	2	0

Staffing and Deployment Unit

The Staffing and Deployment Unit (SDU) was formed in April 2018 to manage all personnel movement within the Department; to track, monitor, analyze, and present all staffing-related metrics to internal and external stakeholders; and to conduct special projects and operational analytics as requested by Command Staff. SDU was created per SFPD Chief's vision to have one neutral entity responsible for overseeing personnel movement in the Department and to facilitate the ongoing tracking and reporting of key metrics to drive data-driven decision-making related to high-level Department staffing. **Since 2018, SDU's scope has increased significantly to include extensive ongoing reporting, operational analyses for other units in the Administration Bureau, and numerous special projects, the largest of which is the comprehensive staffing analysis mandated by Proposition E.**

Example ongoing operations and initiatives of the unit are shown below.

Staffing and Deployment Initiatives	
<i>Example Ongoing Tasks</i>	
Coordinate and execute personnel transfers bi-weekly	
Update and develop staffing management dashboards for bi-weekly presentation to Assistant and Deputy Chiefs	
Update and maintain staffing information in Human Resources Management System (HRMS)	
Facilitate bi-weekly meeting with Assistant and Deputy Chiefs, conduct follow up as needed	
<i>Example Large Projects</i>	
Proposition E - Comprehensive staffing analysis of the San Francisco Police Department	
Develop and author the Department's Diversity Strategic Plan [completed as part of CRI]	
Position Control Numbers - Technical initiative to classify all employees and employee positions in the Department	
<i>Example Special Projects</i>	
Patrol schedule research and development, initially for operational improvement and subsequently for Covid-19	
Exposure tracing, leave tracking, and vaccine tracking throughout Covid-19 pandemic	
Promotional impact assessment(s)	
<i>Example Analytical Projects for Other Units in Administration Bureau</i>	
Large-scale analysis of Academy graduation rates and release and resignation factors	
Analyses on specific Recruit Classes	
Ongoing hiring meeting summary development for Background Investigations	
Ongoing reporting and SmartRecruiter involvement with the Recruitment Unit	

Over the last three years since its inception, SDU has assumed the role of an analytical unit for Staff Services and the Administration Bureau in addition to the analytical work conducted for all staffing-related projects and requests. SDU has conducted ongoing and ad hoc analyses for Recruitment and the Department of Human Resources Public Safety Team, Background Investigations, and the Academy. Moreover, SDU has developed detailed dashboards for these units that promote ongoing data-driven decision-making. There is no shortage of analytical work and projects, and what SDU can produce is based entirely on resource availability. For its initial two years, SDU had only one Senior Administrative Analyst yet its scope continued to expand as project opportunities became apparent.

Voters passed Proposition E ("Prop E") in November 2020, mandating that SFPD prepare a comprehensive staffing analysis of the entire Department every odd year for consideration by the Police Commission. SDU is tasked with conducting the Prop E staffing analysis, a massive undertaking requiring complex quantitative data analysis, qualitative interviews, and extensive information synthesis. As a result

of this significant and important project, all SDU analytical projects were put on hold and additional analysts were assigned to the unit, leaving their respective units with limited resource availability. Due to the prioritization of the staffing analysis project and the resource availability in SDU, the following long-term projects were put on hold:

- In-depth analysis on re-developed *exit interview data* to inform *retention strategies*
- Creating and analyzing cohort dataset on *end-to-end candidate data*, from initial contact with the Department of Human Resources (DHR) to point of resignation, release, or continuation with the Department to *better understand current attrition rates in the Academy and Field Training*
- Transitioning comprehensive staffing metric Tableau dashboards into the Department's Oracle BI system in an effort to *house Department dashboards in one system*

SDU has a significant backlog of important projects and is also currently unable to provide ongoing support to other units in Staff Services and the Academy as was the case prior to the staffing analysis; however, even before the staffing analysis, SDU's analytical scope extended beyond the unit itself and bandwidth was overwhelmed.

Recommendations and Considerations

- **As the analytical arm of SDU is distinct from its operational duties, the Project Team recommends building out the analytics side of SDU with additional official responsibilities and staff.** First, the Department should consider modifying SDU's structure so that a Manager-level position leads all analytical projects and initiatives for the Administration Bureau and for Staff Services. A professional staff leadership position would promote continuity in the unit and would also be the appropriate classification for an individual responsible for long-term planning, project management, personnel management, and analytical execution. Second, additional analytical staff would enable SDU to provide ongoing analytical support to other units in Staff Services and in the Administration Bureau; all work would be directed by Manager-level position. Shared work responsibility for three additional Senior Administrative Analysts may take the following form:
 - One Senior Administrative Analyst would focus predominantly on long-term SDU projects and ongoing reports
 - One Senior Administrative Analyst would focus on providing project work and analytical support to SFDHR/Recruitment and Backgrounds and assist with SDU projects as needed
 - One Senior Administrative Analyst would focus on the Academy Division (Basic Recruit Course and Field Training) and respond to PRAs and other internal and external requests
- **The Department should determine how to execute Proposition E ongoing.** The Proposition calls for a report every odd year. The Department should determine how to make the reporting process relevant and sustainable, and the Department the City must factor the work here into ongoing resource conversations and decisions.
- **SDU should determine methodologies for quantifying workload to be used in future analyses.** Tracking projects and estimated hours required may be one such method. The Manager-level position should invest time and effort into determining performance metrics for the unit.

Staffing and Deployment Unit						
	<i>SWORN</i>			<i>CIVILIAN</i>		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
SDU	3	3	0	2	4	+2
Lieutenant	1	1	0			
Sergeant	2	2	0			
Manager				0	1	1
Administrative Analyst				1	3	2
Personnel Analyst				1	0	0

At this time, all positions in the unit are classified as non-scalable. The Lieutenant serves as the Officer in Charge (OIC) of the unit, and the two Sergeants have unique duties and areas of specialized expertise (transfers and liaising with personnel-related information systems, respectively). A Principal Administrative Analyst (noted in “Admin Analyst” above) oversees all analytical projects of the unit, including the Proposition E staffing analysis; manages the Personnel Analyst; and performs a variety of ongoing analytical tasks such as maintaining staffing dashboards for the Assistant and Deputy Chiefs. The Personnel Analyst conducts a wide variety of analytical tasks for SDU and numerous other units in the Bureau and the Department on topics such as recruiting and backgrounds, separations, various Covid-19 metrics, and others. Given the nature of the work performed, the Personnel Analyst would be more appropriately classified as a Senior Administrative Analyst.

Crime Information Services Unit (CISU)

The Crime Information Services Unit (CISU) is composed of two Divisions and is responsible for the management of records, property control, and crime analysis. According to regulations and mandates, CISU maintains a database for all stolen, lost, and recovered property entered into evidence, as well as property destroyed. The unit maintains all evidence and found property in a secure facility and compiles statistics and performs analysis of Department resources. Recommended staffing for CISU is presented below.

Crime Information Services Unit						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
CIS - Admin	1	1	0	1	1	0
Records Division	6	1	(5)	18	27	+9
Property Control Division	10	10	0	16	18	+2
DIVISION TOTAL	17	12	(5)	35	46	+11

CISU – Admin

CISU is divided into the Records Management Division and the Property Control Division. A Captain oversees the two Divisions and is supported by a Clerk and two Lieutenants who manage their respective Divisions. In prior years, CISU had three Sergeants and two Chief Clerks who were assigned to oversee daily operations and provide training; however, those positions are currently vacant. The Admin Team is responsible for supporting administrative duties, serving as a liaison for Department projects, as well as distributing and overseeing staff workload. For the purpose of this analysis, the Admin positions are considered as unique and not scalable to any workload measures.

Crime Information Services - Admin						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
CISU - Admin	1	1	0	1	1	0
Captain	1	1	0			
Clerk				1	1	0

Records Management Division

The Records Management Division is responsible for the collection, storage, and distribution of all incident reports. These reports are submitted by Department members, outside agencies, and by members of the public using the Department's website (CopLogic) and/or the City's 311 system. Records Management also keeps and maintains historic records, with the added responsibility of ensuring that all digital records are searchable and available to be used for statistical and investigative purposes. Another essential duty is maintaining the front window, which requires a supervisor to be present to approve requests and respond to potentially hostile citizens and/or requests that cannot be filled. Additionally, the Division also serves as the administrator for some of the software programs that the Department uses, including GovQA, CopLogic, and Laserfiche. Recommended staffing for the units in the Records Management Division is shown below.

Crime Information Services Unit (CISU)						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Records Management Division						
Records - Admin	1	1	0	0	3	+3
Report Request Team	2	0	(2)	10	12	+2
Data Entry Team	0	0	0	2	2	0
LIAS	1	0	(1)	4	6	+2
Background & Mailroom	1	0	(1)	1	2	+1
Firearms Team	1	0	(1)	1	2	+1
DIVISION TOTAL	6	1	(5)	18	27	+9

Recommendations and Considerations

The Records Management Division faces many challenges due to the lack of supervisory staff which limits efforts put toward staff development and training. The Division is currently staffed with five Officers (not including the supervisory Lieutenant, there are two permanent and three temporary modified duty) and 18 clerks. In practice, many of the staff members are cross-trained in the areas listed below but have primary assignments and responsibilities. Previously there was one Sergeant and two Chief Clerks who provided oversight of the Division. However, all three of those positions are currently vacant which requires the CISU Captain and Records Division Lieutenant to take on additional responsibilities for oversight of daily operations.

All tasks performed by the Records Management Division can be performed by civilian staff. This is a civilian unit composed predominantly of Clerks who are used interchangeably. However, there are some Officers assigned to the Division. Some are on temporary modified duty (TMD) and are placed here due to activity restrictions, but there are also several Officers who hold a permanent assignment. There is an opportunity to civilianize these positions and utilize the sworn members in other areas of the Department as civilian/professional staff are capable of serving the same functions.

Staffing Methodologies by Position

- A span of control methodology is applied to the three supervisory positions (previously a Sergeant and two Chief Clerks), each requiring one full-time position for every 10 direct reports. Based on recommended staffing levels (24 clerks) and the recommendation to civilianize the entire Division, Records Management will require the addition of three Chief Clerks to oversee daily operations. Currently there is no supervisory staff, aside from the Captain and Lieutenant. Filling these positions will allow for cross training and provide direct supervision across the Division.
- A workload-based methodology is used to determine staffing levels for some of the positions in Records Management. For the purposes of this analysis, the workloads from these areas of responsibility are aggregated together to determine staffing levels for the Division and is reflected in the table below, and additional relevant detail, where needed, is provided in the following unit sections. The mailroom and external background requests are excluded as those positions are unique and defined as non-scalable.

Assignments	Workload Measures	Volume (2019)	Time per Task (mins)	Total Hrs
Report Request Team	# of Report Requests	43861	15	10965
Report Request Team	# of External Agency Requests	459	30	230
Data Entry Team	# of Data Entry Reports	12362	10	2060
LIAS	# of LIAS Documents	172067	5	14339
Firearms FCN Processing	# of Firearm FCNs Processed	933	15	272
		2320	*1	
TOTAL HRS				27866

* New technology has improved firearms FCN processing times

I. Records Management – Admin

Records Management Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Records - Admin	1	1	0	0	3	+3
Lieutenant	1	1	0			
Chief Clerk				0	3	+3

The Records Management Admin Team has an immediate need for supervisory support. Previously there were two Sergeants who provided oversight for the sworn members within the Division but currently there is only one Lieutenant who is responsible for supervising five Officers and 18 Clerks within Records Management. The Lieutenant being heavily involved in the day-to-day operations has limited the overall capacity of the sub-units and is not feasible for the long-term. As mentioned above, with the recommendation to civilianize the Records Management Division, there will be an immediate need to hire three Chief Clerks.

II. Report Request Team

Records Management Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Report Request Team	2	0	(2)	10	12	+2
Officer	2	0	(2)			
Clerk				9	11	+2
PSA Supervisor				1	1	0

Staff assigned to the Report Request Team are responsible for fulfilling any report requests from members of the public, outside agencies, and insurance companies. Recent technological upgrades have enabled the unit to receive requests electronically, as well as by phone or mail. Currently there are two Officers, nine Clerks and one PSA Supervisor assigned to the Report Request Team. **The Project Team recommends civilianizing the two Officer positions and converting them to two Clerks. The Officers can be utilized in other areas of the Department that requires their institutional knowledge.**

III. Data Entry Team

Records Management Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Data Entry Team	0	0	0	2	2	0
Clerk				2	2	0

Staff assigned to data entry are responsible for entering stolen and/or lost and found property into the California Law Enforcement Telecom System (CLETS) and entering reports from outside agencies. The process has become more efficient due to technology upgrades and is supported by officers on the night duty data entry team. Currently there are two Clerks assigned to the Data Entry Team and no staffing changes are recommended.

IV. Laserfiche Imaging Archive System (LIAS)

Records Management Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
LIAS	1	0	(1)	4	6	+2
Officer	1	0	(1)			
Clerk				4	6	+2

Staff are responsible for scanning and entering traffic reports, evidence sheets, and crime lab reports into the Laserfiche Imaging Archive System (LIAS). The team is also responsible for the sealing of court documents and supporting requests from external law enforcement agencies. A technological upgrade now allows some reports to be automatically uploaded where there had previously been a need for manual processing. The LIAS team is currently staffed with one Officer and four Clerks. **Based on the aggregated data presented above, the Project Team recommends the addition of one Clerk to support the LIAS Team, and one Clerk to replace the current Officer position.**

V. Firearms Team

Records Management Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Firearms Team	1	0	(1)	1	2	+1
Officer	1	0	(1)			
Clerk				1	2	+1

The Firearms Team is responsible for entering stolen and/or lost records regarding firearms into the California Law Enforcement Telecom System (CLETS) and entering reports from outside agencies. Currently there is one Officer who enters firearms data into the CLETS system and generates a monthly report, and one Clerk who audits the Officer's entries and scans e-trace gun purchase records. **The Project Team recommends civilianizing the Officer position and converting it to an additional Clerk who can serve the same function.**

VI. Mailroom and External Background Requests

Records Management Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Background & Mailroom	1	0	(1)	1	2	+1
Officer (Backgrounds)	1	0	(1)			
Clerk (Backgrounds)				0	1	+1
Clerk (Mailroom)				1	1	0

Mailroom and external background requests are also functions within the Records Management Division, each of which requires on full-time employee. The mailroom duties are assigned to one Clerk and external background requests from other law enforcement agencies are assigned to one full-time Officer. **The Project Team recommends civilianizing the Officer assigned to Backgrounds and converting this position to a Clerk position.**

Property Control Division

The Property Control Division is responsible for maintaining and processing all property and evidence that is entered into the custody of the San Francisco Police Department. The Division also handles evidence for SFPD investigations and ensures that evidence is barcoded and entered into the Evidence on Q system. This includes the collection, storage and tracking of all evidence including guns, narcotics, and cash, from District Stations and other units. The Division maintains the important chain of custody for all evidentiary items at various locations and is also responsible for researching and returning lost or stolen items that are processed. A recent organizational restructuring moved the Supplies Unit from the Fiscal Division to Property Control. A supervising Lieutenant has oversight over the Property Control Division, which is currently composed of nine Officers (four full-duty, five temporary modified duty), 19 Storekeepers, one Clerk, and 10 part-time Officers (960s).

Crime Information Services Unit (CISU)						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Property Control Division						
Property - Admin	1	2	+1	0	0	0
Front Counter	2	3	+1	2	4	+2
Firearms Processing	3	1	(2)	2	2	0
Narcotics	1	2	+1	0	0	0
Holds and Destruction	2	2	0	1	1	0
Lost and Found	1	0	(1)	1	1	0
Parcel	0	0	0	1	1	0
Equipment Disbursal	0	0	0	1	1	0
Overflow Warehouse	0	0	0	4	4	0
Supplies Unit	0	0	0	4	4	0
DIVISION TOTAL	10	10	0	16	18	+2

Recommendations and Considerations

The Property Control Division is in the process of preparing for its pending relocation before which all items will need to be barcoded or disposed of. Thousands of old cases will need to be reviewed to determine if property can be disposed of and support is also needed with barcoding, destruction, packing, and evidence transport. The magnitude of this project alone will require significant staffing which Property Control will not be able to handle on its own without disrupting daily operations. The Project Team recommends the addition of part-time Officers (960s) and/or utilizing Officers who are on Temporary Modified Duty (TMD) to provide support.

Full duty Officers within Property Control have specialized assignments while civilian staff within the Division are cross trained and share responsibilities of the core functions described below.

I. Property Control – Admin

Property Control Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Property - Admin	1	2	+1	0	0	0
Lieutenant	1	1	0			
Sergeant	0	1	+1			

Currently there is only one supervising Lieutenant to oversee the Property Control Division. There is an immediate need for a Sergeant to support daily operations, cross-train staff, and facilitate various projects and tasks such as the Division's relocation project. Applying the span of control methodology, the Project Team recommends the addition of one Sergeant to take on supervisory duties. Sworn staff members are needed to supervise the handling of evidence and property.

II. Front Counter

Property Control Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Front Counter	2	3	+1	2	4	+2
Officer	2	3	+1			
Storekeeper				2	4	+2

Full duty Officers and Storekeepers are responsible for the initial collecting, sorting, categorizing, and data entry of all property and evidence being received and released. Officers conduct daily runs to the 10 District Stations and other units to collect evidence and handle items are also dropped off throughout the day. This team requires full-duty (armed) Officers to handle evidence and property which often includes firearms. With the implementation of Evidence on Q, all items are now being tracked through barcodes.

Currently there are two full-duty Officers and two Storekeepers assigned to handle the duties of the Front Counter. A workload-based methodology is applied to determine staffing for this sub-unit and uses the following measures from 2019 to determine appropriate staffing levels: 10 hours per day for daily station runs (collection and data entry), 72,610 total property items collected and processed, and approximately 25,000 items released from the front counter. Using the workload-based approach, the Project Team recommends the addition of one Officer and two Storekeepers to provide additional support and backup for the Front Counter.

III. Firearms Processing

Property Control Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Firearms Processing	3	1	(2)	2	2	0
Officers	3	1	(2)			
Storekeeper				2	2	0

This team is responsible for the daily intake of firearms, release of firearms and related evidence, and the destruction of firearms. Staff members examine firearms, review case reports, categorize firearms, photograph firearms, maintain a firearms database, and cross reference items in various data systems. This team also now pulls daily gun reports to determine if they meet the criteria to be sent to the Crime Gun Information Center (CGIC) for further investigation. Unit members also prepare firearms for lab testing and destruction when needed. Firearms requiring destruction must be properly documented and dismantled.

Currently there are three Officers (two full duty, one temporary), two Storekeepers and one part-time Officer (960) assigned to process firearms. A workload-based methodology is applied factoring in the total number of firearms processed annually. In 2019, there were 1,233 firearms processed, each taking approximately one hour. Using the previously established workload-based methodology, only one Officer and two Shopkeepers are required to perform the unit's responsibilities. The temporary and part-time Officers can assist as needed but could be utilized elsewhere.

IV. Narcotics

Property Control Division						
	<i>SWORN</i>			<i>CIVILIAN</i>		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Narcotics	1	2	+1	0	0	0
Officer	1	2	+1			

The Narcotics Team is currently staffed with one Officer and one part-time Officer (960). Duties include storing and maintaining narcotics evidence, destruction of narcotics, and transporting substances to the Alameda Crime Laboratory for testing. Sworn officers retrieve evidence from a drop box, ensure the items are packaged and barcoded properly, and enter information into the Department's data systems. These Officers receive requests for items to be tested from Department members and specialized units, and the District Attorney's office. Officers also transport items that need to be destroyed and are often required to provide courtroom testimony.

A workload-based methodology is applied factoring in the total number of narcotics envelopes received for intake, the total number of envelopes sent to the Alameda County Sheriff's Office for narcotics testing, and the total number of trips to Alameda for testing. In 2019, there were a total of 3,287 envelopes received at intake, 1,254 envelopes sent out for testing, and 78 trips taken. It should be noted that each envelope often contains multiple drugs. Based on these measures, the Project Team recommends the addition of one Officer or an additional part-time Officer (960) to support the Narcotics Team.

V. Holds and Destruction

Property Control Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Holds and Destruction	2	2	0	1	1	0
Officer	2	2	0			
Storekeeper				1	1	0

The Holds and Destruction Team retains items that may be needed for investigations and disposes of items that investigators have determined are no longer needed. Investigators with case property in storage are sent forms on a regular basis to maintain an updated status of the items. In 2019, this team processed 14,657 cases requiring holds, and 45,558 cases requiring destruction. Time per task is highly variable. Currently there are five Storekeepers, two Officers on modified duty, and four part-time Officers (960s) staffing this unit at two different locations. These positions are unique and are not scalable to any workload measures. However, as previously mentioned, Property Control will need additional support for their anticipated relocation, which will be led by the Holds and Destruction Team.

VI. Lost and Found

Property Control Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Lost and Found	1	0	(1)	1	1	0
Officer	1	0	(1)			
Storekeeper				1	1	0

The Lost and Found unit is responsible for returning property to rightful owners. Lost and found items are kept in a separate area from evidence. Items are booked into a database with as much identifying information as possible, and staff members conduct various searches while attempting to locate the owner of the property. One Officer on modified duty and one Storekeeper are currently assigned to this area. The Storekeeper position is unique and is considered non-scalable for this analysis. The Officer on modified duty can provide support as needed, but the Project Team recommends reassigning this position to assist with the Division's relocation project/efforts.

VII. Parcel

Property Control Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Parcel				1	1	0
Storekeeper				1	1	0

The function of this section is to prepare items for shipping, such as found property and evidence to other agencies. This position is unique and considered as non-scalable. Currently there is one Shopkeeper who is assigned to Parcel but shares other Division responsibilities as well.

VIII. Uniforms/Equipment Disbursal

Property Control Division						
	<i>SWORN</i>			<i>CIVILIAN</i>		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Equipment Disbursal				1	1	0
Storekeeper				1	1	0

This section provides uniforms and equipment for sworn officers and uniformed civilians, including stars, vouchers, radios, and helmets. Staff track the assignment of stars and equipment, maintain files for uniform vouchers, and report to the Fiscal Unit on expenditures. Currently there is one Shopkeeper who is assigned to this role who shares other Division responsibilities as well. This is a unique position and is considered non-scalable for this analysis.

IX. Overflow Warehouse

Property Control Division						
	<i>SWORN</i>			<i>CIVILIAN</i>		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Overflow Warehouse				4	4	0
Storekeeper				4	4	0

The Overflow Warehouse stores items long-term, such as large bulky items, narcotics, bicycles, and freezer items. It also supports entry of items submitted from the Crime Lab. This team supports destruction, donation, and recycling of items, such as e-waste, metal items, and biohazards. The unit is responsible for barcoding legacy items and adding them to the Evidence on Q database. Currently there are four Storekeepers and one part-time Officer (960) staffing the Overflow Warehouse. These positions are classified as unique and non-scaling. However, based on industry standards, the Project Team recommends the addition of one Storekeeper or one supplementing part-time Officer (960) to provide the appropriate staffing.

X. Supplies Unit

Property Control Division						
	<i>SWORN</i>			<i>CIVILIAN</i>		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Supplies Unit				4	4	0
Storekeeper				3	3	0
Clerk				1	1	0

The Supplies Unit manages the procurement of all supplies needed by Department personnel and distributes the items to District Stations and specialized units. This includes stationary items, office supplies, and cleaning products. The unit also provides reproduction services including printing of brochures, pamphlets, and other materials needed by staff. Due to a recent Department restructuring, the Supplies Unit was moved to the Property Control Division from the Fiscal Division (Strategic Management Bureau). The Supplies Unit is currently operated by three Storekeepers and one Clerk. These positions are considered non-scalable for this analysis and no changes are needed to current staffing levels.

Strategic Management Bureau

Overview

The Strategic Management Bureau (SMB) is responsible for implementing tools and best practices regarding organizational change while simultaneously integrating change initiatives into the Department's strategic framework. The Department currently faces more than a dozen major change initiatives, many driven by external factors, such as the California Department of Justice (CalDOJ) Collaborative Reform Initiative (CRI), the San Francisco Office of Racial Equity's Racial Equity Action Plan (REAP), the Mayor's policing reform initiatives, and new legislation at the local, state, and federal levels.

Strategic Management is broken into one unit and two Divisions: Professional Standards and Principled Policing (PSPP) Unit, Fiscal Division, and Technology Division. PSPP works collaboratively with internal and external stakeholders to update policies, implement policy changes and initiatives, and drive improvements rooted in reform efforts. The Strategic Management Bureau is also responsible for ensuring financial stewardship. SMB puts technological and procedural systems in place, as well as the monitoring and maintenance thereof, to enable members to do their jobs effectively. Finally, the Strategic Management Bureau coordinates annual and longer-range strategic planning efforts, which set and communicate the Department's priorities, both internally and externally, as to where effort and resources should be directed.

Recommended Staffing


The table below provides a staffing overview for the various Divisions within the Strategic Management Bureau. While sworn staffing levels are appropriate to meet workload demands, there is a significant need for highly trained professional staff with expertise in analytics and technology. A detailed analysis for each Division/unit is provided in the following sections.

Strategic Management Bureau						
Division or Unit	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
SMB - Admin	0	0	0	2	3	+1
Professional Standards	10	10	0	9	21	+12
Fiscal Division	0	0	0	12	14	+2
Technology Division	1	1	0	41	58	+17
BUREAU TOTAL	11	11	0	64	96	+32

Organizational Chart



Strategic Management Bureau



Methodologies Used to Determine Staffing

Staffing for the Strategic Management Bureau is determined using the following methodologies. Examples are provided below.

Ratio-based Methodology

The Project Team used a ratio-based span of control methodology to determine the appropriate staffing levels for supervisory roles based on the targeted number of direct reports for a specific unit/function. For example, span of control for the Program Manager of the Business Analysis Team scales at a rate of one full-time equivalent (FTE) per 10 direct reports; the Business Analysis Team currently has seven Analysts which can be managed by one Program Manager. Another example is the Accounting Unit in the Fiscal Division, where a ratio based on the number of sworn staff in the Department is used to determine staffing.

Non-scaling Methodology

Many of the units and roles within the Strategic Management Bureau are specialized and are not scalable to any performance measures. These positions are unique and staffing levels are determined by Department leaders and key decision makers.

Recommended Staffing by Division and Unit

Strategic Management Bureau – Administration

The Strategic Management Bureau is managed by a civilian Executive Director who reports directly to the Chief of Police and receives administrative support from a Senior Clerk. Due to the varied nature of the Clerk position, and the fact that Deputy Chiefs in the Department are generally supported by the Executive Secretary classification, the Project Team recommends an Executive Secretary position in place of the Senior Clerk position. These positions are unique and considered non-scalable for the purpose of this analysis.

Strategic Management Bureau						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Administration						
Executive Director				1	1	0
Manager				0	1	+1
Senior Clerk				1	0	(1)
Executive Secretary				0	1	+1

The Project Team recommends adding a Manager to support the Executive Director and to provide additional oversight and leadership for the Bureau. This position would be well-versed in the Department's budget process and technologies and understand the functions of all three Divisions within the Bureau. As the Department prepares to transition to a brand-new Records Management System, this position would be responsible for assisting with implementation, oversight, and communication throughout the Department.

Professional Standards and Principled Policing (PSPP) Unit

Members of PSPP are responsible for working collaboratively with internal and external stakeholders to update policies, implement policy changes and initiatives, drive improvements rooted in reform efforts, and work with leadership to determine strategic goals and annual initiatives. Professional Standards is composed of four units who work collaboratively on reform initiatives and various Department priorities.

Professional Standards and Principled Policing Unit						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
PSPP - Admin	2	2	0	1	1	0
Prof. Standards (CRI Team)	4	2	(2)	0	3	+3
Written Directives Unit	2	3	+1	1	4	+3
Staff Inspections Unit	2	3	+1	0	2	+2
Business Analysis Team	0	0	0	7	11	+4
UNIT TOTAL	10	10	0	9	21	+12

PSPP – Administration

A Captain and Lieutenant provide general oversight of PSPP, with a Manager position serving as both the Executive Director's lead on special initiatives – policy implementation coordination and strategic planning – and the Manager of the Business Analysis Team (BAT). Given the leadership responsibilities of these positions, they are considered non-scalable.

Professional Standards and Principled Policing Unit						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
PSPP - Admin	2	2	0	1	1	0
Captain	1	1	0			
Lieutenant	1	1	0			
Manager				1	1	0

Professional Standards Unit – CRI Team

The Professional Standards Unit, also referred to as the CRI Team, has the primary responsibility of driving Department-wide change initiatives relating to the Collaborative Reform Initiative (CRI) with the California Department of Justice (CalDOJ). Prior to January 2019, the CRI Team was composed of mostly sworn Officers. However, Department leadership determined that it would be more appropriate to have Sergeants in these roles, as the new direction of CRI would require more communication with executive sponsors and Command Staff. Currently there are two Sergeants and two Officers on the team who are assigned to support a portfolio of recommendations for five focus areas/objectives identified by the DOJ: Use of Force, Bias, Community Policing, Accountability, and Recruitment. Each Sergeant oversees their own focus area which typically contains more than 30 recommendations. Their duties include collaborating with project managers, communicating with executive sponsors and external partners (e.g., CalDOJ and consultant Hillard Heintz), facilitating meetings and workgroups, writing recommendations, and providing supporting documents.

The work completed by the CRI Team is complex and involves collaboration with various stakeholders throughout the Department. Over the last 18-24 months, CRI has been the Department's top priority. As of October 27, 2021, the Department is in substantial compliance with 90% (245 out of 272) of the DOJ recommendations. As the remaining 27 recommendations are finalized, the unit's focus will shift towards sustaining those efforts. This will include conducting reviews to ensure that the Department is completing all action items associated with the CRI recommendations consistently.

The CRI Team will also begin to consolidate the different strategic plans that were developed under CRI and prioritize the different initiatives within those plans. The objective and focus of this unit will continue to evolve, so these positions are considered non-scalable for the purpose of this staffing analysis. As additional information is collected and work assigned, the Project Team recommends that a workload-based methodology be used in future analyses.

Professional Standards and Principled Policing Unit						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Prof. Standards (CRI Team)	4	2	(2)	0	3	+3
Sergeant	2	2	0			
Officer	2	0	(2)			
Senior Admin Analyst				0	2	+2
Management Assistant				0	1	+1

For this unit's scope of work, it is essential to include staff that retain institutional knowledge that is specific to policing: how members patrol, how members are using force, and how members are interacting with the community. However, dedicated Analysts who provide administrative support in the areas of change management and/or policy development and implementation would benefit the unit greatly. Analysts working collaboratively with sworn members will align with the unit's objective of sustaining changes from the CRI recommendations and enabling the Department to utilize sworn members elsewhere. The Project Team recommends reclassifying the two Officer positions to Analyst positions and adding a Management Assistant to provide additional administrative support.

Written Directives Unit

The Written Directives Unit is responsible for coordinating Department-wide policy reviews and disseminating all orders to the Department (e.g., Department General Orders, Department Bulletins, Department Notices). The unit is currently managed by a Sergeant with support from one Officer and one Management Assistant. Functionally, the unit provides administrative support and facilitates the concurrence process, which includes reviews by the Chief of Police and members of the Command Staff. The unit also devotes a significant amount of time to drafting and editing policy content for subject matter experts (SMEs).

The Written Directives Unit also works on pulling Department policies for the Legal Division for PRA requests, and fulfilling requests for the City Attorney's Office, Department of Police Accountability (DPA), and other stakeholders. From August 2019 through September 2020, team members spent a majority of their time procuring PowerDMS, a policy management software, for the Department.

The table below represents the number of policies, manuals, and orders that were worked on by the Written Directives Unit and issued by the Department. Although the unit can quantify these measures, it does not reflect their other duties and responsibilities, nor their work performed for those policies/orders that were not issued by the Department. The unit's work relies heavily on contributions from other stakeholders, which is why there are no measures directly related to workload. These positions are non-scalable for this staffing analysis.

Written Directives Unit									
Year	# of DGOs Issued	Time per DGO (hours)	# of Manuals Issued	Time per Manual (hours)	# of DBs/DNs Issued	Time per DB/DN (hours)	# of Bureau/Unit orders Issued	Time per Bureau/Unit Order (hours)	Total Time Spent by WDU (hours)
2019	4	120	2	50	239	15	16	10	4,325

* Please note the #s above do not include policies that were not issued by the Department

The Written Directives Unit faces many challenges with the Department's concurrence process. There are many stakeholders and subject matter experts (SMEs) involved from other Bureaus/units, making it very difficult to facilitate the process and meet deadlines. This process could be more efficient if it were centralized within one unit. As recommended by CalDOJ, the Department is currently looking into creating a Policy Team that would be composed of a dedicated group of report writers and policy experts. This team's primary responsibility would be researching and drafting all policies for the Department.

If the Written Directives Unit was adequately staffed with a mix of sworn members and Analysts (policy writers), the unit could own and streamline the concurrence process. Current unit members would continue to handle the administrative side, and a policy development sub-unit would be responsible for developing drafts, managing workgroups, communicating with SMEs, providing DGO updates to Deputy Chiefs as necessary, facilitating discussions with the Department of Police Accountability (DPA), and finalizing documents. The Chief of Police also has special policies that require best practices research, including analyzing other jurisdictions and their policies to determine how and if the Department may be able to adopt some of these identified practices. Analysts could also help draft/propose policies that the Chief and Command Staff could further develop.

Professional Standards and Principled Policing Unit						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Written Directives Unit	2	3	+1	1	4	+3
Sergeant	1	1	0			
Officer	1	2	+1			
Senior Admin Analyst				0	3	+3
Management Assistant				1	1	0

Based on these needs and the Department's intent to form a Policy Team, the Project Team recommends the addition of one Officer and three Senior Administrative Analysts who are dedicated to policy development. Implementing such changes within the Written Directives Unit would also create an opportunity for the Department to utilize sworn members who are on Temporary Modified Duty (TMD) to contribute to policy development with their field expertise. The Department should monitor workload and Policy Team roles and responsibilities to assess staffing needs ongoing as the unit develops.

Staff Inspections Unit (SIU)

The Staff Inspections Unit (SIU) serves as an internal audit unit for the entire Department. The unit is tasked with monitoring ongoing compliance with the Department's wide range of policies and procedures, and for conducting audits that are requested by various external agencies. SIU is a specialized unit; all members receive training and certification in law enforcement audit procedures. The unit frequently handles confidential information and must abide by the Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards (GAGAS).

In the last 18-24 months, the unit has focused its efforts on reviewing all accountability recommendations that were implemented through CRI. SIU currently operates with one Sergeant and one Officer, and an Analyst assigned to the Business Analysis Team (BAT) also provides analytical support part-time.

The Staff Inspections Unit's current staffing and limited capacity makes it difficult to support the entire Department. The team needs dedicated Analysts to develop reports and manage large datasets that are pulled routinely from various systems. An additional sworn member is also needed to enable the unit to work on multiple audits and inspections simultaneously. As use of force policies change and new legislation is passed, the volume of compliance-checking from the Body Worn Camera Unit will also continue to increase to ensure the Department is compliant with all new requirements.

Professional Standards and Principled Policing Unit						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Staff Inspections Unit	2	3	+1	0	2	+2
Sergeant	1	1	0			
Officer	1	2	+1			
Senior Admin Analyst				0	2	+2

The number of hours dedicated to complete audits is not currently tracked and therefore the positions within the unit are recognized as non-scalable in this analysis. The Project Team recommends that SIU develop, track, and monitor metrics on audit completion so that unit staffing can be determined using a workload-based methodology in the future. Based on the unit's needs and growing responsibilities, the Project Team recommends the addition of two dedicated Analysts and one Officer to allow the unit to function efficiently and to ensure Department accountability.

Business Analysis Team (BAT)

The Business Analysis Team (BAT) was established in 2018 to centralize data-related work across the Department. Prior to 2018, there were no delineated roles between crime analysts and data analysts. The goal of BAT is to provide data to all stakeholders in a way that is informative, interesting, and accurate. The unit supports the Department with non-operational analytical requests and aims to improve data-driven decision making. The unit's primary responsibilities are to provide data analysis and generate various mandated reports to federal, state, and local officials. Some mandated reports include the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Program, use-of-force reports, stop data reports, Law Enforcement Enterprise Portal Reporting (FBI), and local MOU reports. The Business Analysis Team is also responsible for responding to legal inquiries, CLERY requests (requirements of educational institutions), and other requests from stakeholders such as the Chief of Police, the Mayor's Office, and the Board of Supervisors.

BAT is comprised of one civilian Manager who oversees seven Senior Administrative Analysts. The Analysts work collaboratively to respond to requests and generate routine reports but must also manage various projects within their specialized areas of focus. Focus areas include a data transparency program with the Department of Police Accountability, development of academic partnerships, data development for Department General Orders, strategic planning, dashboard development, and internal database development. In addition, each Analyst must also dedicate time to provide direct support to other units throughout the Bureau and Department (CRI Team, Staff Inspections Unit, Written Directives Unit, Policy Public Affairs Office).

Data collection and transparency are critical to the Department. Trends toward data-driven decision-making and increased data reporting requirements will continue to place greater pressure on the Business Analysis Team. BAT serves as a critical data team both internally (helping the Department understand what the data means) as well as externally (providing information to government officials and members of the public).

Current staffing and the growing demand for data analyses and reporting from the Business Analysis Team has not allowed the unit to operate to its full potential. Some of the required statutory reports are not submitted by required deadlines and the unit is unable to execute their plans for new development projects. Analysts are unable to devote time to more complex analytical work, and fulfilling requests for analytical support from other Bureaus/units has been challenging. To meet required deadlines and provide a level of service that enables data-driven decision making, the Project Team recommends the addition of three Senior Administrative Analysts and one Principal Administrative Analyst. The Principal Administrative Analyst supervise the full team of analysts and provide oversight on management-level projects for the Professional Standards and Principled Policing Unit.

Professional Standards and Principled Policing Unit						
	<i>SWORN</i>			<i>CIVILIAN</i>		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Business Analysis Team				7	11	+4
Principal Admin Analyst				0	1	+1
Senior Admin Analyst				7	10	+3

At this time, the work performed by the Business Analysis Team varies immensely in scope and nature; therefore, the positions within BAT are recognized as non-scalable for this staffing assessment. The Project Team recommends that BAT develop and track metrics that represent workload for use in future analyses.

Fiscal Division

The Fiscal Division is divided into three units and is responsible for carrying out all administrative functions related to budgeting, accounting, contracts, and grants. This includes executing the Department's annual budget, financial plans, financial analysis, supplemental appropriations, grant awards, and other revenue programs. The Chief Financial Officer provides oversight over the Division and is supported by three managers: Budget Manager, Contracts Manager, and Accounting Manager. Prior to July 2021, the Supplies Unit was also part of the Fiscal Division; however, a recent Department restructure shifted the Supplies Unit to the Property Division in the Administration Bureau.

Fiscal Division					
	SWORN			CIVILIAN	
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Need
Fiscal Division - Admin				2	+1
Accounting Unit				7	0
Grants Unit				2	+1
Contracts Unit				1	0
DIVISION TOTAL	0	0	0	12	+2

Fiscal Division – Administration

Currently, the Fiscal Division is understaffed due to several vacancies which has limited its ability to take on new projects. The Grant Manager position is currently vacant, and an Accountant Supervisor position has remained vacant since March 2020. This has required a reprioritization of staff time toward only high-priority projects, and ultimately, project timelines have been significantly delayed and other initiatives suspended indefinitely, resulting in providing a lower level of service and support to Department staff.

The approval of the Acquisition of Surveillance Technology Ordinance (19B) by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors has also impacted the overall capacity of the Fiscal Division. The 19B ordinance requires Departments obtain Board approval for any technologies subject to the Surveillance Technology Ordinance. The ordinance requires the Department to go through a Surveillance Technology Review Process, which includes additional administrative work to adhere to the requirements. The significant amount of staff time and resources required to put together a surveillance technology review package has placed a significant strain on staffing resources. The various review packages require the coordination and input of various stakeholders before submission and presently, the work is performed ad-hoc, primarily by the Chief Financial Officer.

Additionally, the citywide Office of Contracts Administration has been revising its guidance and instructions to Departments on what types of technology commodities and services are eligible for the Technology Marketplace. Factors determining the applicability may include, but are not limited to, the cybersecurity risk factor, a purchase covering multiple fiscal years, or instances wherein the City desires to higher contract liability thresholds. More and more information technology service contracts that were once procured through the Technology Marketplace now warrant a separate solicitation and contract agreement. With the increased workload and limited capacity, the Project Team recommends the

addition of a Senior Administrative Analyst to provide direct support to the Contracts Manager and Budget Manager and to facilitate requests for 19B Surveillance Ordinance Requirements.

Fiscal Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Fiscal Division - Admin				2	3	+1
Chief Financial Officer				1	1	0
Budget Manager				1	1	0
Senior Administrative Analyst				0	1	+1

Accounting Unit

The Accounting Unit provides centralized accounting support for the whole Department. Responsibilities include reviewing, analyzing, and interpreting City accounting records and policies; identifying and allocating revenue and expenditures; financial record keeping within complex accounting systems; processing of deposits, reimbursements, and interdepartmental charges; reviewing invoices and purchase orders; and presenting accounting activity to various Department members. The unit is managed by an Accounting Manager who is currently supported by two Supervising Accountants, an Accountant, and three Senior Account Clerks. One Accountant position has remained vacant since March 2020, which has put a significant strain on the unit.

The City's transition to a new financial management system has created many challenges for the entire Division and has reduced the overall productivity of staff within the Accounting Unit. Although the new system has some new/additional functionalities, there are limitations and inefficiencies within the system that have impacted the unit. For example, the new system does not align with how appropriation control is handled or how purchase orders and vouchers are created. Staff has spent much of their time troubleshooting the system and developing workarounds.

Fiscal Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Accounting Unit				7	7	0
Accounting Manager				1	1	0
Accounting Supervisor				2	2	0
Accountant				1	1	0
Senior Account Clerk				3	3	0

The positions within the Accounting Unit are determined using a ratio-based methodology based on the overall size of the Department. With 2,501 sworn and non-sworn full-time employees (excluding Airport), the Accounting Unit does not warrant any current staffing changes.

Grants Unit

The Grants Unit is composed of two Grant Analysts in the Senior Administrative Analyst classification who are responsible for analytical work in the areas of grant administration. Their primary duties include preparing grant claims, preparing grant budget modifications, assisting with audits and monitoring visits,

the City's Post Audit, and preparing the general ledger. The Grants Manager position is currently vacant so the unit is temporarily supervised by the Chief Financial Officer, which is not sustainable. Positions within this unit are unique and are considered non-scalable for this staffing analysis.

Fiscal Division						
	<i>SWORN</i>			<i>CIVILIAN</i>		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Grants Unit				2	3	+1
Grants Manager				0	1	+1
Grants Analyst				2	2	0

Although one of the unit's Grant Analysts recently vacated a position, current staffing with two analysts appears to be adequate as the unit has been able to fulfill all of its responsibilities. However, given the scope of its responsibilities, the unit requires a dedicated manager and therefore the Project Team recommends the addition of a Grant Manager to oversee the unit.

Contracts Unit

The Contracts Unit manages procurement activities related to all SFPD professional services, warranty, and maintenance contracts. The unit is operated by one Contracts Manager who is responsible for implementing contract administrative procedures; contract preparation, execution, and administration; and performing requests for proposals or other solicitation methods.

Recent shifts in City procurement toward standalone contracts for information technology services, rather than procuring information technology services through the City's Technology Marketplace, has impacted the Contract Unit's workload; however, current staffing is appropriate for this unit. As the Contract Manager provides unique services to the Department, the position is considered non-scalable for this staffing assessment.

Fiscal Division						
	<i>SWORN</i>			<i>CIVILIAN</i>		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Contracts Unit				1	1	0
Contracts Manager				1	1	0

Technology Division

The Technology Division provides all communication and information technology support services for the Department. The Division is divided into five units who work collaboratively to ensure that the Department's information systems are up-to-date and functioning properly so that sworn and civilian members can perform their jobs efficiently and effectively. Members throughout the Department use various systems for record keeping, report writing, generating data, business intelligence, and data management.

High-level Department priorities and citywide trends include an effort to modernize technology platforms, including introducing and implementing new systems for records management and business intelligence. SFPD is also currently working with the Department of Emergency Management (DEM) on a Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) system upgrade which will improve the use of mobile technology and be utilized as a tool by officers in the field. The primary role of the Technology Division is to understand the needs of end-users and to develop systems and programs accordingly.

Projects and workload are only expected to increase with the nature of the Division's work gravitating towards business analysis. To keep pace with citywide trends and standards for technological development, the Division will need to bolster its Business Analyst/Project Manager staffing capacity.

Technology Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Technology - Admin				2	2	0
IT Project Management Office				6	8	+2
IT Architecture and Operations Unit				8	13	+5
Applications Unit				9	11	+2
Business Intelligence Unit				6	8	+2
*IT Technical Services & Support	1	1	0	10	16	+6
DIVISION TOTAL	1	1	0	41	58	+17

* The Technical Services & Support Unit currently relies on four contracted full-time employees to support their unit. Those employees are not reflected in the table above.

Technology Division – Administration

The Technology Division is overseen by a Chief Information Officer (CIO) who is supported by a Secretary. These positions are considered non-scalable due to the unique roles that they fulfill in the Department.

Technology Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Technology - Admin				2	2	0
Chief Information Officer				1	1	0
Secretary				1	1	0

IT Project Management Office (PMO)

The Project Management Office (PMO) manages the implementation of information systems projects, particularly enterprise software. The unit is run by a Manager and is supported by three budgeted Project Managers, a Senior Business Analyst, and a Business Analyst.

The Project Managers perform project management responsibilities of scoping out Department projects, defining business requirements, and monitoring the implementation and roll out of projects. The Senior Business Analyst monitors the Technology Division's budget and provides procurement support for technology purchases. The Business Analyst provides support in monitoring low priority or low impact projects. Some of the unit's recent high priority initiatives include:

- Implementation of BiasSync – a science-based solution designed to help the Department more effectively manage unconscious bias in the work environment
- Benchmark analytics
- Replacing Crime Data Warehouse (CDW) with the National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS)
- Fleet vehicle technology modernization project
- Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) replacement project with DEM
- Property control – various Hall of Justice relocations
- Transitions to new Department facilities/locations
- Transition of the Department's call manager to the citywide call manager
- Infrastructure and foundational improvement
- Cable decommissioning

The unit has little to no capacity to conduct strategic planning for the Technology Division and administer a comprehensive technology training program, as the Project Managers are at capacity with their project management work. There is an immediate need for a dedicated Project Manager to drive long-term strategic planning and analyze future technological needs of the Department. An additional Project Manager is needed to develop a formal, centralized training program for technological tools and systems used throughout the Department.

Technology Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
IT Project Management Office				6	8	+2
Manager				1	1	0
IS Project Manager				3	5	+2
Senior IS Business Analyst				1	1	0
IS Business Analyst				1	1	0

Due to the breadth and complexity of administrative and analytical work required, workload for this unit is not scalable to specific measures. However, for the Department to remain current and proficient with evolving technology and systems, the Project Teams recommends the addition of two Project Managers dedicated to strategic planning and training development, respectively.

IT Architecture and Operations Unit

The Architecture and Operations Unit provides technical support and maintenance for all networks, systems, security, and access controls used in Department applications and systems. The unit is led by an IS Project Director and administered by seven IS Engineers. One of the unit's Principal Engineers serves as the Department's Security Manager, while another supports the Department's network. The remaining six engineers are dedicated to supporting the Department's various critical systems.

The Architecture and Operations Unit has been tasked with an increasing number of new projects but has not received any additional support. Current unit priorities include:

- New building construction and the relocation of units requiring the development of new networks/systems (e.g., new facility for the Crime Lab and Traffic Company on Evans St.)
- Replacing and providing maintenance for aging infrastructure (e.g., replacing the video wall system at DOC)
- Increasing storage capacity and improving network performance
- Protecting the Department's network against an increasing number of cybersecurity threats
- Compliance with the increasing number of state and federal regulations regarding criminal justice information

Due to the complexity and variety of projects and technical tasks managed by each engineer, productivity is not measured through simple workload measures. However, there are industry best practices for applying a ratio of engineers based on specific technical functions.

The Technology Division manages a large network including 252 network switches, 82 wireless access points, 76 routers, 24 firewalls, 22 critical systems, and 248 servers. The Department currently has one dedicated Security Manager to oversee this broad network. While industry ratios for security personnel vary, the Department needs to allocate two IS Engineers to create stability and redundancy in security oversight. Additional staff will mitigate the loss of institutional knowledge and allow for continuous coverage through succession planning should the current incumbent vacate the position. Moreover, redundancy will offer immediate relief whenever the current incumbent is out of the office or otherwise unavailable.

As for network support, the unit also only employs one engineer to manage 252 network switches, as well as the wireless access points, routers, and firewalls. Industry best practices recommend a ratio of one engineer per 100 network switches. For SFPD, this would amount to 2.5 full-time engineers. Based on these industry standards, the Project Team recommends hiring two additional full-time engineers to provide more oversight of the Department's broad network.

Finally, the unit has six systems engineers to support the Department's 22 critical systems and 248 servers. Industry staffing ratios for server support vary depending on the size of the organization and whether servers are physical or virtual. Unit personnel recommend a ratio of one engineer per 30 servers based on their portfolio, amounting to eight full-time equivalent engineers. Based on this ratio, the Project Team recommends hiring two additional full-time engineers to provide the adequate support needed for the Department's systems and servers.

Technology Division						
	<i>SWORN</i>			<i>CIVILIAN</i>		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
IT Architecture and Operations Unit				8	13	+5
IS Project Director				1	1	0
IT Security Manager				1	2	+1
IS Engineer				6	10	+4

Applications Unit

The Applications Unit is led by the Applications Manager and consists of a team of six Programmers, one Business Analyst, and one Engineer. The unit is responsible for a range of projects from website development to applications programming, to database administration. Prior to March 2021, the Business Intelligence Unit also reported to the Applications Manager but now functions as its own unit.

Like other Technology units, one major change initiative that will impact the Applications Team is the Department's transition to a new records management system. The Department has plans to discontinue the use of the current system, Crime Data Warehouse, and replace it with the National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS). Although the new system has not been purchased, the Applications Unit anticipates changes with this transition due to supporting the new system and applications.

The unit needs support for specialized functions where only one staff member is currently dedicated, hence promoting redundancy and succession planning. There is currently one programmer dedicated to working on projects through PeopleSoft/Human Resource Management System (HRMS). Due to the increase in operational analytics and personnel information being produced for legislators, management, mandated reporting, and other external requests, this function has become increasingly important. Although workload metrics were unavailable for this function, a vital support role such as this requires additional staffing to promote institutional knowledge, allow for succession planning, and increase coverage for this area if the incumbent is unavailable or the position becomes vacant. Additionally, the teams only APEX Programmer recently retired, and the position remains vacant. The Project Team recommends hiring two additional Programmers to support HRMS and Crime Data Warehouse (APEX) programming for redundancy in these important functions and so the unit can take on more initiatives.

Technology Division						
	<i>SWORN</i>			<i>CIVILIAN</i>		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Applications Unit				9	11	+2
Manager				1	1	0
IS Programmer Analyst				6	8	+2
IS Business Analyst				1	1	0
IS Engineer				1	1	0

Business Intelligence (BI) Unit

The Business Intelligence (BI) Unit reports directly to the Chief Information Officer and is managed by an IS Project Director. The team consists of two IS Business Analysts and three IS Programmer Analysts who are responsible for synthesizing all of the data collected by the Department and centralizing it into one database so that members can access it; various databases are created, and tools are developed, that enable end-users to extract data.

Over the last 18 months, the BI Team has been tasked with providing technological support for many of the DOJ Recommendations. Through collaboration with the CRI Team, various data models and dashboards have been created in subject areas such as stop data and officer conduct and performance. These high-priority projects have been time consuming and the unit requires additional support in order to take on new initiatives and maintain other routine unit responsibilities.

Like the Applications Unit, the BI Team shares similar concerns for providing redundancy in service coverage and preserving institutional knowledge for core support operations. Currently there is only one programmer for metadata modeling and one programmer for ETL (extraction, transformation, loading) development. These roles are crucial in allowing dashboards and automated reports to accurately extract data and information. As the Department becomes more technologically advanced and relies on data dashboards for a range of operational needs, there is an increased need for supporting these programming roles. Based on these needs, the Project Team recommends hiring two additional Programmers to support metadata modeling and ETL development. Doing so would also mitigate the risk of loss of institutional knowledge and optimize coverage for this function when the incumbents are unavailable.

Technology Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Business Intelligence Unit				6	8	+2
IS Project Director				1	1	0
IS Business Analyst				2	2	0
IS Programmer Analyst				3	5	+2

IT Technical Services and Support Unit

The Technical Services and Support Unit manages the 24-hour Help Desk and provides regular ongoing technical support for the entire Department. The unit is managed by the IT Project Director and is comprised of nine IT Operations Support Administrators (engineers), one Officer, and a part-time retiree. Six of the engineers and the Officers are each assigned to manage a particular technical service as well as respond to work orders from the Help Desk. Some examples of technical services include:

- Body worn camera deployment and support
- Mobile device management
- Training and support for law enforcement applications
- Supporting Department-wide telecommunications
- E-Citations support
- Testing applications coming out of build

Due to demand in the Department and lack of internal staffing resources, the Technical Services and Support Unit must rely on four contractors who operate on a full-time basis responding to field work, service requests, and providing front counter support.

Smart phone accessibility has been a priority for the Department over the last few years. The mobile platform continues to evolve and allows sworn members to have access to data and information while they are in the field. New applications are constantly being developed and added to mobile devices which is proving to be a great resource. However, the addition of each application places additional pressure on the Technical Services and Support Unit.

Over the last 18-24 months, the Covid-19 pandemic has also created drastic changes within the Department's work environment in that members are now working remotely. Supporting this hybrid work environment has required the Department to adopt new technology and systems, which has put additional demand on support services. The number of laptops distributed increased significantly, support for VPN connectivity has increased, requests for troubleshooting VPN/Cisco-related issues increased, the volume of requests for support of new systems/software (e.g. MS Teams, Zoom, WebEx) has increased, and more technology such as speakers and webcams is required.

There are several upcoming high-priority initiatives that will also have a huge impact on the Technical Services and Support Unit. The first major change will be the implementation of the National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS). The implementation of a new Records Management System (RMS) will require an immense amount of training, guidance, and support to lead the Department through this transition. The new RMS will potentially have various modules and it is anticipated that the entire ecosystem will change with the possibility of moving to a web-based application. The Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) project with DEM is another initiative that will increase the unit's workload significantly. This will require changing and standardizing all computers and related components in every patrol car and providing appropriate training and support. This project alone will pull staff away from their current areas of responsibility so additional staff will be needed to support various initiatives.

The positions within the Technical Services and Support Unit are considered non-scalable as there are no measures directly related to the work performed. However, based on current staffing and various Department initiatives, the Project Team recommends hiring six additional full-time IT Operations Support Administrators (engineers). This would establish a core group of Engineers who focus on managing their respective technical service areas while also allowing the unit to support new Department priorities. The Department would also no longer need to rely on the four contract employees for support.

Technology Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
*IT Technical Services & Support	1	1	0	10	16	+6
IS Project Director				1	1	0
IT Support Administrator				9	15	+6
Officer	1	1	0			

* The Technical Services & Support Unit currently relies on four contracted full-time employees to support their unit. Those employees are not reflected in the table above.

Office of Chief of Staff

Overview

The Office of Chief of Staff reports directly to the Chief's Office and consists of five units: Strategic Communications, Policy and Public Affairs Office, Labor Relations Office, Risk Management Office, and the Police Commission Office. Strategic Communications includes the Media Relations Unit and is responsible for strategizing all external messaging and communications on behalf of the Department. The Office of Policy and Public Affairs provides direct support to the Chief's Office and serves as a dedicated liaison to the San Francisco Board Supervisors (BOS). The unit is responsible for collaborating with the Police Commission and providing guidance to the Department regarding policy, legislation, and government mandates. The Labor Relations Unit is responsible for any Department items that fall within the scope of representation. Among other things, this includes collective bargaining and meet and confers for general orders and policies. The Risk Management Office is composed of two divisions: Legal Division and Internal Affairs Division. Collectively it is the responsibility of the Risk Management Office to ensure that the Department complies with all applicable laws and legal requirements imposed by local, state, and federal mandates. The Police Commission Office serves as a liaison for the Police Commission and is the point of contact for all Commission matters.

Recommended Staffing


The table below provides a staffing overview for the various Divisions within the Office of Chief of Staff. Collectively, the staffing levels for sworn members appear to be appropriate for the current workload amongst the Divisions. However, there is a significant need for civilian staffing to increase the level of administrative and analytical support across the Bureau. A detailed analysis for each Division/unit is provided in the following sections.

Office of Chief of Staff						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Administration	1	1	0	1	1	0
Strategic Communications	4	4	0	6	7	+1
Policy and Public Affairs				4	5	+1
Labor Relations Office				2	3	+1
Risk Management - Admin	2	2	0			
RMO - Legal	11	12	+1	26	42	+16
RMO - Internal Affairs	20	18	(2)	5	6	+1
Commission Office	2	2	0	2	2	0
BUREAU TOTAL	40	39	(1)	46	66	+20

Organizational Chart



Office of Chief of Staff



Methodologies Used to Determine Staffing

Staffing for the Office of the Chief of Staff is determined using the following methodologies. Examples are provided below.

Workload-based Methodology

The Project Team conducted analyses on various measures throughout the different Divisions to determine appropriate staffing levels for Officers, Sergeant Investigators, Legal Assistants, and Clerks. Examples of workload measures include the total number of various Public Records Act (PRA) requests, the number of Internal Affairs (IA) investigations, and the number of officer-involved shootings.

Ratio-based Methodology

The Project Team used a ratio-based methodology to determine staffing for positions supporting the Court Liaison Unit. Recommended staffing for sworn and civilian members is scaled to the total number of court dates within the calendar year.

Non-scaling Methodology

Many of the units and roles within the Office of Chief of Staff are specialized and are not scalable to any measures. These positions are unique and staffing levels are determined by Department leaders and key decision makers.

Recommended Staffing by Division and Unit

Office of Chief of Staff – Administration

Office of Chief of Staff - Administration						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Administration	1	1	0	1	1	0
Assistant Chief	1	1	0			
Executive Secretary				1	1	0

One of the Department's Assistant Chiefs serves as Chief of Staff and is the link between the Chief of Police and various units within the Department. The Chief of Staff is responsible for the oversight of the Strategic Communications Division (Media Relations Unit), the Policy and Public Affairs Office, the Labor Relations Office, the Risk Management Office, and the Commission Office. The Deputy Chief of the Administration Bureau also reports directly to the Chief of Staff.

The Chief of Staff receives administrative support from one dedicated Executive Secretary. The Secretary's responsibilities include calendar management, tracking of all incoming/outgoing correspondence, preparing documentation/talking points for appearances at specific events, miscellaneous report tracking, and other administrative duties. Both roles are unique and are classified as non-scalable.

Strategic Communications/Media Relations Unit

The Strategic Communications Office is responsible for strategizing all external messaging and communications on behalf of the Department. The Director of Strategic Communications provides oversight to the Media Relations Unit (MRU), which consists of nine sworn and civilian members who act as the point of contact for the various media outlets (print, television, radio, and social media). Members of the unit provide information to the public by responding to media inquiries, compiling information for public records requests, and by creating multimedia content to convey messages from the Department. Unit members are delineated into the following roles:

- A civilian Director oversees Strategic Communications and the MRU
- A Sergeant is the Officer in Charge (OIC) of the Media Relations Unit and acts as the Public Information Officer for the Department
- Three sworn Officers perform Public Information Officer (PIO) duties and respond to media and external inquiries on a regular basis and coordinate public messaging on behalf of the Department
- One PR Assistant serves as a Social Media Manager
- One fulltime Videographer supports the entire Department
- One Special Examiner works on special projects as needed at the request of the Chief of Police
- One Clerk and one Management Assistant provide administrative support to the unit

Strategic Communications - Media Relations Unit						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Media Relations Unit	4	4	0	6	7	+1
Director				1	1	0
Sergeant/PIO	1	1	0			
Officer/PIO	3	3	0			
PR Assistant				1	1	0
Media Production Technician				1	2	+1
Management Assistant				1	1	0
Special Examiner				1	1	0
Clerk				1	1	0

Recommendations and Considerations

The demand for videographer capabilities has increased significantly in recent years. Social media platforms continue to evolve and there is a greater demand for the unit to produce more video content and explore new avenues with social media. The Covid-19 pandemic has also caused the unit to change their practices and adapt to new social distancing protocols. Many interviews are now conducted remotely and the Chief's Office is receiving an increasing number of requests for various video productions in lieu of invitations for the Chief to speak in person. If an officer-involved shooting (OIS) occurs, the videographer must dedicate several days to the production of video footage in preparation for Town Hall meetings and footage release to the public. With only one videographer on staff to support the entire Department, the MRU has struggled to meet growing demand and requires additional support. Other members have been cross-trained in the basic fundamentals of video editing but lack the proficiency required to produce professional videos/projects. The addition of a Videographer would provide backup and allow the MRU to work on more projects simultaneously for the Department.

Language capability is a huge need for the Media Relations Unit. Bilingual staff would improve communication and build better rapport with non-English speaking communities in San Francisco. However, bilingual resources are currently centralized in the Community Engagement Division and the Department should consider where and under what structure bilingual officers are best utilized in the Department.

All roles within the Media Relations Unit are non-scalable. However, based on the increased demand for video productions, the Project Team recommends the addition of one Videographer (Media Production Technician). The unit also previously had a civilian Website Manager that currently no longer exists. This position is required and plays a significant role in keeping the Department website up to date. The Department should consider consolidating the roles of the Social Media Manager and Website Manager.

In the Controller's Office's May 2019 report "Civilianization Progress and Options", the Controller identified the Media Relations Unit's Officer positions as potential candidates for civilianization. After reviewing the unit's staffing structure and duties, the Project Team recommends that MRU maintain its current structure of utilizing sworn Officers as Public Information Officers so that the Department's media representatives possess the applicable field knowledge and sworn expertise to respond effectively to public and media inquiries.

Policy and Public Affairs Office

The Policy and Public Affairs Office reports directly to the Chief of Staff and is composed of four civilian members. The unit was established in 2019 to serve as a dedicated liaison with the San Francisco Board of Supervisors (BOS). Responsibilities have continued to expand, and other functions include supporting the Chief's Office, collaborating with the Police Commission, analyzing legislation and government mandates, reviewing Department reports, preparing Command Staff for public hearings/appearances, and contributing to messaging and negotiations during the budget cycle.

Policy and Public Affairs Office						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Policy and Public Affairs				4	5	+1
Director				1	1	0
Manager				2	2	0
Senior Admin Analyst				1	2	+1

The primary function of the Policy and Public Affairs Office is acting as a liaison with the BOS and staying current with the various ordinances. The BOS routinely submit proposals for new ordinances and/or make amendments to existing police codes based on priorities of various Supervisors that can directly impact Department operations. The Policy and Public Affairs Office must facilitate the review of proposed ordinances by consulting with Command Staff and the City Attorney to consider all liabilities and policy decisions. The unit is also responsible for ensuring that the BOS understand the impact of proposed bills and new legislation so that all ordinances are in alignment. Reviewing state legislation and attending committee hearings are essential to understand the impact of amendments and determine if the Department needs to lobby for or against a bill through the Mayor's Office.

Collaboration with the Police Commission occurs routinely to review policies and develop strategic messaging as it relates to legislative priorities. In today's climate, the direction of Department policies is heavily influenced by community input and high-profile incidents that occur often demand immediate action. In response to the George Floyd incident in 2020, the Policy and Public Affairs Office was able to work with the Commission to expedite the Department General Order (DGO) concurrence process to revise the Department's use of force policy (DGO 5.01).

The Policy and Public Affairs Office also provides administrative support to the Chief's office and provides consultation to Command Staff prior to any BOS or Police Commission hearings. The unit also reviews/sanitizes all shared information and prepares all presentations to ensure that messaging aligns with the Chief's vision and Department priorities.

In the next year, the Policy and Public Affairs Office intends to outline goals and objectives and establish a unit order to clearly define duties and responsibilities. As these positions provide strategic leadership and direct support to Command Staff, they are unique and considered non-scalable in the staffing analysis. However, the Policy and Public Affairs Office currently does not have the bandwidth required to stay up to date with state legislation. The Project Team recommends an additional Analyst to conduct routine review of more than 30 state bills and participate in all committee hearings.

Labor Relations Office

The Labor Relations Office was established in June 2020 and is currently staffed by two civilian members: one Director and one Senior Labor Personnel Analyst. The unit is responsible for collective bargaining, meet and confers for general orders and policies, any Department items that fall within the scope of representation, and the review of all changes and/or implementations related to DOJ recommendations or the Department's Collaborative Reform Initiative (CRI). The unit also provides guidance and recommendations to the Chief of Police and Command Staff when complex issues arise and regularly consults with the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors on labor-related issues.

Labor Relations Office						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Labor Relations Office				2	3	+1
Director				1	1	0
Senior Labor Analyst				1	2	+1

In August 2021, the Police Commission made the decision that the Department's Code of Conduct (DGO 2.01) and all Department General Orders (DGOs) must apply to all civilian employees within the Department. This decision greatly impacts the workload of the Labor Relations Office. Prior to this decision, the Labor Relations Office only worked with the two unions that represent sworn members: San Francisco Police Officers Association (SFPOA) and the San Francisco Municipal Executives Association (SFMEA). Effective September 2021, the Labor Relations Office must now provide an opportunity to meet and confer for the general ordinance with all 10 unions that represent Department employees.

The roles within the Labor Relations Office are unique and are not currently scalable to any workload measures. However, based on the Police Commission's recent approval to include all civilian employees under DGO 2.01, the unit's workload will increase significantly and requires additional analytical support. The Project Team suggests closely monitoring the unit's workload and recommends the addition of one Labor Personnel Analyst to provide meet and confers for the additional unions that represent civilian members.

Risk Management Office (RMO)

The Risk Management Office (RMO) is split between the Legal Division and the Internal Affairs Division (Administrative and Criminal). It is the responsibility of Risk Management to ensure that the Department complies with all the applicable laws and legal requirements imposed by local, state, and federal mandates. The two Divisions work collaboratively to monitor the conduct of all Department members to ensure that a high level of integrity is upheld and to mitigate misconduct and/or at-risk behavior. The table below provides an overview of current and recommended staffing in the two Risk Management Divisions. A summary and analysis of each RMO unit are provided in this section.

Risk Management Office						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Risk Management - Admin	2	2	0			
Commander	1	1	0			
Captain	1	1	0			
Legal Division	11	12	+1	26	42	+16
Legal Unit	3	3	0	5	7	+2
EIS Unit	1	1	0	2	2	0
Court Liaison Unit	3	3	0	4	8	+4
Body Camera Unit	3	4	+1	8	12	+4
SB-1421 Unit	1	1	0	7	13	+6
Internal Affairs (IA) Division	20	18	(2)	5	6	+1
Administrative Investigations	8	8	0	3	4	+1
OIS/In-Custody Deaths	4	2	(2)	0	0	0
Brady Unit	0	0	0	2	2	0
EEO Office	1	1	0	0	0	0
Investigative Services Detail	7	7	0	0	0	0
RISK MANAGEMENT TOTAL	33	32	(1)	31	48	+17

Current Trends

Senate Bill (SB) 1421 has increased workload significantly for all Risk Management Divisions. Effective January 1, 2019, this law amends the Police Bill of Rights and expands the Public Records Act (PRA) to allow individuals to request documents that were previously able to be withheld by law enforcement agencies. This includes any records relating to incidents where: (1) an officer discharges a firearm at an individual; (2) an officer's use of force results in death or great bodily injury; (3) a sustained finding that an officer engaged in sexual assault involving a member of the public; and (4) a sustained finding that an officer was dishonest during the investigations, reporting, or prosecution of a crime.

Staffing levels have not been adjusted to meet the demand of additional work created through DOJ recommendations and other policy changes/requirements. Ongoing staffing shortages coupled with increased responsibilities has created backlog that will remain for some time. This has caused delays in service from various units and has made it difficult for Risk Management units to respond to requests within customary time frames without impinging on the ability to perform other duties. DOJ recommendations and legislation have had the greatest impact on Department policies. Various processes now require additional steps and have become more time consuming.

Senate Bill (SB) 16 will increase workload significantly for all Risk Management units. Recently approved by the Governor of California on September 30, 2021, SB-16 will expand the categories of disclosure previously defined by SB-1421 under the California Public Records Act. First it expands use of force disclosures to include sustained findings involving all use of force that is unreasonable or excessive. This bill also allows for release of sustained findings of unlawful searches/arrests and all records that show racist or discriminatory conduct by a member. SB-16 also expands the type of administrative investigations subject to disclosure and expands the definition of sustained cases which will require revisiting previously reviewed cases. SB-16 has the potential to produce 18,000 backdated/historical cases, in addition to 1,000+ new cases per year.

RMO – Legal Division

The Legal Division is responsible for ensuring that the Department complies with all applicable laws and legal requirements imposed by local, state, and federal mandates. The Division also monitors litigation in which the Department, its members, or the Chief is named and works with the City Attorney's Office on civil litigation matters. The Legal Division consists of five sub-units that are described below.

Risk Management Office - Legal Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Legal Division						
Legal Unit	3	3	0	5	7	+2
EIS Unit	1	1	0	2	2	0
Court Liaison Unit	3	3	0	4	8	+4
Body Camera Unit	3	4	+1	8	12	+4
SB-1421 Unit	1	1	0	7	13	+6
DIVISION TOTAL	11	12	+1	26	42	+16

Legal Unit

The Legal Unit provides support and guidance to Department members and also handles the majority of requests made by the public and other City agencies under the CA Public Records Act (PRA) and Sunshine Ordinance. The process of fulfilling a PRA request begins when it is received. A legal assistant is assigned to the request and subsequently enters it into an information management system to monitor and track the Department's progress in completing the request. Through the same system, the Legal Unit acknowledges that the request was received and provides a response within 10 days. The Department is also able to file for a 14-day extension if additional time is warranted.

While PRA requests are not new to the Department, they have increased in both activity and, in many cases, complexity given the emergence of body-worn cameras and the passing of SB-1421. Requests vary extensively, ranging from narrow focuses that may only require a few hours to fulfill, to a vast and complicated request that requires significant research and legal analysis with contributions from multiple Divisions/units. Due to this variance, these positions are considered non-scalable in this staffing analysis. However, in 2019, the Legal Unit processed and completed 210 PRA requests and that number increased

by 41% in 2020. The Project Team recommends one Legal Assistant and one Management Assistant to meet the growing demands of fulfilling PRA requests.

Risk Management Office - Legal Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Legal Unit	3	3	0	5	7	+2
Lieutenant	1	1				
Sergeant	1	1	0			
Officer	1	1	0			
Management Assistant				0	1	+1
Legal Assistant				3	4	+1
Senior Clerk				1	1	0
Senior Legal Clerk				1	1	0

Early Intervention System (EIS) Unit

The EIS Unit operates an early warning intervention program that aims to ensure member accountability and increase performance. EIS is an information management system that monitors the conduct of all sworn members and creates alerts for members who show patterns of at-risk behavior. If alerts are triggered, the EIS Unit will notify the District Stations and work with supervisors to coordinate interventions/trainings.

The methodology for determining staffing for the EIS sergeant is workload-based, assigning an estimated amount of time to review an alert and determine if an intervention is required. In 2019, there were 601 alerts generated by the EIS. The estimated time per alert is calculated from a base of 60 minutes to complete a comprehensive analysis of the alert and officer history, plus an additional average of 30 minutes to close the alert and/or initiate follow-up. In total, each alert represents 90 minutes of workload.

Overall, at over 900 hours, EIS-related workload (including all follow-up and intervention coordination) warrants the full-time Sergeant position. In addition to conducting EIS work, the Sergeant also serves as the Officer in Charge (OIC) of the unit. The Principal Administrative Analyst and Senior Administrative Analyst assigned to EIS are set as non-scalable support to the Sergeant. They play a valuable role in analyzing data, developing reports, and focusing on use of force incidents. Civilianization of the Sergeant position is not recommended, as law enforcement experience greatly aids in understanding the full context of each situation and the personnel record of the individual for whom an alert has been generated.

Risk Management Office - Legal Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
EIS Unit	1	1	0	2	2	0
Sergeant	1	1	0			
Senior Admin Analyst				1	1	0
Principal Admin Analyst				1	1	0

Court Liaison Unit

The Court Liaison Unit has several sub-units and is responsible for the administrative processing of subpoenas, front counter interactions with the public, scheduling and payroll, and record keeping. The unit also provides legal counsel regarding subpoenas and various court issues and acts as a liaison between the Department and the SF City Attorney, SF Superior Court, SF District Attorney, and SF Public Defender.

Unit staffing has decreased over the last 18 months due to retirement and reassignment which has resulted in staff performing the duties of multiple positions. In June 2020, the unit's payroll clerk retired and this position has remained vacant. This role is essential to the unit as the member was responsible for processing and approving court-related overtime for the entire Department in a timely manner. The unit is also staffed with only one paralegal who is performing the duties of two distinct positions. Their primary responsibility is to act as the Department's Custodian of Record in responding to criminal records subpoenas. However, this member has also been taking on the duties of responding to civil records subpoenas which should be covered by a second paralegal position.

Although staffing levels have been insufficient for a number of years, the unit's workload has increased simultaneously causing backlog and delays in timely subpoena service. Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, the volume of defense and civil subpoenas had increased at an alarming rate. With only a single clerk to manage front counter secretarial duties as well as all Department witness subpoenas, served subpoenas often do not arrive until well after the court date, if at all. Approximately less than 25% of all subpoenas sent for service are returned.

The courts also recently added a fifth day (Friday) to the weekly calendar which has increased the number of monthly traffic hearings by 25%, from 640 to 800. Criminal records subpoenas have not increased in volume but have begun to include subpoenas from the Grand Jury which are extremely time consuming. The scope and frequency is expected to increase over time and continue with the passing of SB-16 and the growing attention to cases involving officer use of force.

Many of the functions performed by the Court Liaison Unit are manual processes that involve the over-processing of documents. For example, the Traffic Subpoenas subunit is tasked with daily printing of Department-wide e-citations and is required to physically deliver them to various offices. The unit could work more efficiently and streamline their processes if automated systems were put in place.

Risk Management Office - Legal Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Court Liaison Unit	3	3	0	4	8	+4
Sergeant	1	1	0			
Officer	2	2	0			
Attorney				1	1	0
Senior Legal Clerk				0	1	+1
Senior Clerk				3	6	+3

Given that the unit's scope of work continues to evolve and increase in volume, specifically the number of court hearings, a ratio-based methodology was used to assess the appropriate staffing levels of the unit for sworn and civilian members who share responsibilities. The ratio-based methodology recommends the addition of one sworn Officer, one legal clerk, and two civilian clerical positions. However, it appears that the Court Liaison Unit could benefit from civilianizing the additional sworn position to provide additional administrative support. Therefore, the Project Team recommends the addition of one paralegal to support the unit's legal counsel, and three clerical roles to support work with traffic subpoenas, records subpoenas, and witness subpoenas. Adding these roles will enable the unit to process all subpoenas in timely manner.

Body Worn Camera (BWC) Unit

The Body Worn Camera Unit is responsible for retrieving, editing, redacting, and processing audio and video footage for requesting parties. Requestors include the general public, media, the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), the Department of Police Accountability (DPA), the SF Public Defender's Office, traffic courts, and various City agencies. Requests vary considerably in their scope, ranging from pulling one narrowly defined video to numerous videos over a period of time. A Sergeant supervises the BWC Unit; however, a Lieutenant oversees both the BWC Unit and the SB-1421 unit.

The workload required to fulfill a request also depends on the party requesting video, as the standards and specifications needed for redactions and edits vary considerably. A video released to the public, for instance, will be far more heavily redacted than a video released to the Department of Police Accountability (DPA). Requests made by other agencies, for instance, typically involve pulling far more videos, resulting in longer processing times. However, the most significant factor in determining workload is the number and length of videos requested. The industry standard for redaction is 6-9 times the amount of the recording being reviewed, based on technological tools and resources available. This does not account for the time spent locating videos, preparing letters, and completing other administrative tasks associated with the process.

A single Lieutenant oversees the BWC and SB-1421 units with two Sergeants serving as the direct supervisor of each unit. The Officer assigned to the BWC Unit shares some responsibilities with the Legal Assistants. However, there is some role delineation where the civilian members focus on redacting videos, while the Officer spends the majority of their time locating and reviewing videos being sent to other law enforcement agencies for prosecution.

The Body Worn Camera Unit does not have the bandwidth to meet the growing demand for audio/video requests. With current staffing levels, the BWC Unit is only able to process approximately 50,000 minutes of video per year without employing overtime. The current demand is more than 100,000 minutes per year. In 2019, the unit allocated a significant amount of overtime and was able to respond to 519 requests and produce 132,984 minutes of redacted audio/video. Using the industry standard of redaction taking 6-9 times the amount of recorded footage reviewed as noted above, this corresponds to

approximately 18,839 hours spent on audio/video redaction⁷. A huge backlog remains which has resulted in the unit's inability to meet deadlines for requests from various requestors and City agencies such as DPA. On average, the unit typically has 75,000 - 80,000 minutes of audio/video backlog that has been requested and is awaiting processing.

The volume of visual and audio recordings created each day continues to increase and the Department must now to retain and document more body worn camera footage than previously required. This is due to SB-1421 and other mandates. Anticipating the drastic impact that SB-16 will have on the unit's workload, the Body Worn Camera Unit has been proactive and has already begun to flag current audio/video recordings that meet the SB-16 criteria.

One of the primary obstacles in performing video and audio redactions are the tools associated with the Department's current software. Some videos could potentially be outsourced for redaction but before release of any video for anything other than criminal prosecutions and investigations, state law requires the redaction of any CORI/CLETS information captured. This information is primarily captured on computer screens, printouts, and audio transmissions. Videos processed by an outside vendor would need to be processed for CLETS redactions prior to sending out and would need to be reviewed by staff prior to public release. Outsourcing this work would also require approval by the Civil Service Commission and notification to Local 21. Hiring provisional or temporary employees to clear the backlog would not be cost effective based on office space limitations and the training and time needed to gain competency and purchase additional equipment.

The Department's current redaction software has many shortcomings. The object tracking is inconsistent, and results in employees having to apply manual redactions throughout. The software does not provide a tracking log for redactions applied to video or audio, requiring notes of redactions to be made during the process, further compounding the length of time required to process video. More robust software suites have features such as masks automatically applied to computer screens and transcription that allows the user to easily locate and redact required CLETS audio as well as provide automated redaction audit trails. These features would greatly enhance the efficiency of the redaction workflow.

Using established workload-based methodologies, the Project Team recommends the addition of four Legal Assistants and one Officer to the Body Worn Camera Unit. Increased staffing levels will allow the unit to keep pace with the increasing demand for audio/video requests while decreasing overtime utilization. Current workload-based methodologies do not take into consideration the additional work that will be generated from the passing of SB-16. Moving forward, and for future analysis, the unit's workload should be monitored closely to measure/assess the impact of Senate Bill 16.

⁷ This calculation is $(132,984 \times 8.5)/60$.

Risk Management Office - Legal Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Body Camera Unit	3	4	+1	8	12	+4
Lieutenant	1	1	0			
Sergeant	1	1	0			
Officer	1	2	+1			
Legal Assistant				8	12	+4

Senate Bill (SB) 1421 Unit

The SB-1421 Unit manages the disclosure of all records connected to officer-involved shootings (OIS), use of force resulting in great bodily injury, and cases of dishonesty and/or sexual assault by a Department member. The Department has received a number of requests for previously confidential peace officer records made public because of the passage of SB-1421. Despite the Department's best efforts to respond promptly, a backlog has quickly developed and will remain for some time.

Responding to each request is extremely time-consuming and involves many hours of research, analysis, and redaction. The Department has received general requests for disclosure of all records in all categories and requests by specific incidents and by specific officers. This requires a robust tracking and cross-tracking of all of the sub-requests contained within single requests as well as overall request tracking. The SB-1421 collaborates with other units within the Legal Division to provide responses in the form of acknowledgement of receipt, extension of time, clearance letters for non-responsive category requests for specific officers, and productions of responsive documents.

Responding to SB-1421 requests has proven to be challenging and extremely time consuming and the Department has not been able to respond within customary time frames. The Department began using an electronic tracking system (AIMS) to capture use of force incidents in 2006. However, the entries only indicate that a reportable use of force had occurred and did not track the type(s) of force used or whether great bodily injury occurred. Records created from 2016 to present indicate the type of force used, but the Department has only recently begun to track great bodily injury. Injury is not always apparent at the initial use of force and may become apparent later; this information may not be available in the form of a police report. Risk Management Divisions do not have electronic entries sufficient to determine the eligibility of a record for disclosure without reviewing the physical file for most cases.

Each case contains multiple line items that must be evaluated. Approximately 5,000 line items have completed review, 2,500 are in the review process, 6,500 eliminated electronically, and 18,500 remain for review. It is important to note this is only the count of records entered into electronic systems. Additional documents exist that must be evaluated by reviewing paper files. Locating and preparing documents for review for determination is a lengthy process which requires checking multiple electronic platforms, ordering physical files from offsite, and documenting each step for tracking purposes. Thousands of new records are generated yearly. These numbers do not include the time required to craft correspondence, update internal tracking, generate monthly reports, and review applicable laws and like requests and responses. In 2019, the SB-1421 unit received 137 PRA requests, which resulted in 1,155 releases/responses and more than 20,740 pages released.

Eleven new civilian positions were funded to provide support to the SB-1421 Unit: one Attorney, one Senior Legal Processing Clerk, and nine Legal Assistants. The positions were initially approved as temporary positions but were recently converted to permanent as the requirements for SB-1421 will remain in place and be expanded with the passing of SB-16. Currently, the Senior Legal Processing Clerk and four of the Legal Assistant positions remain vacant as a result of the hiring freeze during the Covid-19 pandemic. The unit holds funding for those positions and hopes to resume the hiring process as soon as possible.

SB-16 is currently in the final review stages of the legislative process. As written, SB-16 will expand the categories of disclosure previously defined by SB-1421 under the California Public Records Act. First it would expand use of force disclosures to include sustained findings involving all use of force that is unreasonable or excessive. This bill also allows for release of sustained findings of unlawful searches/arrests and all records that show racist or discriminatory conduct by a member. The bill also expands the type of administrative investigations that are subject to disclosure and expands the definition of sustained cases which will require revisiting previously reviewed cases. If passed, SB-16 has the potential to produce 18,000 backdated/historical cases (does not include paper files), in addition to 1,000+ new cases per year.

Using established workload-based methodologies, the Project Team recommends the addition of five Legal Assistants and one Legal Clerk to support the SB-1421 Unit. Additional members will allow the unit to decrease their amount of backlog and enable them to provide responses in a timely manner. Like the Body Worn Camera Unit, current workload-based methodologies applied do not take into consideration the additional work that will be generated from the passing of SB-16. Five of the additional positions already have funding and can be filled when the interview/hiring process resumes. Moving forward, and for future analysis, the unit's workload should be monitored closely to measure/assess the impact of Senate Bill 16.

Risk Management Office - Legal Division						
	<i>SWORN</i>			<i>CIVILIAN</i>		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
SB-1421 Unit	1	1	0	7	13	+6
Sergeant	1	1	0			
Legal Assistant				5	10	+5
Legal Process Clerk				1	2	+1
Attorney				1	1	0

RMO – Internal Affairs (IA) Division

The Internal Affairs (IA) Division is directed by a Lieutenant and comprised of three units: Internal Affairs Administrative Investigations Unit, Officer-involved Shooting (OIS) Unit, and Brady Unit. The Investigative Services Detail (ISD) is also organized within IA but focuses primarily on criminal investigations and is led by a Lieutenant. The single person Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) Office is also organized within IA. The table below provides a staffing overview of the Internal Affairs Division and an analysis of each unit is provided in this section.

Risk Management Office - Internal Affairs Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Administrative Investigations	8	8	0	3	4	+1
Lieutenant	1	1	0			
Sergeant	7	7	0			
Attorney				1	2	+1
Senior Clerk				1	1	0
Senior Legal Clerk				1	1	0
OIS/In-Custody Deaths	4	2	(2)			
Sergeant	4	2	(2)			
Brady Unit				2	2	0
Attorney				1	1	0
Senior Legal Clerk				1	1	0
EEO Office	1	1	0			
Sergeant/Inspector	1	1	0			
Investigative Services Detail	7	7	0			
Lieutenant	1	1	0			
Sergeant/Investigator	5	5	0			
Officer	1	1	0			
DIVISION TOTAL	20	18	(2)	5	6	+1

IA – Administrative Investigations (Non-OIS)

The primary responsibility of the Internal Affairs (IA) Administrative Investigations Unit is to investigate allegations of policy violations brought against Department members. Unlike criminal investigations, the subject(s) of an administrative investigation is generally known and interviews are scheduled and conducted in accordance with Public Safety Officers Procedural Bill of Rights Act (POBRA) and collective bargaining agreement protocols. A union representative is present during interviews and subjects are required to provide responses to questions relating to the alleged policy violations. Once an investigation is complete, a determination of the finding is conducted internally along with any proposed discipline that may be warranted. The discipline component is intended to be corrective so that such behaviors do not occur again; however, it is essential that this unit is staffed adequately so that investigations are comprehensive and corrective measures can be implemented as soon as possible.

The IA Administrative Unit is composed of seven Sergeant Investigators, one Attorney, and one Senior Clerk (both of whom work with all units in the Division). Staffing for the Investigators and Attorneys assigned to the unit are determined through a workload-based methodology, the structure of which mirrors the calculation process that is used for investigative units. As with many units in the Investigations

Bureau, staff assigned to Internal Affairs are case-driven, following a process in which working a case entails case assignment, information retrieval and witness identification, interviews, and concluding with written investigative findings.

Workload for the IA Administrative Unit has increased as a result of the recommendations made by the US Department of Justice (DOJ) in its 2016 assessment. Through the Department’s Collaborative Reform Initiative (CRI), many of the Department’s policies changed which has created additional steps and made processes more time consuming. The unit is required to generate routine reports and complete trainings on a quarterly/annual basis. Its day-to-day responsibilities have also increased as Investigators now follow additional protocols, including regular monthly follow ups with complainants and additional documentation ensuring “closure.”

The methodology for determining staffing for IA Investigators is workload-based, assigning an estimated amount of time to review and complete administrative investigations (non-OIS). In 2019, there were 261 administrative investigations completed by IA. The estimated time required to complete a comprehensive investigation is approximately 30 hours. Using this workload-based methodology, the Project Team does not recommend any changes to the number of administrative Investigators.

A workload-based methodology is also used to determine Attorney assignments. However, since this position provides support to the entire IA Division (OIS and Non-OIS), the cases are categorized differently. There are minor cases which are considered “Chief’s Level Investigations” and major cases which are “Commission Level Investigations.” From the Attorney perspective, these cases are categorized based on the level of discipline sought rather than the underlying type of misconduct. For example, an OIS case could be considered a Chief’s Level Investigation and result in written reprimand, or it could be more severe and considered a Commission Level Investigation and result in termination. Determining whether a case is minor or major also drastically changes the amount of work that goes into the investigation. In 2019, the IA Division completed 192 Chief’s Level (minor) Investigations and 9 Commission Level (major) Investigations. Chief’s Level investigations are estimated to take 35 hours to complete, while Commission Level investigations take approximately 140 hours. In IA Administrative Investigations, some of this workload is also distributed amongst the Sergeant Investigators, who provide assistance to the Attorneys in the cases described above. Using this workload-based approach, the Project Team recommends the addition of one Attorney to provide additional legal support to the entire Internal Affairs Division.


Risk Management Office - Internal Affairs Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Administrative Investigations	8	8	0	3	4	+1
Lieutenant	1	1	0			
Sergeant	7	7	0			
Attorney				1	2	+1
Senior Clerk				1	1	0
Senior Legal Clerk				1	1	0

Officer-Involved Shooting (OIS)/In-Custody Death Unit

Four Sergeant Investigators are directly assigned to investigate and review officer-involved shootings (OIS) and are organized as a distinct component of Internal Affairs. Their work investigating these incidents entails reviewing all documents and investigative material from an officer-involved shooting; investigative work itself is conducted by Investigative Services Detail and District Attorney's office. Reviews focus on policy, training, and supervision and is used to determine whether the use of force falls within policy and training. Unlike investigations, reviews do not require new investigations or interviews, but rely on investigations that are already completed. An OIS review can be started before other investigations are complete, but cannot be concluded until all other processes have been completed.

The prior staffing report used a workload-based methodology with the 10-year average for OIS incidents as the primary metric. However, over the last 10 years, officer-involved shootings have decreased significantly, by 72%. This workload-based approach uses 2019 data, during which three OIS incidents occurred, each incident requiring approximately 800 hours of investigative time. There are currently four Investigators assigned to the OIS Unit. However, this methodology shows that only two Investigators are required given the number of cases and the time per case.

Year	# OIS
2010	11
2011	8
2012	6
2013	8
2014	8
2015	9
2016	3
2017	6
2018	5
2019	3



Risk Management Office - Internal Affairs Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
OIS/In-Custody Deaths	4	2	(2)			
Sergeant	4	2	(2)			

Brady Unit

The Brady Unit is comprised of one Attorney and one Senior Legal Clerk. Upon request, it is the unit's primary responsibility is to review conduct that calls into question the integrity of a member of the Department. Requests are most often received from the SF District Attorney's Trial Integrity Unit. In 2019, the unit responded to 135 requests for Brady material. Due to extensive variation in the workload involved in handling a Brady request, it is not feasible to construct an overall average. Moreover, the

number of miscellaneous tasks associated with the role would require a very high generalized administrative time figure. As a result of these considerations and due to the unique role of the Brady Unit, the Attorney and Senior Legal Clerk positions have been set as unique/non-scalable. The Brady Unit should be monitored for backlogs and processing delays in the future, as these may indicate that staffing levels should be reexamined.

Risk Management Office - Internal Affairs Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Brady Unit				2	2	0
Attorney				1	1	0
Senior Legal Clerk				1	1	0

Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) Office

The Equal Employment Opportunity Office investigates Equal Employment Opportunity complaints for referral to the Human Resources Department; work is conducted by a single Inspector (Sergeant rank equivalent). Based on data previously reported by the Department, the EEO Office handled 46 cases in 2019 and was able to close 40. Turnaround times for case reviews are unavailable to estimate staffing capacity so this position has been classified as non-scalable for this assessment. Workload and turnaround time should be tracked and monitored for use in future analyses.

Risk Management Office - Internal Affairs Division						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
EEO Office	1	1	0			
Sergeant/Inspector	1	1	0			

Investigative Services Detail (ISD) – Criminal Investigations

The primary responsibility of Investigative Services Detail is to conduct investigations of alleged criminal misconduct by Department members within the City and County of San Francisco. The unit frequently receives allegations from the Department of Police Accountability, various Department memos, and through referrals from the Internal Affairs Administrative Investigations Unit. Such cases have potential to be very high-profile so the unit needs to be extremely thorough when conducting investigations.

ISD investigations are different than criminal cases in that the subject of the investigation is generally known, interviews are scheduled in advance and are conducted in accordance with the union collective bargaining agreement (CBA), and there is typically counsel present. Officers cannot be compelled to make statements that could be used against them in a criminal proceeding and therefore the subject of the investigation is not required to answer questions. If statements are compelled, they cannot be used outside of internal discipline. Once an investigation is complete, it is forwarded for a determination of prosecution.

In 2019, a new MOU was created with the SF District Attorney's Office that defined "covered incidents" that would fall under the responsibility of the Investigative Services Detail. Most notably, these "covered

incidents” included officer-involved shootings and in custody deaths. Prior to 2019, OIS were the responsibility of the Homicide Unit. With the new MOU, if an OIS occurs, ISD would be responsible for investigating the ancillary crime while the District Attorney would investigate the OIS. Officer-involved shootings take priority over all other investigations and the unit devotes one hundred percent of their time for a minimum of four to six days following an OIS. Tasks include collaborating with the DA and collecting all pertinent information to present to Command Staff in preparation for Community Town Hall Meetings, which must occur within ten days of the incident.

With the new MOU, the Investigative Services Detail has taken on more responsibilities. Simultaneously, the unit’s staffing level has decreased as they have lost two Investigators since 2019. A workload-based methodology is used in determining the staffing levels for both Investigators and Officers. In 2019, the unit conducted 59 criminal investigations, each requiring approximately 130 hours of investigative time from the Sergeant Investigators and approximately 5-8 hours of administrative support from the sworn Officer. The sworn Officer also performs tasks that require law enforcement jurisdiction and expertise, including responding to crime scenes and collecting evidence. Using this workload-based approach, the Project Team does not recommend any staffing level changes at this time.

Risk Management Office - Internal Affairs Division						
	<i>SWORN</i>			<i>CIVILIAN</i>		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Investigative Services Detail	7	7	0			
Lieutenant	1	1	0			
Sergeant/Investigator	5	5	0			
Officer	1	1	0			

Police Commission Office

The Police Commission Office acts as a liaison between the Department and the Police Commission and reports directly to both the Chief of Staff as well as the President of the Police Commission. A sworn Commission Secretary (Sergeant) provides oversight and conducts duties such as handling discipline matters and reviewing policies. Other responsibilities include working on DOJ recommendations and reform initiatives, responding to PRA (SB-1421) requests received by the Police Commission specifically, attending meetings on behalf of the Commission, coordinating weekly agendas with the Commission President, contributing to policy reviews/amendments, participating in workgroup meetings, and collaboration with the City Attorney's Office on discipline cases and other Commission matters.

There are no workload measures to determine staffing for the Police Commission Office and thus the positions are classified as non-scalable. Current staffing levels are adequate; however, it is recommended to closely monitor the number of PRA requests generated by SB-1421 and the passing of SB-16.

Police Commission Office						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Commission Office	2	2	0	2	2	0
Sergeant	2	2	0			
Principal Admin Analyst				1	1	0
Executive Secretary				1	1	0

Chief's Office

Overview

Members in the Chief's Office provide high-level administrative support for the Chief of Police in managing the oversight of the Department and its operations. The Chief's Office is currently comprised of three full-time positions and several part-time retirees. The Sworn Detail includes one Sergeant and one Officer who share responsibilities for oversight of the office. They triage, refer, and elevate points of contact to the Chief as appropriate. This includes fielding phone calls, emails, and in-person contact directed at the Chief in the office as well as in public spaces. The Sworn Detail also acts as an escort detail for the Chief, which includes driving the Chief to events and providing general security. The Chief also has an Executive Assistant who manages scheduling, emails to the Chief, and other administrative support assignments and special projects. Workload for these positions is not captured through specific measures and therefore these positions have been classified as non-scalable.

Staffing within the Chief's Office has decreased in recent years due to promotions and other Department staffing priorities. In recent years, the Chief's Sworn Detail alone included one Sergeant and four Officers. Previously there were also two Managers who were responsible for managing and coordinating oversight for special projects assigned by the Chief. These two positions are now assigned to the Policy and Public Affairs Office; they support policy work for the Chief under the direction of the Director of Policy and Public Affairs. Additionally, a Clerk position has remained vacant within the Chief's Office which was typically responsible for project tracking and overseeing office payroll.

Recommended Staffing

Chief's Office						
	SWORN			CIVILIAN		
	Current	Recommended	Need	Current	Recommended	Need
Chief of Police	1	1	0			
Sergeant	1	1	0			
Officer	1	1	0			
Executive Assistant				1	1	0
Clerk				0	1	+1
CHIEF'S OFFICE TOTAL	3	3	0	1	2	+1

Although positions within the Chief's Office are non-scalable, there is a need for additional clerical support to assist with various administrative tasks such as payroll and processing Captain's compliments. The Project Team recommends the addition of one civilian Clerk to meet demands the Chief's Office.

Discussion of Non-Police Response

Project Overview

The City and County of San Francisco has implemented and/or wishes to implement various strategies to promote alternatives to policing such as using the Street Crisis Response Team (SCRT) to address specific mental health-related calls, and reassigning specific Priority C call types from the Police Department to other City agencies. Per Police Commission Resolution No. 21-60, the report should include a discussion of the potential staffing impact of these strategies for non-police response. At this time, there is no consistent and reliable data that would enable the Project Team to conduct a rigorous and defensible workload analysis.

However, the San Francisco Police Department has engaged with the City Performance Unit of the Controller's Office to initiate a joint project to determine 1) the ongoing SFPD workload related to 800-B calls as SCRT continues to develop, and 2) to assess if and how other City agencies may be able to handle workload currently attributed to SFPD for specific Priority C calls in areas such as homelessness, mental health, substance use, and traffic enforcement. The Controller is the ideal partner for this project due to the organization's neutrality, pre-existing familiarity with public safety/SFPD data, and citywide perspective. Indeed, this is a citywide project rather than simply a Police Department project, and SFPD looks forward to working with the Controller in the next fiscal year to determine if and how other City agencies are able to handle workload currently attributed to SFPD, and at what magnitude, hence determining if these strategies are viable long-term alternatives to policing.

This project aims to 1) determine both citywide and SFPD workload associated with the implementation of the Street Crisis Response Team and 2) determine what Priority C call types, and the associated workload magnitude, might be assigned to other City agencies if deemed appropriate for other agencies to handle. This project would determine how to assess workload associated with SCRT and with designated Priority C calls by developing a replicable methodology that the Department and the City can utilize in the future in making resource decisions.

The following sections provide an overview of SCRT and a summary of available data, and a discussion of potential Priority C calls types, including a preliminary data and call type review.

Street Crisis Response Team (SCRT)

In December 2019, the City and County of San Francisco enacted legislation to establish Mental Health SF, a program that provides access to mental health, substance abuse, and psychiatric care services to homeless and uninsured San Franciscans. In November 2020, the City launched the first phase of San Francisco's Street Crisis Response Team (SCRT) pilot program. The goal of SCRT is to provide rapid, trauma-informed response to calls for service for people experiencing crisis in public spaces; to reduce the frequency of police responses to non-violent, non-criminal, behavioral health-related calls; and to reduce unnecessary emergency room occupancy. The first SCRT team began responding to calls on

November 30, 2020, with a focus in the Tenderloin. Following data analysis and impact reports, SCRT expanded to six fully operational teams that provide services in areas impacted by severe behavioral health conditions in San Francisco.

Each SCRT team has a community paramedic from SF Fire Department, a behavioral health clinician from HealthRIGHT 360, a peer specialist from Richmond Area Multi-Services (RAMS), and a care staff dedicated to linkages and follow up support services. The first two teams launched and subsequently provided coverage seven days a week for 12 hours each day. Following the implementation of the additional four teams, coverage expanded to 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, with each team focusing on different areas of San Francisco.

SCRT teams respond to 911 calls that are designated as “800-B” – those calls whose code indicates a classification of mentally disturbed person and whose priority level indicates an active incident that is not a threat to public safety. SCRT teams can also respond to “on view” cases in which they encounter a person in crisis within their designated neighborhoods or receive a notification from another City agency. Based on ongoing evaluations of the program, additional call types may be added to SCRT, such as suicide attempts, juveniles beyond control, well-being checks, and mental health detentions.

The Department has worked collaboratively with partners to ensure a successful transition of calls to SCRT. As SCRT builds capacity, the Department is still co-responding to several calls or responding entirely when SCRT teams are limited or fully occupied. In 2020, SFPD responded to approximately 652,622 calls for service. Of those, 20,950 calls were mental health-related (e.g., 800-B mentally disturbed person and 801 person attempting suicide) and 28,628 check on well-being (code 910) calls for service for a total of 49,578 mental health-related incidents. 800 calls are a considerable category with calls for service amounting to 16,451. From November 2020, when SCRT was launched, to March 2021, when the six teams went live, SFPD responded to 2,501 800-B calls and SCRT responded to 624 800-B calls. Available data indicates that SCRT teams responded to approximately 20% of B-priority 800 calls and a smaller percentage of all mental health-related calls for service. The Department looks forward to ongoing evaluation and transfer of calls to SCRT.

Understanding the complexities of mental health issues, substance abuse issues, and homelessness, the City has supported the development and proposals of other groups, such as the Compassionate Alternative Response Team (CART) and the Street Wellness Response Team (SWRT). CART proposes to respond to all homeless C-Priority calls, coded 601 (trespassing - unauthorized person occupying others property), 916 (suspicious person in car), 917 (suspicious person), 919 (sit/lie), 910 (well-being check), and overflow 800. CART teams would be composed of community workers trained in mental health and first aid to de-escalate crisis and connect people to supportive services. The SWRT wellness teams would work 12-hour shifts and include paramedics with the Fire Department and members of the Homeless Outreach Team (HOT). SWRT would be two-member teams that drive around the City to assist located individuals who are not in an acute behavioral health crisis but may require immediate attention. Again, the Department is committed to ongoing conversations with City officials, City partners and community groups, to provide the appropriate care to those individuals who are non-violent but in need of assistance.

Priority C Calls

This discussion provides some preliminary data on calls for service related to homelessness, behavioral/mental health, substance abuse, well-being, and other low priority, non-violent public safety areas.

Homelessness

Calls for service related to homelessness include the call codes 915 (Homeless related) and 919 (Sitting or Lying on Public Sidewalks). In 2019 there were 48,224 Priority C computer-aided dispatch (CAD) records with one of these codes listed as the original call type. Thirty percent of these (14,345) were calls for service, while 70% (33,879) were self-initiated police activity, or “on-views,” in which police officers encounter these incidents while patrolling. By comparison, Priority A and B calls had a combined total of 367 records for 2019.

There were 50,693 unit responses to Priority C Homeless-related CAD events (47,041 assigned units and 3,652 backup units). The average handling time for Priority C CAD records related to homelessness was 23 minutes for assigned units and 78 minutes for backup units; however, the number of officers that responded to these calls is unable to be determined due to limitations of the CAD data (information on number of officers per unit exists within sector patrol call signs but not in other unit types). Sector patrol call signs account for 19% of the responding units for this call type with the remaining 81% representing any other responding unit in the Department, District Station or otherwise.

Behavioral/Mental Health

Behavioral/mental health call codes include 800 (Mentally disturbed person) and 5150 (Psychiatric Evaluation/Hold). Other call codes to consider in future analyses would be 801 (Person attempting suicide), 806 (Juvenile Beyond Parental Control), 800CR (Mentally Disturbed Person/Weapon or Potential for Violence) and 801CR (Person Attempting Suicide/Weapon or Potential for Violence). However, the severity of these calls types generally warrant a Priority A or B response and therefore may not be appropriate to transfer wholly to other agencies. At this time, SFPD’s Crisis Intervention Team (CIT), specifically trained in crisis response, address 800CR and 801CR incidents with other City behavioral health specialists.

Indeed, 99% of mental health-related calls in 2019 are categorized as Priority A (29%) or Priority B (70%). As discussed in the SCRT section, the Street Crisis Response Team aims to respond to 800-B calls at this time, though SFPD is still the responding agency, or one of the responding agencies, in many instances. Priority C calls account for only 1% of mental health calls (codes 800 and 5150 in this analysis), with 229 CAD records. Of these 229 CAD entries, 216 were calls for service and 13 were on-views. There were 314 responses to these Priority C CAD events, with 221 assigned units and 93 backup units. Average response times were 26 minutes for assigned units and 46 minutes for backup units. Eighty-three percent of responses were conducted by Sector Patrol units. Priority C mental health calls could potentially be handled by SCRT, which is already intending to handle 800-B mental health calls.

Well-Being Check

The CAD call code for Well Being Check is 910. Priority A and Priority B calls represent the majority of 2019 CAD records where the original call code is 910. There were 9,251 Priority A calls for service and six Priority A on-views, 17,465 Priority B calls for service and 1,901 Priority B on-views. For Priority C well-being checks, there were 220 calls for service and 31 on-views. For the Priority C 910 calls, there were 359 responses to these CAD events, with 249 assigned units and 110 backup units. Average handling times was 34 minutes for assigned units and 73 minutes for backup units. Eighty-one percent of these calls were handled by Sector Patrol units.

Substance use calls may also be considered under calls related to well-being checks. Call types specific to substance use include 811 (Intoxicated person), 106N or 6N (Narcotics). The majority of these substance use CAD entries in 2019 are Priority C, at 1,243 calls. Sixty-nine percent, or 860 Priority C substance use CAD records, were calls for service, while 31% were on-views (383). Combined there were 284 Priority A and B calls for service and 4 on-views. There were 1,551 unit responses to Priority C CAD events (1,180 assigned units and 371 backup units). Average handling time was 23 minutes for assigned units and 44 minutes for backup units. Sixty-seven percent of calls were responded to by Sector Patrol units.

The preliminary data presented here indicates that some call types, such as those related to Homelessness, may have a volume of Priority C calls that could be appropriate for other City agencies to handle, warranting further analysis here. On the other hand, CAD records from 2019 indicate that a majority of calls related to behavioral/mental health and to well-being checks are classified as high priority – Priority A and Priority B rather than Priority C, as initially designated for analysis. Further exploration of these calls codes and priority designations is needed to determine if transferring specific call codes in the Priority C designation is a viable strategy for facilitating non-police response – and at what workload magnitude.

Civilian Staffing Opportunities

Overview

According to the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) Model Policy establishing law enforcement agencies' commitment to hiring and utilizing civilian personnel, the "efficiency and effectiveness of law enforcement agencies is enhanced when sworn and non-sworn personnel are appropriately used to perform those functions that are best suited to their special knowledge, skills and abilities." One primary goal of SFPD's civilianization effort is to enable sworn personnel to be properly assigned to patrol or other law enforcement-specific roles, yet the Department is also invested in ensuring that members, sworn and non-sworn, are performing job duties most aligned with their unique skillsets so that the Department can most efficiently provide services to the City and County of San Francisco. Allocating professional staff throughout the Department in a thoughtful and sustainable way can help build an infrastructure to effectively handle the public safety demands placed experienced by San Francisco.

Therefore, it should be noted that civilian staffing opportunities encompasses various structural and job classification changes that aim to best align sworn and non-sworn members with the appropriate duties. These changes include:

- The **complete civilianization of a position** or unit because a civilian could execute the job duties of a sworn member and garner salary savings.
- The **addition of a civilian position** to a unit so that this position can execute *some* of the job duties performed by a sworn member, but not all duties. This results in more effective delineation in job duties such that sworn members can devote their time to activities that necessitate sworn expertise and/or a reduction in the number of sworn in the position.
- The **addition of a civilian position** to a unit because the unit responsibilities necessitate additional staffing and the specialized skills and abilities of trained professional staff provide the unit with function(s) that enhance unit operations.

Throughout, the report suggests civilian staffing opportunities that can be categorized by the situations described above. The full report provides detailed analysis and considerations on these recommendations. A summary table, including timeframes and relevant discussion, is shown below.

Identified Opportunities for Civilianization

Unit	Civilianization Opportunity	Benefits	Challenges & Considerations
Captain's Staff, District Stations, FOB	Transfer some job duties to civilian members <i>Short-term</i>	Captain's Staff at District Stations are currently entirely sworn. The addition of a civilian member would transfer job duties such as social media management, newsletter authoring, and meeting preparation to a more appropriate job and enable the Department to reallocate some sworn members on Captain's Staff back to patrol. Suggested classification: 1842 Management Assistant	Sworn members must always be present on the Captain's Staff to enforce permitting, plan events, and provide a sworn presence at community meetings as needed.
ALU/Permits, FOB	Transfer some job duties to civilian members <i>Short-term</i>	Permits/ALU is a heavily administrative unit and functions within a network of processes and communication with other agencies. The unit could greatly benefit from civilian staff with skills and expertise in developing standard work schemas and managing processes and interface with other City agencies. Suggested classification: 1842 Management Assistant	Sworn members must always be present in ALU/Permits to enforce permitting and participate in decoy operations.

Unit	Civilianization Opportunity	Benefits	Challenges & Considerations
Community Engagement Division, FOB	Transfer some job duties to civilian members <i>Medium-term</i>	<p>The Community Engagement Division interacts with residents, visitors, and youth in the community. Civilian members can also interface with the community members to strengthen the Department's relationship with those that it serves. CED could utilize a civilian member in the appropriate classification to also be responsible for programmatic strategic planning around community and youth engagement. Moreover, CED is responsible for managing aspects of SFPD's ongoing compliance with CRI, which includes extensive administrative follow up and meeting preparation. Many of these duties should be transferred to civilian staff.</p> <p>Suggested classifications: 0922 Manager I, 1842 Management Assistant</p>	The Department needs to conduct strategic planning for the Community Engagement Division and part of this process should be determining staffing structure, including role delineation between sworn and civilian staff that effectively utilizes the unique skillsets of each.
Report Writing Unit, FOB	Civilianize unit <i>Medium/long-term</i>	<p>The Report Writing Unit handles non-urgent calls from the public and writes reports. Full duty law enforcement personnel can then focus on responding to high priority calls for service. Sworn members on temporary modified duty are currently staffing the unit. For continuity and to provide high quality customer service, the Department should consider staffing the unit with civilian staff that possess the appropriate skills.</p> <p>Suggested classification: 9209 Community Police Services Aide</p>	The Report Writing Unit is one assignment in which the Department currently uses sworn members who are not full duty. Before civilianizing the Report Writing Unit, the Department will need to determine other strategies for utilizing sworn members on TMD, if at all.

Unit	Civilianization Opportunity	Benefits	Challenges & Considerations
Department Operations Center (DOC), FOB	Civilianize unit <i>Medium/long-term</i>	<p>The Department Operations Center (DOC) functions as a call center. While there are a number of Police Services Aides (PSAs) currently assigned to the unit, DOC is also staffed with sworn members who are less than full duty due to activity restriction or a disciplinary condition. For continuity and to provide high quality customer service, the Department should consider staffing the unit with civilian staff that possess the appropriate skills.</p> <p>Suggested classification: 9209 Community Police Services Aide</p>	DOC is one assignment in which the Department currently uses sworn members who are not full duty. Before civilianizing DOC, the Department will need to determine strategies for utilizing sworn members who on TMD and in particular, on some type of disciplinary condition with a pending investigation.
CISU, Administration Bureau	Civilianize various sub-units <i>Short-term</i>	<p>The Crime Information Services Unit (CISU) includes various sub-units organized in the Records and Property Divisions. Many of these sub-units, particularly in Records Management, as well as the direct supervision of the Divisions, can be wholly civilianized. Given the analysis conducted, the Project Team has made recommendations in the CISU section.</p> <p>Suggested classification: 1404-1410 Clerk series</p>	The Department will always need some sworn presence, such as a member to work with an outside vendor who specializes in field tools for sworn members. Moreover, the Department currently utilizes some sworn members on temporary modified duty in this assignment and will need to determine strategies for utilizing these members.

Unit	Civilianization Opportunity	Benefits	Challenges & Considerations
Crime Scene Investigations (CSI), Investigations	Civilianize various sub-units <i>Long-term</i>	CSI has various sub-units whose functions could be performed by civilian members with the appropriate training. However, these civilian members would need to be highly specialized, which may require working with SF Department of Human Resources to create new job classification(s), which is doable but a lengthy process. Suggested classifications to start with: 8259-8262 Criminalist I-III series	There is a sequencing component given that CSI must remain operational and staffed in order to maintain accreditation. Therefore, civilianization cannot occur until the appropriate classifications and determined, created, and hired.

Challenges

Work Culture

SFPD is relatively new to integrating professional staff above the Clerk level into business administration processes and leadership. In a para-military organization, sworn hierarchy is inherently rigid, information-sharing is conducted on need-to-know basis, and policies around personnel transfers and rotation decrease continuity or expertise in specific areas. Non-sworn with backgrounds in the private or public sector may be accustomed to process-driven information-sharing, open door access to leadership, and positions with growth pathways. Due to these differences, the Department must commit to establishing a culture that embraces non-sworn professional staff at all levels, provides career growth opportunities, and creates ways in which sworn can understand the positions being introduced in certain units.

As part of the non-sworn/professional staff integration process, the Department could consider introducing a rank equivalency structure. This structure not only creates a standard that is easily understood by sworn assigned to work directly with or for professional staff, sometimes for the first time in their careers, but also aides the Department in determining equivalent classifications when civilianizing specific positions. For example, an administrative role typically managed by a Lieutenant can be replaced by an 0922 Manager I classification with the growth potential to promote to a 0923 Manager II position. A transparent and delineated classification structure allows for civilian job growth which facilitates continuity, minimizing attrition due to lack of in-house promotional opportunities.

Example Rank Equivalency Standard

<u>DHR Classification/Professional Staff</u>	<u>Rank and File/ Supervisory/Command Staff equivalent</u>
0955 Deputy Director V	Deputy Chief
0954 Deputy Director IV	Deputy Chief
0953 Deputy Director III	Commander
0941 Manager VI	Q-82 Captain
0933 Manager V	Q-82 Captain
0932 Manager IV	Q-81 Captain
0931 Manager III	Q-80 Captain
0923 Manager II	Q-60 thru Q-62/ Lieutenant through Lieutenant III
0922 Manager I	Q-60 thru Q-62/ Lieutenant through Lieutenant III
1825 Principal Administrative Analyst II	Q-52 Sergeant III
1824 Principal Administrative Analyst	Q-51 Sergeant II
1823 Senior Administrative Analyst	Q-50 Sergeant
*1844 Senior Management Assistant	Q-4 Police Officer III
1842 Management Assistant	Q-3 Police Officer II
1454 Executive Secretary III	Q-2 Police Officer or defer to PSA classifications
1452 Executive Secretary II	Q-2 Police Officer or defer to PSA classifications
All clerk positions (1202, 1204, 1222, 1226, 1402, 1404, 1406, 1408, 1410, 1424, 1920, 1922, 8106, 8108)	Q-2 Police Officer or defer to PSA classifications
Attorneys	Separate category. These may be treated outside of the chain of command structure as ACs, DCs and Commanders or other ranks at the Chief's discretion may submit requests directly to staff attorneys.

*Recommend using this classification instead of analyst (1823 -1825) classifications or 1454 secretarial classifications if there is a need for support staff that can do scheduling, research, analysis, and admin work but may also need to make certain decisions or supervise clerical staff.

Other Considerations

By exploring the civilianization opportunities identified in this analysis, the Department can strategically align with citywide goals of achieving salary savings, moving sworn from administrative functions back to patrol, and managing a major metropolitan Police Department in an effective and sustainable way. Some other areas that may present challenges to the Department and hence warrant consideration are the need to develop a comprehensive general civilian personnel policy, funding, and collective bargaining agreements that dictate the working rights of sworn versus non-sworn members. Moreover, it is critical that the Department determine how to utilize sworn members who are less than full duty, given that this number fluctuates and the inherently temporary nature of the assignment presents challenges for work continuity. Less than full duty statuses also vary: sworn members may be coming back from a work-related injury and have temporary activity restrictions, or may have a pending disciplinary investigation that limits public contact. These factors drive if and how less than full duty sworn can be utilized and the Department should determine appropriate assignments or alternative processes given the designation.

SFPD Staffing Context

Summary

- SFPD staffing levels have been steadily declining over the past roughly three years, from January 2019 to February 2022. Over this period, the number of full duty sworn officers in San Francisco declined 12%, from 1,868 to 1,639⁸.
- Over the past five fiscal years FY 2017 – FY 2021, an average of 100 active sworn members have separated from the Department each year due to retirement, resignation, and termination. This does not include training attrition, which are those separations that occur in the Academy and during Field Training (FTO).
- Given the demographics of the Department, it is likely that retirements will increase significantly in the coming fiscal years as sworn members reach retirement age. This is a national trend; those police officers hired in 1991-1994, largely due to hiring increases related to the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, are aging out of the workforce. As of the end of 2021, there were 521 sworn members over age 50.
- In FY 2022, resignations and terminations are on track to increase over prior fiscal years due to the vaccine mandate. As of February 2022, 76 sworn members remain unvaccinated and are either awaiting vaccine case resolution or are on some type of leave. Twenty-five unvaccinated sworn have separated from the Department since the mandate deadline in mid-October 2021.
- Over the last five years, there has been a significant decline in the number of Recruits entering the Academy due to fewer Academy classes, and smaller class sizes. As of February 2022, there are 32 Recruits in the Academy across two Academy classes. Training attrition occurs in Academy and FTO – and the reality is that it always will – even as SFPD implements targeted initiatives to improve training retention. Therefore, 100 Recruits entering the Academy does not eventually equate to 100 sworn active members in the Department due to training attrition.
- All of these points taken together indicate that even to just *maintain* staffing levels, SFPD will need to hire significantly more than 100 Recruits to 1) account for training attrition, and 2) to backfill those active sworn members who separate due to retirement, resignation, and termination.


Trends in Declining Staffing Levels

Declining Citywide Full Duty Staffing

SFPD staffing levels have been declining steadily since the beginning of 2019. The primary indicator that the Department uses to monitor and assess staffing levels and the overall staffing health of the Department is the **number of full duty sworn in San Francisco**. This metric represents those members who are currently fully deployable because they are not on some type of medical, family, or disciplinary leave; are not recruits in the Academy; and who are assigned to a unit and location within San Francisco

⁸ This count *does* include unvaccinated members who are designated as full duty but are currently on unpaid leave as they await vaccine hearing resolution. This number is approximately 33 as of the beginning of February 2022.

rather than holding an assignment at the Airport. As illustrated on the chart below, SFPD citywide full duty staffing has declined 12% over the roughly three-year period from January 2019 to February 2022, from 1,868 to 1,639. Again, the current value includes those 33 unvaccinated members who are counted as full duty but are awaiting vaccine case resolution.




Declining District Station Staffing

Operationally, SFPD monitors **the number of full duty Police Officers (entry level rank) at the District Stations**. The Department must always prioritize District Station staffing, as the District Stations provide critical law enforcement services of responding to calls for service from the public. The number of full duty Police Officers at the District Stations has declined in tandem, and because of, the decline in citywide full duty sworn over the past roughly three years.

The number of full duty sworn Police Officers at the District Stations has declined 7% over the roughly three-year period from January 2019 to February 2022, from 1,012 to 943. The number of full duty sworn Police Officers at the District Stations has declined less (7%) than the number of citywide full duty sworn (12%) because the Department has purposefully prioritized District Station staffing due to its paramount function of responding to community-generated calls for service. This means that staffing has declined more dramatically in other citywide assignments, as the Department must allocate its limited resources amidst steadily declining overall staffing levels. The current value includes the 27 unvaccinated Police Officers who are counted as full duty but are on paid leave as they await vaccine resolution.

Full Duty Sworn Police Officers at the District Stations, January 2019 – February 2022



Reasons Behind Declining Staffing Levels

Department Separations, FY 2005-06 to FY 2020-21

SFPD monitors separations across four different categories to track and analyze the total number of individuals separating from the department.

Separations: Fully Active, Sworn Members


- Retirements: This category includes both service retirements, calculated based on an individual's age and years of service, and non-service retirements, when individuals retire without full age and years of service eligibility.
- Resignations and Terminations: This category includes individuals who are terminated from the Department, for example, for disciplinary reasons; and those who resign to, for example, seek employment with another law enforcement agency ("lateral" to another agency).

Separations: Sworn Members in Training

- Separations in Academy/Field Training (FTO): This category includes those individuals who have been hired into the Department as a sworn member, but who separate via release (e.g., training failure or disciplinary issue) or resignation (e.g., personal issue) sometime during the two training phases, the Police Academy ("Academy") or Field Training ("FTO").

SFPD also tracks the "In Memoriam" category for each fiscal year.

The chart below shows the count of individuals in each separation category for the respective fiscal year. Deferred Retirement Option Program (DROP) was effective from July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2011, encapsulating FY 2009 through FY 2011; the large spike in the chart represents the significant number of retirements (244) in FY 2012 after the program lapsed.



For the purpose of this analysis, we explore separation trends in the four major categories over the past five fiscal years, FY 2017 to FY 2021.

Table: Separations by All Separation Categories, FY 2017 to FY 2021

	Grand Total	Retirements	Resignations and Terminations	Separations in Academy/FTO	Deaths
FY 2017	195	72	34	87	2
FY 2018	172	84	24	63	1
FY 2019	165	61	25	79	0
FY 2020	131	41	48	42	0
FY 2021	146	70	36	39	1
Grand Total	809	328	167	310	4

Retirements

Retirements hovered in the 72 – 84 range in FY 2017 and FY 2018, and then dipped downward in FY 2019 and FY 2020. In FY 2021, the number of individuals retiring increased back to 70, with another roughly 30 individuals retiring in the first few days of FY 2022. As of February 2022, there have been 58 retirements YTD in FY 2022 – and a large number of retirements generally occur in the last quarter of the fiscal year. **The Department anticipates that the number of retirements will trend upward significantly in the coming fiscal years due to the age demographic of SFPD’s sworn workforce.** Nationally, law enforcement agencies are beginning to experience a wave of retirements as those officers hired via funding available in the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (“1994 Crime Bill”) reach retirement age. SFPD’s sworn workforce age demographics reflect this national trend: as of the end of December 2021, 521

sworn members in the Department were over age 50. **As roughly a quarter of SFPD’s sworn workforce is age 50 and over, it is likely that retirements, including service and non-service, will continue to trend upward.**

Resignations and Terminations

Resignations and terminations trended sharply upward from FY 2019 to FY 2020, from 25 to 48. Officers resigning to “lateral” to other law enforcement agencies was the primary driver of this increase; in calendar year 2020, 36 sworn members lateraled to other agencies compared to 16 in CY 2019, and 7 in CY 2018. SFPD analyzed lateral locations and found that sworn members were leaving the Department to seek employment with smaller agencies in the greater Bay Area, potentially closer to home, or were leaving the Bay Area – or the state of California – altogether. **The Department anticipates that the number of resignations and terminations will increase significantly over prior years in FY 2022 and potentially beyond due to the City and County of San Francisco’s vaccine and booster mandates.** In FY 2022, the YTD number of resignations and terminations is 35, almost equivalent to all of FY 2021. This is driven largely by the number of unvaccinated members who have separated from the Department thus far due to both resignation as well as retirement (service and non-service). No members have been terminated yet.

Training Separations

When analyzing separations in Academy and FTO, it is more productive to assess the number of separations against the number of individuals beginning training – the graduation rate – than to look only at separation counts. In the chart and table above, it appears that separations in Academy and FTO are trending downward in recent fiscal years, but there have been fewer classes entering the Academy in FY 2019 – FY 2021 compared to FY 2016 – FY 2018. Training separations are discussed in the next section.

Separation Categories and Staffing Levels

It is important to note how these separation categories influence the inflow and outflow of individuals into the Department, and how this impacts staffing levels. The sole *inflow* of individuals into the Department is through hiring and subsequent training. Staffing *outflow* from the Department occurs in many areas: in training, and amongst active members who are already part of SFPD’s sworn workforce as members separate due to retirement, resignation, and termination. **To maintain staffing levels, the number of individuals graduating from training (passing the Academy and FTO) must at least equal the number of active sworn members already in the Department who separate due to 1) retirement and 2) resignation and termination.**

The table below shows non-training separations from FY 2017 to FY 2021. Over the past five fiscal years, an average of 100 individuals per year have separated due to “non-training” separations – retirement, resignation, and termination. **Therefore, roughly 100 individuals must *fully complete* training (Academy and FTO) and enter the sworn workforce to backfill those members that separate.**

Table: Non-Training Separations Only, FY 2017 to FY 2021

	Grand Total	Retirements	Resignations and Terminations	Deaths
FY 2017	108	72	34	2
FY 2018	109	84	24	1
FY 2019	86	61	25	0
FY 2020	89	41	48	0
FY 2021	107	70	36	1
Grand Total	499	328	167	4

Trends in the Academy, 2016 – 2020

Over the five-year period 2016 – 2020, the number of Recruits entering the Academy has trended downward, from 290 in 2016 to 91 in 2020. Factors such as the 2020 Covid-19 pandemic have certainly impacted hiring, but the trend is clear: fewer Recruits are entering the Academy. The table below shows the total number of Recruits entering the Academy in the respective year, and the breakdown of Recruit Class by size.

Recruits Entering and Exiting the Academy, 2016 – 2020

Year of Start Date	Class #	Recruits Entering Academy	Total Academy separations	Recruits Entering FTO	Graduation Rate
2016	251/32	55	9	46	84%
	252/33	55	6	49	89%
	253/34	53	10	43	81%
	254	25	7	18	72%
	255	50	15	35	70%
	256	52	18	34	65%
	Total	290	65	225	78%
2017	257	55	10	45	82%
	258/35	54	16	38	70%
	259	55	19	36	65%
	Total	164	45	119	73%
2018	260	51	23	28	55%
	261	55	18	37	67%
	263/36	52	22	30	58%
	264	41	22	19	46%
	Total	199	85	114	57%
2019	265	37	9	28	76%
	267	32	11	21	66%
	268/37	25	7	18	72%
	269	36	7	29	81%
	Total	130	34	96	74%
2020	270	39	12	27	69%
	272	20	11	9	45%
	273	32	13	19	59%
	Total	91	36	55	60%

This table illustrates some significant trends. First, fewer Recruits entered the Academy in the years 2019 – 2020 compared to 2016 – 2018, due to both fewer classes and smaller classes. External factors and trends play a role: nationally, Police Officer applications are declining due to changes in public perception of policing, and locally, affordability and a competitive job market impact the supply of qualified candidates. SFPD analyzes data on the end-to-end hiring process, from recruitment through Academy, and facilitates a Recruitment and Hiring Working Group to convene all stakeholders and address issues identified. **The reality is that fewer Recruits are entering the Academy.** Given the trends apparent here, SFPD is currently in the midst of developing and implementing various recruitment strategies.

Second, attrition occurs in the Academy, as not all Recruits graduate and enter Field Training (FTO) – and not all Officers in Field Training proceed into probation. Recruits separate from the Academy because they fail a training component or resign for personal or other reasons. To address training releases, SFPD has conducted analysis on training failures and implemented targeted additional instruction and remediation in problem subject areas to mitigate Academy releases. To address resignations, which generally occur due to personal reasons that result from a confluence of stressful factors, SFPD has implemented resources for incoming Recruits, such as a pre-Academy workshop for Recruits and their families to understand the demands of the job. **SFPD is constantly exploring strategies for improving Academy retention, but the reality is that there will always be attrition during Police Officer training.**

The table above also shows the overall graduation rates for the classes that entered the Academy in each respective year; over this time period, the overall graduation rates range from 57% to 78% (and additional attrition occurs in FTO as well). **The critical takeaway is that 100 Recruits in the Academy does not ultimately lead to 100 active sworn members in the Department due to training attrition in the Academy and in FTO.** Given that non-training separations have averaged 100 sworn active members over the last five fiscal years, SFPD would have to hire significantly more than 100 Recruit Officers to backfill these separations due to training attrition.

SFPD will need significantly more support to recruit and hire officers to account for the widening deficit between its current full-duty sworn officer level and the recommended full-duty staffing level. The City's Department of Human Resources (DHR) oversees all Public Safety test administration. During the COVID-19 pandemic, DHR suspended in-person testing for the Police Officer job classification when the San Francisco Department of Public Health (SFDPH) issued a shelter-in-place order to prevent the community spread of COVID-19. In June 2020, virtual, proctored testing was also suspended, in line with the Board of Supervisors resolution to review hiring and promotion for law enforcement classes. DHR contracts with the National Testing Network (NTN) for entry-level test administration and scoring. A top-to-bottom review of the application process to recruit, promote, and retain highly qualified police officers resulted in a new Public Safety Job Suitability Assessment focused on measuring bias, integrity, inappropriate use of force, and commitment to equity. The new test measures specific biases that may be present, as well as the potential biases that may develop over time as an officer. NTN has been working on the development of several additional tests specifically designed to target elements critical to equitable policing. The testing and hiring of entry-level police officers resumed in March 2021.

The Department recognizes that recruitment and retention are of utmost importance in addressing SFPD's staffing levels, which currently show a significant shortage when assessed against recommended levels. Given trends in retirements, resignations, and terminations; and Recruits entering the Academy, it is projected that the observed decline in citywide staffing will continue. The Department is currently exploring and developing aggressive recruitment and retention initiatives to address declining staffing levels through every strategy possible. Funding will, of course, play a role in the implementation of many of these initiatives.

SFPD FY23 & FY24 Budget Appropriation Committee



CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Police Department

Budgetary Commitments Sustaining Reforms



01 - Hiring & Recruitment

Academy classes mitigate attrition and promote diversity & culture change.

02 - Overtime

Support the investigation of violent crimes, public safety during First Amendment activities, and time needed for reporting.

03 - Technology

Allows for informed decisions and policy implementation, compliance with mandated reporting, and improved transparency.


04 - Management & Analytical Support

Supports auditing, policy implementation, and community engagement feedback loop.

05 - Civilianization

Having individuals with specialized skills to perform duties that allow for officers to return to the streets, in the communities that need them.

Average Response Times



Calls Dispatched to SFPD

Dispatched to Patrol	2021
Priority A	81,395
Priority B	111,916
Priority C	107,387
Total	300,698

Total Volume of Calls in SFPD's 2021 Staffing Analysis Study (Prop E) identified 308,097 (from 2019 data).

Source: Controller's Office City Performance Scorecards, DataSF

CIT-Related Calls	Volume
2019	50,840
2020	49,578
2021	47,242

Sworn Members Retirement Eligibility

	City		Airport	
Retirement Status by Service	Non-Eligible	Eligible	Non-Eligible	Eligible
Less Than 10 Years of Service	867	24	3	
10 to 20 Years of Service	457	107	45	24
20 – 25 Years of Service	95	129	12	23
25 – 30 Years of Service	23	151	3	36
More Than 30 Years of Service		16		
Totals	1,442	427	63	83

Note: Does not include any service time served at other agencies

	Full-Duty	Other Than Full-Duty	Recruits	Total
City	1,593	237	39	1,869
Airport	130	16	0	146
Totals	1,723	253	39	2,015

District Station Sworn Staffing Levels

Station	Recommended*	Current	Gap
Bayview	153	124	-29
Central	155	130	-25
Ingleside	155	112	-43
Mission	181	127	-54
Northern	180	122	-58
Park	88	75	-13
Richmond	98	79	-19
Southern	176	117	-59
Taraval	118	90	-28
Tenderloin	143	147	4
Totals	1,472	1,123	-349

* From 2021 Staffing Analysis Report, includes all ranks


Academy Class Demographics

Year	# of Classes	Applicants	Entering Academy	Graduate Academy	Complete FTO	Male	Female
2017	3	3,717	165	131	102	83%	17%
2018	4	2,974	197	135	115	84%	16%
2019	4	2,620	127	99	93	79%	21%
2020	3	1,802	86	56	39	89%	11%
2021	2	1,222	41	13	n/a	85%	15%
2022 YTD	1	676	26	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Totals	16	12,335	642	434	349		

Note: Some Academy classes are still in progress, therefore graduate information for on-going 2021 and 2022 are not available. Additionally, lateral classes are excluded.

Recruits Entering Academy by Race

Year of
Start Date



Budget Comparison (All Funds)


Category (in millions)	FY19	FY20	FY21	FY22	FY23
GF Annual Operating*	528.3	578.3	551.7	561.3	606.4
GF Annual Project	2.2	2.7	2.3	2.9	2.7
GF Continuing Project	11.8	7.3	10.2	5.2	13.5
Work Order Fund	5.4	5.9	5.9	6.0	5.7
Airport Fund	72.6	90.3	90.0	72.5	73.9
Special Revenue Fund	9.6	7.9	7.8	9.5	6.1
Total	629.8	692.3	667.9	657.4	708.3

* Airport-funded costs for academy classes are included in Airport Fund Line Item

Recruitment and Retention Enhancements

- **Recruitment Firm Contractor - \$300,000**
 - Enables the competitive recruitment of high-quality candidates through broader and directed networking and marketing techniques
 - Targets the recruitment of candidates in continued support of diversity and specific skill sets (i.e. linguistic capabilities)
 - Supports and expands our current recruitment strategies (local recruitment, college recruitment, leveraging technology, expansive advertising campaigns, mentorship and candidate preparedness)
- **Recruitment Tool - \$480,000 (Funded through COIT Process)**
 - Embed messaging, social media, and application process into a manageable platform for mentored relationship between potential candidates and recruitment team
 - Automate manual processes for better reporting and seamless hiring
 - Works in tandem with marketing
- **Addition of 2 Professional Staff to implement Recruitment tool and develop recruitment and retention strategies**
- **\$3 Million Investment Each Year in Vehicle Replacements**

Historical View of Vehicle Replacement Funding



*Denotes City purchasing all or majority of vehicles through bond funds

GF Operating Overtime Impacts (Excludes Airport Academy)

	Actuals			FY22		FY23
In \$ Millions	FY19	FY20	FY21	Budget	Actuals (YTD)	MYR Budget
Overtime Totals	\$18.7	\$25.6	\$17.1	\$13.6	\$38.2	\$26.8

Major OT Usage Categories include (YTD):

- Arrests – Extended Shifts 36,445 hours \$3.6m
- Investigations & Calls for Service – Extended Shifts 33,308 hours \$3.3m
- Court Subpoenas 19,160 hours \$1.9m
- Violence Suppression 13,116 hours \$1.3m
- Hospital Watch at ZSFGH 9,635 hours \$1.0m
- Safe Shopper/Police Presence/Tourism 99,524 hours \$9.9m
- TL Triangle Safety Plan 45,517 hours \$4.6m
- Events (e.g. Halloween, NYE, SF Pride) 19,346 hours \$1.9m
- OT Backfill/Minimum Staffing 71,753 hours \$7.2m

Supporting Professional Staff Needs

Additional (12) professional staff over the course of two years to support:

- Written Directives Unit to increase pace of Department General Order revisions
- Principled Policing to sustain Collaborative Reform Initiative work and change management
- Community Input Unit to gather community feedback on policies and operations
- Legal/PRA Unit to work on SB1421/SB16 backlog requests and improving PRA response times

The professional staff positions will help

- Assist with staffing shortages, reducing workload on sworn personnel
- Assist with compliance with legal mandates

Technology Funding


NIBRS-compliant RMS System - \$4,900,000

- FBI requirement to report on Uniform Crime Data (monthly/annual)
- Improved Data Accuracy, Data Sharing, Collaborations with Partner Agencies
- Increased transparency
- Requires complete overhaul of existing system(s) – department wide impacting Sworn and Professional
- 23 Professional Staff to implement and support the new system

HRMS Replacement System - \$555,000 (Funded through COIT Process)

- Current system is past “end-of-life ” and not supported by vendor
- The potential to lose critical officer data is high
- Loss of accountability
- Digitization of paper, allowing for increased efficiencies

Organizational Chart



Thank you.
Any Questions?

**SAN FRANCISCO
POLICE DEPARTMENT**



Budgeted Sworn FTE Comparison (City)

Classification Group	FY19	FY20	FY21	FY22	FY23
Chief of Police	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Assistant Chief of Police	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
Deputy Chief	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Commander	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0
Captain	28.0	28.0	28.0	28.0	28.0
Lieutenant	93.4	94.4	95.0	95.0	95.0
Sergeant	475.2	485.2	491.0	491.0	491.0
Officer	1647.0	1,686.0	1,690.2	1,451.0	1,451.0
Officers (Academy Recruits)	75.0	75.0	50.0	22.5	54.5
Attrition	-84.2	-99.2	-233.9	-8.7	-88.6
FTE Totals	2,248.4	2,283.4	2,134.3	2,092.8	2,044.9

Note: Approximately 200 sworn personnel are on other than full-duty status

Budgeted Civilian FTE Comparison (City)

Classification Group	FY19	FY20	FY21	FY22	FY23
Administrative	25.0	27.4	28.5	29.0	28.0
Analyst	29.5	32.0	36.0	36.0	43.3
Automotive	15.0	15.5	15.0	15.0	15.0
Clerical	79.0	79.0	79.0	79.0	80.0
Criminalistics Laboratory	51.7	55.5	54.0	56.0	55.6
Information Technology	36.0	37.5	39.8	39.0	50.9
Legal	23.5	32.5	35.5	34.9	36.6
Maintenance	18.5	19.3	20.0	20.0	20.0
Management	18.8	20.0	21.5	24.0	27.3
Payroll/Personnel	19.1	23.5	21.2	19.0	20.0
Services Aide/Cadet	88.0	89.1	90.0	90.0	83.0
Other	26.0	33.0	34.5	34.0	37.9
Attrition	-37.8	-37.4	-47.0	-46.7	-40.4
FTE Totals	392.3	426.9	428.0	429.2	457.1

Budgeted Sworn FTE Comparison (Airport Bureau)

Classification Group	FY19	FY20	FY21	FY22	FY23
Deputy Chief	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Commander	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Captain	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Lieutenant	10.0	11.5	13.5	11.0	11.0
Sergeant	27.0	37.8	48.7	38.0	38.0
Officer	143.0	201.4	274.1	188.0	188.0
Officers (Academy Recruits)	75.0	72.6	60.0	0.0	0.0
Attrition	-7.0	-22.2	-108.8	-63.5	-64.6
FTE Totals	253.0	306.1	292.5	178.5	177.4

Budgeted Civilian FTE Comparison (Airport Bureau)

Classification Group	FY19	FY20	FY21	FY22	FY23
Administrative	4.8	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Analyst	1.0	1.8	2.0	2.0	2.0
Clerical	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Information Technology	3.0	3.8	4.0	4.0	4.0
Maintenance	0.0	0.0	0.8	1.0	1.0
Payroll/Personnel	2.0	2.8	3.0	3.0	3.0
Services Aide/Cadet	187.0	215.5	216.0	216.0	216.0
Attrition	-12.9	-94.9	-13.0	-27.8	-20.9
FTE Totals	188.9	217.5	221.8	207.2	214.1

Budget Comparison to Other Major Cities

GF Allocation as % of Total GF Budget	FY18	FY19	FY20	FY21	FY22
San Francisco*	10.2%	10.1%	9.9%	9.3%	9.1%
Boston	15.7%	16.1%	15.5%	14.7%	14.1%
Denver*	16.7%	16.7%	17.1%	17.3%	17.5%
Honolulu*	18.2%	17.7%	16.5%	16.5%	17.2%
Houston	34.9%	35.1%	35.6%	36.8%	36.0%
Los Angeles	26.0%	25.1%	25.7%	26.9%	23.2%
Los Angeles County	14.6%	13.9%	13.7%	12.9%	12.8%
New Orleans*	23.4%	24.7%	24.2%	25.9%	27.0%
New York City	8.2%	8.4%	8.0%	7.7%	7.7%
San Jose	29.0%	30.3%	29.6%	29.4%	30.3%
Seattle	26.0%	29.2%	27.1%	22.5%	22.3%

* Denotes a consolidated City & County government



Department of Police Accountability

DPA Proposed Budget FY22-23





MISSION

The Department of Police Accountability (DPA) is committed to providing the City of San Francisco with independent and impartial law enforcement oversight through investigations, policy recommendations, and performance audits to ensure that the Department reflects the values and concerns of the community it serves.



Divisions

INVESTIGATIONS DIVISION investigates and makes findings on civilian complaints of police misconduct or neglect of duty and investigates all officer-involved shootings that result in injury.


AUDIT DIVISION conducts regular performance audits on police officer use of force and how the Police Department handles claims of officer misconduct.

LEGAL AND POLICY DIVISION presents misconduct cases to the Police Chief and the Police Commission, as designated by the Police Commission's Disciplinary Penalty and Referral Guidelines. Attorneys also make recommendations on Police Department policies or practices to enhance police-community relations while ensuring effective police services.

MEDIATION AND OUTREACH DIVISION provides a forum for officers and complainants to discuss complaints. The Outreach program seeks to reach communities that have been economically, racially, culturally, or linguistically isolated from police services.

SENATE BILL 1421 DIVISION - ensures that records involving officer-involved shootings and great bodily injury are posted to DPA's website. Prepare for regulatory changes due to the implementation of Senate Bill 16 that will impact DPA's document production obligations.

Organization Chart



DPA Proposed Budget



Department of Police Accountability

Department Proposed Budget

Highlights

	Original Budget FY2021 -2022	Proposed Budget FY2022 -2023	Base Budget FY2023 -2024	Proposed Budget FY2023 -2024
Total	9,373,996	9,806,177	9,806,177	9,968,743
Change		+ 432,181		+ 162,566

	Original FTE FY2021 -2022	Proposed FTE FY2022 -2023	Base FTE FY2023 -2024	Proposed FTE FY2023 -2024
Total	42	43	43	43
Change		+ 1		0

- 1 FTE (8173) Senior Legal Assistant current senior legal assistant position sunsets in June.
- Substituted a Senior Clerk Typist (1426) for an 8108 Senior Legal Process Clerk.
- Increase in training budget



Department Proposed Budget by Category

FY 2022-23

Category	Change From Base
Salary & Benefits	+ \$396,672
Programmatic Project	No Change
Non-Personnel Services	+ \$10,000
Services of Other Departments	+ \$25,509
Materials and Supplies	No Change
Total	\$432,181



Historical Vacancy

FY 2022-23



Department Hiring Plan

Positions	FTE Count	Hiring Status/Plan
8173 (Legal Clerk)	1	Pending - Recruitment
8124 (Investigator)	3	Background checks
8108 (Senor Legal Process Clerk)	1	Pending - Recruitment
Total	4	



Vacancies Impact

Investigator: DPA case numbers continue to remain over 700 annually. Cases are more complex and require additional review because of video footage and case complexity.

- Vacancies increase Investigators case load and can delay case closures.

Senior Legal Process Clerk: This position was substituted for a senior clerk typist. The position support our admin team by writing letters to complainants and officers and answering phones.

- Vacancies increase the workload for our admin team members.





DPA Budget Focus/Cost Saving

- Senate Bill 16 passed, which increased case disclosures. We also now need to redact video and audio files. SB 1421 and SB 16 will continue to impact DPA's budget.
—
- Teamed up with the Office of Civic Innovation & ZS Associates to develop a new website where complainant's can search for their current case status, submit documents and receive documents. Project Cost \$0
—
- Teamed up with HSA with the Pathway to Hire for two clerks which allowed DPA to decrease workload on admin staff.



Department of Police Accountability

Thank you



Fiscal Year 2022-23 and 2023-24 Mayor's Proposed Budget Overview

San Francisco Fire Department

Budget and Appropriations Committee – June 17, 2022

FY22-23 and FY23-24 High Level Summary

Total Budget by Fund	FY21-22	FY22-23	FY23-24
General Fund Operating	385,780,066	446,695,257	442,021,728
Annual Projects	1,079,646	1,727,980	1,727,980
Continuing Projects	9,902,191	5,296,781	4,999,027
Work Order Fund	11,818,733	12,077,617	12,278,189
Airport Fund	31,395,342	33,198,885	34,098,361
Total:	439,975,978	498,996,520	495,125,285

Total Auth. FTE	FY21-22	FY22-23	FY23-24
Fire Department	1,678	1,803	1,835
Total:	1,678	1,803	1,835

SFFD Hi-Level Budget Overview

- Continuation of initiatives from FY21-22, including:
 - Completed ramp-up of Community Paramedicine initiatives funded in the current year (SCRT, SWRT, SORT), including staffing of new positions and conversion to Emergency Medical Dispatch
 - Integration and hiring of 10 new H-3 Paramedic Ambulance FTEs approved in the FY21-22 budget process and 50 new FTEs during budget supplemental in FY21-22 to raise EMS ambulance staffing by 60 positions. Annual cost of new positions equates to approximately \$8.5 million

SFFD Hi-Level Budget Overview

- Incorporation of funding allocation for structural fixes in Department's budget to address accumulation of issues in recent years
- Personnel cost increases through MOU wage increases based on revised contract moving through Board approval, as well as updates to fringe benefit rates
- Allocation of funding to assist with Department's COVID recovery, including an increase for workers compensation costs as well as additional overtime to assist in addressing increased rate of leave during COVID

Diversity, Equity and Inclusion

- Expansion of SFFD DEI Division to fund and support priority programs, including allocations of additional personnel resources (Assistant Deputy Chief, Executive Officer, Captain, Lieutenant, data analyst, grant writer, and funding the participation of 25 members from across the Department as part of the Racial Equity Advisory Committee)




City EMT

- Initiate City EMT to create an EMT pathway program into the Department, in partnership with OEWD and D 10 (SFFD pipeline)
- Resulted in 15 paid internships and four permanent hires to date
- Current cohort set to graduate June 2022, with next cohort to start in a couple months

Diversity, Equity and Inclusion

- Created Outreach, Recruitment, and Development strategies to support candidates throughout the application and hiring process. Expanded recruitment and hiring efforts to increase the pool of diverse and qualified candidates
- Working with DHR on overhaul of candidate testing process
- Provided a pre-academy for incoming H-2 Firefighter recruits to establish expectations for recruits and support them in the process
- Supported the SFFD's Division of Training Recruit Academy by providing equitable oversight and support of BIPOC candidates
- Fostering new partnerships with other City Departments (such as SFGTV video outreach initiative), employee affinity groups, and NGOs (such as Success Centers, San Francisco Conservation Corps, Bayview YMCA, BAY EMT and EMS Corps)

SFFD Organizational Chart



SFFD Vacancies

- The COVID-19 pandemic had massive impacts to staffing at the Fire Department, both as far as illness/leave/time off were concerned, but also with overall staffing levels.
- Decreased staffing levels and increased use of leave contributed to higher rates of overtime required to backfill for minimum daily staffing, resulting in an overtime supplemental before the Board in FY2021-22.
- Since March 1, 2020, the Fire Department has seen 217 uniform suppression members lost to retirement/attrition. During that same time period, the Department has hired 105 new H-2 Firefighter recruits.
- On the EMS side, the Department is in the process of filling all newly allocated positions for both Ambulance and Community Paramedicine Divisions

Hiring Plan

- Mayor's proposed budget includes funding for two new H-2 Firefighter academies to begin in each of the subsequent two fiscal years to staff vacant positions and replace anticipated retirements/separations
- Department will be monitoring staffing levels and retirement trends in coming fiscal years to maintain staffing counts
- Allocation of H-3 EMT/Paramedic academies in each of the two fiscal years to maintain increased staffing levels for ambulances and Community Paramedicine teams



Questions/Discussion





Budget Presentation FY 2022-24

*BOS Budget and Appropriations
Committee, June 17, 2022*

Who We Are

The San Francisco Public Defender protects and defends the rights of indigent adults and youth accused of crimes, immigrants facing deportation, and people facing conservatorship processes.

Our team of 113 attorneys and 92 advocacy staff provide zealous, compassionate and creative legal representation and support to over 20,000 people annually.

Our mission: to fiercely defend individuals, confront state-sponsored violence, and advocate for community power.



Who We Serve

We represent our community's most vulnerable and disenfranchised


10%

Immigrants or non-English speakers




75%

Suffer from mental illness or substance use issues



100%

Low-income; many live in poverty or suffer from homelessness



What We Do

We aggressively defend our clients in the courts

Our attorneys and defense teams conducted **45** jury trials in 2021, refusing to let the courts' 2021 COVID closures prevent our clients from seeking justice in front of juries.

Across both units, we secured **650** dismissals for our clients.



What We Do

We increase community safety by changing lives

Our **Pre-Trial Release** and **Reentry Units** connect clients to treatment, community-based services, housing, and employment opportunities.

Our **Collaborative Court teams** advocate for clients to participate in Mental Health Diversion, Young Adult Court, Behavioral Health Court, Drug Court, Veterans Court, and other alternative courts.

Our **Clean Slate Unit** clears people's records, removing barriers to employment, housing, and education.

Our **Youth Defender Unit** works to keep our youth out of the criminal legal system, and our **MAGIC** and **Young Defender programs** invest in their education and empowerment.



What We Do

We fight for racial equity

Our **Policy Unit** fights for racial justice by advocating for changes in local and state laws to make the criminal legal system more fair, equitable, and just.

Our **Immigration Unit** advocates on behalf of immigrants facing deportation.

Our **Integrity Unit** holds police accountable for misconduct and advocates for changes to procedures that disproportionately target people of color.

Our **Postconviction Unit** seeks the release or resentencing for individuals who have been punished under laws that disproportionately sentence people of color to longer terms in state prison.

Our **Felony and Misdemeanor Units** are fighting to implement **the Racial Justice Act**. AB 2542 empowers the defense to challenge racial disparities and inequalities in **arrests** by the police, **charging** by the District Attorney, and **sentences** by the courts by demonstrating that racial discrimination or bias, direct or implicit, played a role.

Recent Achievements



Ended unaffordable cash bail in California by winning *In re Kenneth Humphrey* in the California Supreme Court


SFGATE

News // Bay Area & State

City Leaders Applaud Program That Increases Pay To Low-Income Jurors

Oct. 13, 2021

Co-created and implemented AB 1452 – the “Be the Jury” program – into law, aimed at eliminating financial hardships to enable low-income jurors to serve on juries



Launched the Adachi Project, a first-of-its kind media and storytelling initiative to challenge stereotypes and humanizing our clients and their communities



Recent Achievements

Los Angeles Times

Subscribe Now
\$1 for 4 months

WORLD & NATION



California settlement limits ICE from re-detaining immigrants freed because of COVID

Secured a groundbreaking settlement to yield protections for immigrants detained by ICE, and limiting re-detention of those released

 KPIX CBS SF BayArea

NEWS WEATHER SPORTS CBS+ VIDEO MORE

CBS News Bay Area
WATCH NOW ▶

 61° Q

Judge Rules CDCR Inflicted Cruel and Unusual Punishment on San Quentin Inmates During Massive COVID Outbreak


November 18, 2021 at 6:43 pm Filed Under: [COVID outbreak](#), [San Quentin State Prison](#)

Litigated on behalf of 300 incarcerated individuals for a finding that California Dept. of Corrections inflicted cruel and unusual punishment during a massive COVID outbreak

Public Defender Budget and FTE Summary

	Budget	FTEs
FY 2020-21	42,256,703	199.06
FY 2021-22	45,292,551	209.57
FY 2022-23 (Mayor's June 1)	49,090,429	220.23
<i>FY 2022-2023 (General Fund)</i>	<i>47,305,917</i>	<i>210.03</i>
<i>FY 2022-2023 (Grant Funded)</i>	<i>1,784,512</i>	<i>10.2</i>

Public Defender Budget



Our Budget in Context

the Public Defender is the most underfunded agency in the criminal legal system


Our annual budget is approx \$49 million.

This is a little more than **one half** the budget of the District Attorney's Office (\$85 million).

It is **six times less** than the Sheriff's Department (\$299 million).

It is **fourteen times less** than the Police Department (\$708 million).


Proposed Allocated Budget FY2022-23



Our Budget in Context

the Public Defender is the most underfunded agency in the criminal legal system

The Public Defender's budget is **twenty-four times less** than SF's entire carceral system




A Call For Equity

The City invests \$49 million in the services provided by the Public Defender.

70%

Even though the Public Defender represents 7 out of 10 people charged by the District Attorney,



58%

our budget is just over half of the District Attorney's budget.




Vacancies


	2020	2021	2022
Number of Vacancies	2	7	14*

	Total Number of Vacancies	Position	Vacancy Date	Estimated Hiring Date
2022 Attorney Vacancies	0	NA	NA	NA
2022 Non-Attorney Vacancies	14	6 - Sr. Investigator (8143)	Oct '21	Sept '22
		1 - Investigator (8142)	May '22	July '22
		3 – Court Alternative Specialist (8446)	Oct '21 + Jan '22	July '22
		1 – IS Administrator (1094)	Oct '21	July '22
		1 – Public Relations Officer (1314)	Oct '21	July '22
		1 – Legal Process Clerk (8106)	May '22	July '22
		1 – Sr. Legal Process Clerk (8108)	June '22	July '22

Attrition



Organizational Chart





Assistant Chief Attorney | Defend

1 Head Attorney - 8182

Felony

4 Managing Attorneys - 8177
42 Attorneys - 8177 + 8182

Misdemeanor

2 Managing Attorneys - 8177 + 8182
19 Attorneys - 8177

Youth Defender

1 Managing Attorney - 8182
4 Attorneys - 8182 + 8177
2 Legal Assistants - 8173
2 Investigators - 8142 + 8143
2 Court Alternative Specialist I - 8446
1 Social Worker - 2910
1 Criminal Justice Specialist II - 8452
3 Clerks - 1402, 8106, 8108
1 Court Alt. Specialist - 8446 (V)

MAGIC Programs

1 Criminal Justice Specialist II - 8452
3 Clerks - 1402 + 1406

Immigration

1 Managing Attorney - 8177
7 Attorneys - 8177
1 Investigator - 8142
1 Legal Assistant - 8173
2 Court Alternative Specialist I - 8446
1 Clerk - 8106

Pre-Trial Release

1 Lead Attorney - 8177
1.5 Attorneys - 8177
1 Legal Assistant - 8173
1 Social Worker - 2910
1 Investigator - 8142
2 Court Alt. Specialist - 8446 (V)

Post Conviction

1 Managing Attorney - 8182
1 Attorney - 8177
2 Legal Assistant - 8173
1 Court Alt. Specialist I - 8446

Research

1 Managing Attorney - 8182
7 Attorneys - 8177

Specialty Courts + Programs

1 Managing Attorney - 8177
7 Attorneys - 8177 (1 grant funded)
3 Legal Assistants - 8173 (1 grant funded)
2 Clerks - 8108
1 Transcriber Typist - 1430

Mental Health

1 Managing Attorney - 8182
2 Attorneys - 8177
2 Investigators - 8142
1 Legal Assistant - 8173

Advocacy Teams

Investigation

9 Investigators - 8142
7 Sr. Investigators - 8143
6 Sr. Investigators - 8143 (V)
1 Investigator - 8142 (V)

Paralegal

13 Legal Assistants - 8173

Reentry

3 Court Alternative Specialist I - 8446
3 Criminal Justice Specialist II - 8452



Chief of Staff
1 Sr. Comm. Dev. Specialist II - 9775

Human Resources

1 Manager – 0931
1 Sr. HR Analyst - 1244
1 Personnel Clerk – 1204



Assistant Chief Attorney | Operations
1 Head Attorney - 8182

Training


1 Managing Attorney – 8182

Clerical / Information Technology

1 Manager - 8182
7 Clerks - 8106 + 8108
2 Sr. IS Engineer - 1043
2 IS Administrator IV - 1094
1 IS Administrator III - 1093
1 IS Business Analyst - 1053
2 Clerks (8106 + 8018)
1 IS Administrator IV- 1094 (V)

Finance, Admin & Payroll

1 Financial Systems Supervisor - 1670 S
1 Senior Payroll and Personnel Clerk- 1222 N
2 Sr. Account Clerk- 1632



Assistant Chief Attorney | Confront
1 Attorney - 8177

Integrity

1 Managing Attorney - 8177
1 Paralegal - 8173

Communications

1 Public Information Officer - 1312
1 Public Relations Officer - 1314 (V)

Policy

1 Attorney - 8177 (0.25 FTE grant funded)
1 Principal Analyst - 1824

Thank you!



OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY


- **District Attorney Chesa Boudin**
- Budget and Finance Committee
- Fiscal Years 2022-23 & 2023-24



MISSION

- Promote justice by fostering accountability and repairing harms;
- Address root causes of crime and prevent recidivism;
- Center and support crime victims and survivors;
- Reduce mass incarceration and develop effective alternatives to incarceration;
- Eliminate racial and class inequities in the criminal legal system; and
- Promote public safety by using innovative, evidence-based approaches.

EXPENDITURE OVERVIEW - Type



BUDGET & POSITION CHANGES

Budget Year


	2021-22 Original Budget	2022-23 Proposed Budget	Change From 2021-22	Percent Change
Total Budget:	\$81,237,605	\$84,594,904	\$3,357,229	4.1%
Total FTE:	282.99	286.61	3.62	1%

Budget Year + 1

	2022-23 Proposed Budget	2023-24 Proposed Budget	Change From 2022-23	Percent Change
Total Budget:	\$84,594,904	\$86,231,540	\$1,636,636	1.9%
Total FTE:	286.61	286.67	.07	-

Adjustments to Budget

Reduction Description	FY 22-23	FY 23-24
Salary (COLA and Attrition adjustments)	\$2,968,841	\$1,836,343
Mandatory Fringe Benefits (Retirement rates budgeted lower in base)	(754,394)	(\$1,124,158)
Non-Personnel Services (Reallocation of funds from work order for RI to HOJ shuttle service)	\$721,984	(\$306,400)
City Grant Programs (Non-GF/Grant Adjustments)	(\$63,957)	(\$631)
Materials & Supplies (Non-GF adjustments)	(\$58,421)	-
Overhead and Allocations (Non-GF Grant adjustments)	(\$12,725)	\$571
Programmatic Project (COLA increase to IIB Project)	\$135,433	\$142,205
Services of Other Department – (Workers Comp, Property Lease and other misc adjustments)	\$420,538	\$1,088,706
Summary of Changes:	\$3,357,299	\$1,636,636



Staffing & Vacancies

How many current vacancies compared to the last three years:

	2022	2021	2020	2019
Vacant Positions	14	11	14	10

Staffing & Vacancies

How long have these positions been vacant:

Job Class	Date Became Vacant	Status
8177 Trial Attorney	March 23, 2022	New appointment effective 7/11/22
8177 Trial Attorney	April 21, 2022	New appointment effective 8/8/22
8177 Trial Attorney	May 6, 2022	New appointment effective 6/27/22
8177 Trial Attorney	May 21, 2022	Recruitment underway
8177 Trial Attorney	June 3, 2022	1 st quarter FY recruitment
8177 Trial Attorney	June 9, 2022	1 st quarter FY recruitment
8129 Victim/Witness Investigator I	March 5, 2022	New appointment effective 7/5/22
8129 Victim/Witness Investigator I	May 27, 2022	Recruitment underway
8131 Victim/Witness Investigator II	March 9, 2022	Recruitment underway
8131 Victim/Witness Investigator II	March 15, 2022	Recruitment underway
0922 Manager I/Comms Mngr.	November 28, 2021	1 st quarter FY recruitment
1093 IT Operations Support Admin III	May 18, 2019	Scheduling PCS recruitment/was held for attrition last few years
8550 DA Investigator	March 12, 2022	Conducting backgrounds
8133 Victim Witness Investigator III	Newly funded grant position	Recruitment underway

Staffing & Vacancies

Explain planned attrition rates budgeted v. actual annual attrition rates for last 3 years?

	Authorized Positions	Budgeted Attrition Rate	Budgeted Positions	Actual Attrition Rate
FY 2021-22	335.02	8%	308.23	14%
FY 2020-21	322.02	12%	283.27	11%
FY 2019-20	328.00	9%	299.44	11%
FY 2018-19	326.02	9%	296.46	12%

Staffing & Vacancies

- Continuous onboarding and offboarding of employees
 - Continuous recruitment cycles
 - Continuous training cycle on basic systems
 - Fluctuating knowledge base
 - Ongoing rotation of staff to meet critical needs
 - Burden on existing staff leading to burnout
 - Difficulty managing long term collaborations
 - Lack of continuity on cases and projects
 - Preparation issues on cases
- **How have vacancies affected the work of your Department?**


Staffing & Vacancies

- Most of the Department's vacancies are recent vacancies
 - The Department remains focused on filling critical vacancies
 - Leadership transition and uncertainties
 - Recruiting qualified applicants with specific experience
 - Competitive compensation in neighboring counties affects retention
 - Specialized positions take longer to recruit (i.e. environmental law, consumer protection etc. . . .
- **Why are positions still vacant?**
 - **What are the internal or external obstacles?**

Staffing & Vacancies


- Over the next two years, the Department will remain committed to filling vacancies as they become open.
- Continue to advertise and seek recruitment of talented candidates with the desired qualifications and experience.
- **What is the Department's plan to fill budgeted vacancies in the upcoming two fiscal years?**

DISTRICT ATTORNEY ORGANIZATIONAL CHARTS



San Francisco District Attorney


District Attorney Direct Reports Organizational Chart



LEGEND
8198 District Attorney – 1
8193 Chief Atty – 1
8556 Chief DA Investigator - 1
0943 Manager VIII- 1
0954 Deputy Director IV – 1
8181 Asst. Chief Attorney - 1
8182 Head Atty – 2
8177 Attorney - 4
8554 Lt. DA Investigator - 1
8550 DA Investigator - 5
8173 Legal Assistant - 2
TOTAL – 20

San Francisco District Attorney

Chief of Staff Organizational Structure




LEGEND

0922 Manager I - 2
 0923 Manager II - 1
 0931 Manager III – 1
 1824 Principal Analyst - 1
 1823 Sr. Admin Analyst – 2
 1822 Admin Analyst - 1
 8133 Vic/Wit Inv III - 1
 8131 VW Inv. II – 1
 8135 Asst Chf VV Inv – 2
 8177 Attorney – 9
 8181 Asst. Chief Atty 1 – 1
TOTAL – 22

San Francisco District Attorney

Operations Department Organizational Structure



LEGEND


8177 Att'y – 90
8182 Head Att'y – 11
8181 Asst Chief Att'y - 4

TOTAL – 105

As of June 14, 2022

San Francisco District Attorney


Programs and Initiatives Organizational Structure



LEGEND
0942 Manager VII – 1
0923 Manager II - 1
0922 Manager I – 2
1824 Principal Analyst - 1
8135 Asst Chief Vic/Witness - 4
8133 VW Inv. III – 3
8131 VW Inv. II – 10
8129 VW Inv. I - 29
8177 Attorney – 9
8182 Head Atty – 2
9914 Public Svc Aide - 3
TOTAL – 63

San Francisco District Attorney

Bureau of Investigations Organizational Structure




LEGEND

8150 Captain DA Investigator- 1
8149 Lt. DA Investigator - 2
8554 Lt. DA Investigator - 2
8147 Sr DA Investigator – 2

8552 Sr DA Investigator – 6
8146 DA Investigator – 3
8550 DA Investigator - 16
8173 Legal Assistant - 1
8133 Vic/Witness Inv III – 2
TOTAL – 35

San Francisco District Attorney

Support Services Organizational Chart



LEGEND
0922 Manager I – 1
0932 Manager IV – 1
0933 Manager V – 1
1043 Sr. Engineer - 2
1054 Business Analyst – 1
1091 Operations Admin I – 1
1092 Operations Admin II – 1
1093 Operations Admin III - 2
1094 Network Admin – 1
1226 Chf Payroll/Personnel Clrk – 1
1244 Sr. HR Analyst – 1
1246 Pr. HR Analyst – 1
1404 Clerk – 1
1654 Accountant III – 1
1657 Accountant IV – 1
1824 Principal Admin Analyst – 1
8131 VW Inv. II – 2.5
8133 VW Inv. III – 11
8135 Asst. Chf VW Inv. – 3
8173 Legal Assistant – 33
9914 Public Srvc Aide-Admin – 2
TOTAL – 69.5



San Francisco
Sheriff's Office



San Francisco Sheriff's Department FY2022-23 & FY2023-24 Budget





Provides for safe, secure, humane, constitutional detention of persons arrested or under court order

- **Personnel:** Reduce OT to 10% of total hours, replace OT hours with full-time hours
 - ✓ Funding to address increased Covid-related leave
 - ✓ Increase rate of deputy hires
 - ✓ Civilianize sworn positions where appropriate so that deputies can return to sworn tasks
- **Recruitment/Retention/Training: Ensure staff can successfully meet expectations**
 - ✓ Close gap in training requirements vs. training budget
 - ✓ New training focused on direct supervision, crisis intervention, creating an inclusive environment
- **Support Criminal & Financial Justice Reforms**
 - ✓ Provide Covid-safe and non-custodial housing options
 - ✓ Provide no-charge tablet services for incarcerated persons
 - ✓ Provide more robust Discharge Planning Services for justice-system frequent users
- **Modernize Data: Support transparency and unfunded mandates**
 - ✓ Replace Jail Management System to be more flexible and provide more responsive data
 - ✓ Establish professional public-safety policy management system



Criminal Justice Reforms




Free Phone Calls:	Inmate cost for 15-minute call from \$4.45 FY14 to \$0.00 FY21. Funding for free phone calls in FY22-23 & FY23-24 base budget
Commissary:	Commissary cost reduced 50%, free items for indigent persons in FY21. Funding to support reduced/zero cost commissary included in FY22-23 & FY23-24 base budget
Tablets:	No-cost Tablet Program for Incarcerated Persons to start FY22. Funding for this pilot included in FY22-23 & FY23-24 budget.
Decarceration:	In FY17, 65% of justice-involved were in-custody, In FY22 65% justice-involved now out-of-custody. Funding in support of successful outcomes has tripled since FY17.
JMS Upgrade:	Case management system for justice-involved persons both in and out of custody. New system allows for integration with Courts, Public Defender, District Attorney. Provides data resources in support of better outcomes for justice-involved. Upgrade recommended by the workgroup to Re-envision the Jail Replacement Project.



SHF FTEs

Sworn Staff - Non-Overtime/Long-Term Leave



176 sworn positions are open as of May 2022

150 new sworn vacancies since July 2020

Annual sworn separation rate normally
~35




Overtime now **25% of total work**

Unit cost is same as regular-full-time but ...
... this is operationally unsustainable

Long on-boarding process for public-safety
Six months from position request to payroll
Nine months additional for training


SFSO levels of service required per CBAs & MOUs
Fixed Levels of service for courts, jails, workorders





Hiring Not Keeping Pace with Separations

Sworn Staff Hiring vs. Sworn Attrition





Hiring Plan

SFSO hiring plan budget years FY2022-23 and FY2023-24
Total number of authorized sworn FTEs, net attrition, is
approximately 783.

Projected FY2022-23 hiring timelines for 8302
Deputy Sheriff I (Entry Level) are as follows:

Totals	Current	FY22/23	FY23/24
Academy Class		60	40
Academy Trained Hires		15	10
Projected Separations		(35)	(35)
Long-Term Leave	(78)	(60)	(40)
Sworn Staff net of Long-Term Leave*	680	738	773

*Overtime as a percent of total work hours decreases from 25% currently to 17% in FY22/23 and 12% in FY23/24


Written Exam	Fall Academy	Winter Academy	Spring Academy
Academy Start	Aug 2022	Jan 2022	Apr 2022
Projected # of Hires Pre-Academy	20	20	20
Start of Work for Pre-Academy Hires	Apr 2023	Sep 2023	Dec 2023
Projected # of Hires Post-Academy	5	5	5
Start of Work for Post-Academy Hires	Oct 2022	Mar 2022	Jun 2022

*Hiring dates may change dependent on number of suitable candidates in each projected hiring times.




Organizational Chart

Custody Operations



Authorized:	491
Actual:	373
Total:	-118 76%

Field Operations




Authorized:	268
Actual:	205
Total:	-63 76%




Organizational Chart

Administration and Programs



Authorized:	82
Actual:	51
Total:	-31 62%

Projects and Planning



Authorized:	16
Actual:	17
Total:	+1 106%



San Francisco Sheriff's Office

Community Access



April 26, 2022 San Francisco Sheriff's Office
Newsletter Issue 101

Message from Sheriff Miyamoto

Welcome to the April 2022 edition of the San Francisco Sheriff's Office (SFSO) newsletter! April was a groundbreaking month.

I'm excited to announce that the Sheriff's Office is the first City department in San Francisco history to join forces with the U.S. Army to collaborate on recruitment efforts. General Michael Garrett of the U.S. Army Forces Command flew all the way from Fort Bragg, North Carolina to sign a PaYS, or **Partnership for Youth Success**, agreement with us. Check out our video below!

April is **Autism Acceptance Month**. Thank you, Deputy Petty, whose son is on the spectrum, for sharing your experience.

In honor of **National Public Dispatcher Week**, we recognized the heroes behind each 911 call who work tirelessly to ensure that our first responders and community stay safe. I'm proud to announce that the National Tactical Officer Association named **Sergeant Worthge** one of the fittest SWAT Operators in the nation. Congratulations, Sgt. Worthge!

Speaking of fitness, the **California Peace Officers Association's Run to Remember 5K and 10K** will be held in May. Proceeds benefit the families of fallen officers.

Last week I joined City leaders to commemorate the anniversary of the **1906 Earthquake and Fire**. Always remember the resilience of our City; we survived then and we continue to persevere through the COVID-19 pandemic.

This was the first year since the pandemic started that we were able to enjoy the **Northern California Cherry Blossom Festival** in person. I've always enjoyed the festival because it keeps me in touch with my Japanese roots and showcases the diversity of the Japanese-American community. That's all for now. On the law enforcement front: please read our flyer below on phone scams to learn how to protect yourself.

If you're interested in joining the SFSO Team, visit our [website](#).

Follow us on social media on Twitter [@SheriffSF](#), Instagram [@sf_sheriff](#), and Facebook



San Francisco Sheriff's Office
@SFSheriff · Law Enforcement Agency

Instagram



Continue as sf_sheriff



OFFICE OF THE SHERIFF CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE
ROOM 456, CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94102



STATEMENT FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Tuesday, March 16, 2022
Contact: San Francisco Sheriff's Office of Communications
sfsocommunications@sfgov.org


ZUCKERBERG SAN FRANCISCO GENERAL HOSPITAL PROTEST

On March 14 at approximately 10:47 a.m., sheriff's deputies were called to respond to an illegal breach of a secure area run by a private security team within Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital by anti-abortion protesters. Deputies responded within two minutes of receiving the emergency call. They took immediate action using minimal force to protect the safety and privacy of patients. One protester followed instructions and left, while three other protesters, who refused to leave, were escorted off the premises within seven minutes. All were cited for trespassing and later released. One protester was charged with resisting arrest.

A criminal investigation is ongoing into this matter. The San Francisco Sheriff's Office is working with the Department of Public Health to review the incident. People have the right to express their First Amendment rights, but in an acceptable way that respects other individuals and their privacy. We stand by women's rights and will continue to provide medical services to women and support their safety and privacy.

###

Social Media Accounts, Newsletters, and Press Releases are tools used to communicate with the public and to receive community feedback



Demographic breakdown of SFSO staff as of May 2022



SFSheriff.com is translated in English, Chinese (Simplified and Traditional), Filipino, Russian, Spanish and Vietnamese

SFSO has over 100 certified translators.

In 2022, SFSO unveiled its Bilingual Nameplate Program allowing community members to instantly identify bilingual deputies.

Sheriff's Alliance for Equity is dedicated to increasing language access features through translation services and recruitment.





San Francisco Sheriff's Office



Questions?





San Francisco
Sheriff's Office



Appendix: Requested Information





Available Requisitions										
Facility / Position	Sworn				Professional			Cadet		
Open Req - Deputy Sheriff	138	152	14							
Open Req - Sr. Deputy Sheriff	10	20	10							
Open Req - Sheriff's Sergeant	2	2	0							
Open Req - Sheriff's Lieutenant	1	1	0							
Open Req - Sheriff's Captain	0	0	0							
Open Req - Chief Deputy	0	0	0							
Open Req - Undersheriff	0	0	0							
Open Req - Non Sworn	0	0	0		20	14	-6			
Open Req - Sheriff's Cadet	0	0	0					8	21	13
Total Available Requisitions:	151	175	24		20	14	-6	8	21	13



Staffing

Leaves over 90 Days											
May 2022		Plus/ (Minus)				Percentage of Authorized Sworn	Total Authorized Civilian	Plus/ (Minus)			
		Current Cadet Staffing			Current Civilian Staffing						
		Total Authorized Cadet									
		Sworn			Professional			Cadet			
Total Leaves over 90 Days:		30	78	48	260%	0	1	1	0	6	6



Organizational Chart

ADMINISTRATION AND PROGRAMS DIVISION											
May 2022	Facility / Position	Total Authorized Sworn	Current Sworn Staffing	Plus/ (Minus)	Percentage of Authorized Sworn	Total Authorized Civilian	Current Civilian Staffing	Plus/ (Minus)	Total Authorized Cadet	Current Cadet Staffing	Plus/ (Minus)
		Sworn				Professional			Cadet		
	Academy + Core Training	35	20	-15	57%						
	Communications			0		2	3	1			
	Executive Team (Sheriff, Undersheriff, Assistant Sheriff, Chief of Staff)	3	3	0		1	1	0			
	Financial Services			0		9	7	-2			
	Internal Affairs	7	7	0	100%	1	0	-1	0	1	1
	Legal Counsel			0		4	2	-2			
	Payroll Services			0		3	3	0			
	Sheriff's Administration	9	9	0	100%	2	2	0	4	0	-4
	Sheriff's Furniture & Equipment			0		1	1	0			
	Backgrounds / Jail Clearance Officer	6	6	0	100%						
	Community Programs	36	25	-11	69%				1	2	1
	Criminal Investigations Unit	5	5	0	100%				0	0	0
	Jail and Re-Entry Programs			0		19	15	-4			
	Personnel & Recruitment	4	4	0	100%	3	1	-2			
	Prisoner Legal Services			0		4	3	-1			
	Training	7	7	0	100%				0	0	0
	Total APD:	112	86	-26	77%	49	38	-11	5	3	-2



Organizational Chart

CUSTODY OPERATIONS DIVISION

May 2022	Plus/ (Minus)	Current Cadet Staffing	Total Authorized Cadet	Plus/ (Minus)	Current Civilian Staffing	Total Authorized Civilian	Percentage of Authorized Sworn	Plus/ (Minus)	Current Sworn Staffing	Total Authorized Sworn
	Cadet			Professional			Sworn			
							68%	-25	54	79
							86%	-17	103	120
							73%	-55	147	202
							81%	-5	22	27
							77%	-6	20	26
							75%	-1	3	4
							100%	0	1	1
						85%	-4	23	27	
Total COD:	0	0	0	-13	32	45	77%	-113	373	486



Organizational Chart

FIELD OPERATIONS DIVISION

May 2022	Total Authorized Sworn	Current Sworn Staffing	Plus/ (Minus)	Percentage of Authorized Sworn	Total Authorized Civilian	Current Civilian Staffing	Plus/ (Minus)	Total Authorized Cadet	Current Cadet Staffing	Plus/ (Minus)
Facility / Position	Sworn				Professional			Cadet		
Canine Unit	2	2	0	100%						
City Hall Security	22	18	-4	82%				15	13	-2
Civil	13	11	-2	85%	10	7	-3			
Community Relations	1	1	0	100%						
Court Services	97	61	-36	63%				18	12	-6
Department of Emergency Management	7	7	0	100%				6	1	-5
Field Services Support Staff	7	7	0	100%						
HSA	1	1	0	100%						
Medical Examiners Patrol Unit	6	5	-1	83%						
MTA	1	1	0	100%						
APD	1	1	0	100%						
Public Library	4	3	-1	75%						
PUC	5	1	-4	20%				4	5	1
Department of Public Health (Sheriff's Patrol Unit)	87	59	-28	68%	2	2	0	68	55	-13
Transportation	30	22	-8	73%						
Warrant Services Unit	6	5	-1	83%						
Total FOD:	290	205	-85	71%	12	9	-3	111	86	-25



Organizational Chart

PLANNING & PROJECTS DIVISION

May 2022	Total Authorized Sworn	Current Sworn Staffing	Plus/ (Minus)	Percentage of Authorized Sworn	Total Authorized Civilian	Current Civilian Staffing	Plus/ (Minus)	Total Authorized Cadet	Current Cadet Staffing	Plus/ (Minus)
	Sworn				Professional			Cadet		
Facility / Position										
Planning & Projects Support Staff	3	3	0	100%						
Professional Standards	1	1	0	100%						
Technical Service	10	10	0	100%	9	4	-5			
Communications	1	1	0	100%						
Fleet Manager	1	1	0	100%	1	0	-1			
Safety Analyst					1	1	0			
San Bruno Complex Maintenance					11	3	-8			
San Bruno Jails Storekeeper					2	1	-1			
425-7th Street Maintenance					8	5	-3			
425-7th Street Storekeeper					1	1	0			
HOJ Jails Shared Costs					2	2	0			
All Facilities Shared Costs					1	1	0			
Total PPD:	16	16	0	100%	36	18	-18	0	0	0



Sheriff's Department Staffing Report Summary - May - 2022											
May 2022		TOTAL AVAILABLE POSITIONS	TOTAL ACTUAL	TOTAL AUTHORIZED	Percentage of Authorized Sworn	TOTAL AVAILABLE POSITIONS	TOTAL ACTUAL	TOTAL AUTHORIZED	TOTAL AVAILABLE POSITIONS	TOTAL ACTUAL	
		TOTAL AVAILABLE POSITIONS	TOTAL ACTUAL	TOTAL AUTHORIZED		TOTAL AVAILABLE POSITIONS	TOTAL ACTUAL	TOTAL AUTHORIZED			
Facility / Position		Sworn			Professional			Cadet			
Total:		934	758	-176	81%	142	98	-44	116	95	-21
Total (less attrtion for authorized, less long-term-leave for actual):		783	680	-103	87%	122	97	-25	108	89	-19



San Francisco
Sheriff's Office

Communications Team



Tara Moriarty

Director of Communications

Kelvin Wu

Media Relations
(628) 286-8168

Terry Rather

Public Relations
(415) 554-7247

From: [Katie Conry](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please approve \$4M for the Tenderloin Community
Date: Friday, June 17, 2022 3:55:58 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors, Budget Committee and Supervisor Preston:

We are asking that the \$4 million dollars in funds dedicated to the Tenderloin through the Planning Department NOT be put on reserve.

In 2022, the TLCBD worked with several other community partners (St. Anthony's, La Cocina, Tenderloin Museum, Weekend Adventures, Kroc Center, La Voz Latina, and Boys & Girls Club) to present a Tenderloin Community Budget to the Mayor's Office. This was a community-led effort that reflects many of our priorities and hopes for the future of the Tenderloin, and we are excited to have a budget for the community that was created by the community. We also have a commitment from the Planning Department to work with the Tenderloin community to bring the resources to implement these priorities.

The people who live and work in the Tenderloin are depending on these funds being available in next year's budget. Please do not put them on reserve! The Tenderloin community is being given a chance to shape our own future. Please fund the Planning Department to meet the community with the resources that we deserve.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

--

Katie Conry
Executive Director
Tenderloin Museum

My pronouns: *She/Her/Hers*

From: [Kelly Lindberg](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Tenderloin Funding
Date: Friday, June 17, 2022 2:48:13 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors, Budget Committee and Supervisor Preston:

We are asking that the \$4 million dollars in funds dedicated to the Tenderloin through the Planning Department NOT be put on reserve.

The Tenderloin Community (residents and CBOs together) worked on a budget priority sheet that was presented to the Mayor's office and we are excited to have a budget for the community that was created by the community. We also have a commitment from the Planning Department to work with the Tenderloin community to bring the resources to implement these priorities.

The people who live and work in the Tenderloin are depending on these funds being available in next year's budget. Do not put them on reserve! The Tenderloin community is being given a chance to shape our own future. Please fund the Planning Department to meet the community with the resources that we deserve.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Kelly

From: [Leonor Melara](#)
To: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Urging you to fund social housing, which Mayor Breed ignored
Date: Friday, June 17, 2022 2:42:51 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Brent Jalipa,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to fund the social housing recommendations that Mayor Breed refused to include in her proposed budget, through both the add-back process and other financing tools at your disposal (such as Certificates of Participation).

As you know, voters resoundingly approved November 2020's Prop K to authorize 10,000 units of Public Housing for All, and passed Prop I to raise around \$140 million this upcoming year for social housing. Taken together, Props I and K represent a clear expression from the voters to fund and create social housing: affordable housing for everyone that is focused on working people.

However, the Mayor refused to fund most of the \$136 million in recommendations produced by the Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board (HSFOB). Her proposal also cuts MOHCD's budget by \$52 million, while increasing spending on the Police and Sheriff by \$51 million and \$30 million respectively. This is despite us living through an affordable housing crisis that will require BILLIONS of dollars a year in funding for SF to hit its RHNA goals.

I urge you to deliver on the will of the voters, by funding -- through add-backs and all other means at your disposal -- the ignored recommendations. In particular, Supervisor Preston has proposed a \$100 million Certificate of Participation to fund social housing acquisition, construction, and repairs. The remaining \$36 million in Prop I spending recommendations can partly be covered through add-backs.

The recommendations I am asking you to approve include:

1. \$300,000 to study a new agency to create Public Housing for All. This is add-back request E085 in the Budget Justice Coalition's list.
2. City staffing, feasibility analyses, and NOFAs to study and support innovative social housing models
3. The acquisition of land to build social housing
4. Construction of new social housing
5. Expansion of the Small Sites Program

This would be the second budget cycle in a row where the Mayor has refused to seriously fund social housing. MOHCD has failed to partner meaningfully with the HSFOB on supporting the

community's vision for social housing. And it's not for a lack of trying; the HSFOB spent months developing spending recommendations, with community input from grassroots organizations, labor unions, and non-profit housing developers.

I urge you to ensure all unfunded social housing recommendations are incorporated into the FY 2022-23 budget. The voters have spoken, and it's time to deliver on the mandate promised by Props I and K two years ago.

Thank you,

Leonor Melara
leonormelara@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94131

From: [Alex Lantsberg](#)
To: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Urging you to fund social housing, which Mayor Breed ignored
Date: Friday, June 17, 2022 2:33:01 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Brent Jalipa,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to fund the social housing recommendations that Mayor Breed refused to include in her proposed budget, through both the add-back process and other financing tools at your disposal (such as Certificates of Participation).

As you know, voters resoundingly approved November 2020's Prop K to authorize 10,000 units of Public Housing for All, and passed Prop I to raise around \$140 million this upcoming year for social housing. Taken together, Props I and K represent a clear expression from the voters to fund and create social housing: affordable housing for everyone that is focused on working people.

However, the Mayor refused to fund most of the \$136 million in recommendations produced by the Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board (HSFOB). Her proposal also cuts MOHCD's budget by \$52 million, while increasing spending on the Police and Sheriff by \$51 million and \$30 million respectively. This is despite us living through an affordable housing crisis that will require BILLIONS of dollars a year in funding for SF to hit its RHNA goals.

I urge you to deliver on the will of the voters, by funding -- through add-backs and all other means at your disposal -- the ignored recommendations. In particular, Supervisor Preston has proposed a \$100 million Certificate of Participation to fund social housing acquisition, construction, and repairs. The remaining \$36 million in Prop I spending recommendations can partly be covered through add-backs.

The recommendations I am asking you to approve include:

1. \$300,000 to study a new agency to create Public Housing for All. This is add-back request E085 in the Budget Justice Coalition's list.
2. City staffing, feasibility analyses, and NOFAs to study and support innovative social housing models
3. The acquisition of land to build social housing
4. Construction of new social housing
5. Expansion of the Small Sites Program

This would be the second budget cycle in a row where the Mayor has refused to seriously fund social housing. MOHCD has failed to partner meaningfully with the HSFOB on supporting the

community's vision for social housing. And it's not for a lack of trying; the HSFOB spent months developing spending recommendations, with community input from grassroots organizations, labor unions, and non-profit housing developers.

I urge you to ensure all unfunded social housing recommendations are incorporated into the FY 2022-23 budget. The voters have spoken, and it's time to deliver on the mandate promised by Props I and K two years ago.

Thank you,

Alex Lantsberg
lantsberg@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94124

From: [Josh Miller](#)
To: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Urging you to fund social housing, which Mayor Breed ignored
Date: Friday, June 17, 2022 2:20:17 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Brent Jalipa,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to fund the social housing recommendations that Mayor Breed refused to include in her proposed budget, through both the add-back process and other financing tools at your disposal (such as Certificates of Participation).

As you know, voters resoundingly approved November 2020's Prop K to authorize 10,000 units of Public Housing for All, and passed Prop I to raise around \$140 million this upcoming year for social housing. Taken together, Props I and K represent a clear expression from the voters to fund and create social housing: affordable housing for everyone that is focused on working people.

However, the Mayor refused to fund most of the \$136 million in recommendations produced by the Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board (HSFOB). Her proposal also cuts MOHCD's budget by \$52 million, while increasing spending on the Police and Sheriff by \$51 million and \$30 million respectively. This is despite us living through an affordable housing crisis that will require BILLIONS of dollars a year in funding for SF to hit its RHNA goals.

I urge you to deliver on the will of the voters, by funding -- through add-backs and all other means at your disposal -- the ignored recommendations. In particular, Supervisor Preston has proposed a \$100 million Certificate of Participation to fund social housing acquisition, construction, and repairs. The remaining \$36 million in Prop I spending recommendations can partly be covered through add-backs.

The recommendations I am asking you to approve include:

1. \$300,000 to study a new agency to create Public Housing for All. This is add-back request E085 in the Budget Justice Coalition's list.
2. City staffing, feasibility analyses, and NOFAs to study and support innovative social housing models
3. The acquisition of land to build social housing
4. Construction of new social housing
5. Expansion of the Small Sites Program

This would be the second budget cycle in a row where the Mayor has refused to seriously fund social housing. MOHCD has failed to partner meaningfully with the HSFOB on supporting the

community's vision for social housing. And it's not for a lack of trying; the HSFOB spent months developing spending recommendations, with community input from grassroots organizations, labor unions, and non-profit housing developers.

I urge you to ensure all unfunded social housing recommendations are incorporated into the FY 2022-23 budget. The voters have spoken, and it's time to deliver on the mandate promised by Props I and K two years ago.

Thank you,
Josh Miller
District 8

Josh Miller
heathens.radio@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94131

From: [Jennifer Kiss](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Funding for Tenderloin Community Priorities
Date: Friday, June 17, 2022 1:12:34 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors, Budget Committee and Supervisor Preston:

I am writing to request that the \$4 million dollars in funds dedicated to the Tenderloin through the Planning Department **NOT** be put on reserve, but be accessible to deploy to the safety and community serving programs the funds are intended to support.

The Tenderloin Community (residents and CBOs together) built consensus on budget priorities that were presented to the Mayor's office and we are excited to have a budget for the community that was created by the community. We also have a commitment from the Planning Department to work with the Tenderloin community to bring the resources to implement these priorities.

The people who live and work in the Tenderloin are depending on these funds being available in next year's budget. Do not put them on reserve! The Tenderloin community is being given a chance to shape our own future. Please fund the Planning Department to meet the community with the resources that we deserve.

This is exactly how the city can work successfully WITH the community supporting community-informed priorities to create the change we all want to see in the neighborhood.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Jennifer Kiss

Member-at-Large
Board of Directors
Tenderloin Community Benefit District

Board of Governors
Boys and Girls Clubs of San Francisco

Executive Director
R&D Impact Foundation

From: [Iris Lee](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Tenderloin Community Budget
Date: Friday, June 17, 2022 1:08:55 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors, Budget Committee and Supervisor Preston:

We are asking that the \$4 million dollars in funds dedicated to the Tenderloin through the Planning Department NOT be put on reserve.

The Tenderloin Community (residents and CBOs together) worked on a budget priority sheet that was presented to the Mayor's office and we are excited to have a budget for the community that was created by the community. We also have a commitment from the Planning Department to work with the Tenderloin community to bring the resources to implement these priorities.

The people who live and work in the Tenderloin are depending on these funds being available in next year's budget. Do not put them on reserve! The Tenderloin community is being given a chance to shape our own future. Please fund the Planning Department to meet the community with the resources that we deserve.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

IL

--

--

Iris Lee

Pronouns: she/her | they/them | [why pronouns matter](#)

Broker & Small Business Consultant

DRE #01957294

[Tenderloin Community Benefit District](#)

iris@tlcbd.org

(c) 908.938.8806

. . . a Vibrant Community for ALL.

From: [joey lusterman](#)
To: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Urging you to fund social housing, which Mayor Breed ignored
Date: Friday, June 17, 2022 12:03:41 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Brent Jalipa,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

My name is Joey Lusterman and I live in District 1. Every year is a struggle with affording rent for my family and yet, the Mayor is only funding the cops.

I am writing to urge you to fund the social housing recommendations that Mayor Breed refused to include in her proposed budget, through both the add-back process and other financing tools at your disposal (such as Certificates of Participation).

As you know, voters resoundingly approved November 2020's Prop K to authorize 10,000 units of Public Housing for All, and passed Prop I to raise around \$140 million this upcoming year for social housing. Taken together, Props I and K represent a clear expression from the voters to fund and create social housing: affordable housing for everyone that is focused on working people.

However, the Mayor refused to fund most of the \$136 million in recommendations produced by the Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board (HSFOB). Her proposal also cuts MOHCD's budget by \$52 million, while increasing spending on the Police and Sheriff by \$51 million and \$30 million respectively. This is despite us living through an affordable housing crisis that will require BILLIONS of dollars a year in funding for SF to hit its RHNA goals.

I urge you to deliver on the will of the voters, by funding -- through add-backs and all other means at your disposal -- the ignored recommendations. In particular, Supervisor Preston has proposed a \$100 million Certificate of Participation to fund social housing acquisition, construction, and repairs. The remaining \$36 million in Prop I spending recommendations can partly be covered through add-backs.

The recommendations I am asking you to approve include:

1. \$300,000 to study a new agency to create Public Housing for All. This is add-back request E085 in the Budget Justice Coalition's list.
2. City staffing, feasibility analyses, and NOFAs to study and support innovative social housing models
3. The acquisition of land to build social housing
4. Construction of new social housing
5. Expansion of the Small Sites Program

This would be the second budget cycle in a row where the Mayor has refused to seriously fund social housing. MOHCD has failed to partner meaningfully with the HSFOB on supporting the community's vision for social housing. And it's not for a lack of trying; the HSFOB spent months developing spending recommendations, with community input from grassroots organizations, labor unions, and non-profit housing developers.

I urge you to ensure all unfunded social housing recommendations are incorporated into the FY 2022-23 budget. The voters have spoken, and it's time to deliver on the mandate promised by Props I and K two years ago.

Thank you,

joey lusterman
joeylusterman@gmail.com

san francisco, California 94118

From: [Luke Spray](#)
To: [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Simon Bertrang](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Fund the Tenderloin without delay!
Date: Friday, June 17, 2022 10:19:03 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Budget Committee and Supervisor Preston:

I write this email to kindly ask that the \$4 million dollars in funds dedicated to the Tenderloin through the Planning Department **NOT** be put on reserve. The needs of the Tenderloin are far too urgent.

The Tenderloin Community (residents and CBOs together) worked on a budget priority sheet that was presented to the Mayor's office and we are excited to have a budget for the community that was created by the community. We also have a commitment from the Planning Department to work with the Tenderloin community to bring the resources to implement these priorities.

The people who live and work in the Tenderloin are depending on these funds being available in next year's budget. Do not put them on reserve! The Tenderloin community is being given a chance to shape our own future. Please fund the Planning Department to meet the community with the resources that we deserve.

Many thanks,
Luke Spray

From: [Valdeck](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); connie.chan@sfgov.org; [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Funds Dedicated to the TL
Date: Friday, June 17, 2022 9:56:38 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Supervisors and Budget Committee:

We are asking that the \$4 million dollars in funds dedicated to the Tenderloin through the Planning Department NOT be put on reserve.

The Tenderloin Community (residents and CBOs together) worked on a budget priority sheet that was presented to the Mayor's office and we are excited to have a budget for the community that was created by the community. We also have a commitment from the Planning Department to work with the Tenderloin community to bring the resources to implement these priorities.

The people who live and work in the Tenderloin are depending on these funds being available in next year's budget. Do not put them on reserve! The Tenderloin community is being given a chance to shape our own future. Please fund the Planning Department to meet the community with the resources that we deserve.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Valdeck Ribeiro
378 Golden Gate Avenue
Hampton Court Apts.

From: [Adam Tetenbaum](#)
Subject: Tenderloin Budget Allocation
Date: Friday, June 17, 2022 9:24:45 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors, Budget Committee and Supervisor Preston:

We are asking that the \$4 million dollars in funds dedicated to the Tenderloin through the Planning Department NOT be put on reserve.

The Tenderloin Community (residents and CBOs together) worked on a budget priority sheet that was presented to the Mayor's office and we are excited to have a budget for the community that was created by the community. We also have a commitment from the Planning Department to work with the Tenderloin community to bring the resources to implement these priorities.

The people who live and work in the Tenderloin are depending on these funds being available in next year's budget. Do not put them on reserve! The Tenderloin community is being given a chance to shape our own future. Please fund the Planning Department to meet the community with the resources that we deserve.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Adam Tetenbaum



Adam Tetenbaum | Olympic Residential Group | 235 Montgomery Street, Suite 960, San Francisco, CA 94104
D 415-947-7884 | M 917-626-1780 | adam@olympicrg.com
www.olympicrg.com

From: [Himalayan Pizza](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Christy Shirilla](#)
Subject: Budget To Tenderloin Community
Date: Thursday, June 16, 2022 11:01:35 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Supervisors and Budget Committee:

Through the Planning Department, we are asking that the \$4 million dollars allocated to the Tenderloin NOT be put on reserve.

The Tenderloin Community (residents and CBOs together) worked on a budget priority sheet that was presented to the Mayor's office and we are excited to have a budget for the community that was created by the community. We also have a commitment from the Planning Department to work with the Tenderloin community to bring the resources to implement these priorities.

The people who live and work in the Tenderloin depend on these funds being available in the next budget. Please, don't put them aside in reserves! We are being given a chance to shape our own future in Tenderloin. We deserve to have the resources that the Planning Department needs to meet the needs of our community.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Team Himalayan Pizza & Momo

From: [Pauline Kahney](#)
To: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Urging you to fund social housing, which Mayor Breed ignored
Date: Thursday, June 16, 2022 10:01:37 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Brent Jalipa,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to fund the social housing recommendations that Mayor Breed refused to include in her proposed budget, through both the add-back process and other financing tools at your disposal (such as Certificates of Participation).

As you know, voters resoundingly approved November 2020's Prop K to authorize 10,000 units of Public Housing for All, and passed Prop I to raise around \$140 million this upcoming year for social housing. Taken together, Props I and K represent a clear expression from the voters to fund and create social housing: affordable housing for everyone that is focused on working people.

However, the Mayor refused to fund most of the \$136 million in recommendations produced by the Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board (HSFOB). Her proposal also cuts MOHCD's budget by \$52 million, while increasing spending on the Police and Sheriff by \$51 million and \$30 million respectively. This is despite us living through an affordable housing crisis that will require BILLIONS of dollars a year in funding for SF to hit its RHNA goals.

I urge you to deliver on the will of the voters, by funding -- through add-backs and all other means at your disposal -- the ignored recommendations. In particular, Supervisor Preston has proposed a \$100 million Certificate of Participation to fund social housing acquisition, construction, and repairs. The remaining \$36 million in Prop I spending recommendations can partly be covered through add-backs.

The recommendations I am asking you to approve include:

1. \$300,000 to study a new agency to create Public Housing for All. This is add-back request E085 in the Budget Justice Coalition's list.
2. City staffing, feasibility analyses, and NOFAs to study and support innovative social housing models
3. The acquisition of land to build social housing
4. Construction of new social housing
5. Expansion of the Small Sites Program

This would be the second budget cycle in a row where the Mayor has refused to seriously fund social housing. MOHCD has failed to partner meaningfully with the HSFOB on supporting the

community's vision for social housing. And it's not for a lack of trying; the HSFOB spent months developing spending recommendations, with community input from grassroots organizations, labor unions, and non-profit housing developers.

I urge you to ensure all unfunded social housing recommendations are incorporated into the FY 2022-23 budget. The voters have spoken, and it's time to deliver on the mandate promised by Props I and K two years ago.

Thank you,

Pauline Kahney
pfkahney@mac.com

San Francisco, California 94103

From: [San Francisco Travel - President & CEO](#)
To: [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [DPH - cassandra](#)
Subject: Support for Welcome Ambassadors and Funding for the Economic Core
Date: Thursday, June 16, 2022 3:54:26 PM
Attachments: [Ambassador Letter_SF Travel_PDF 2022.pdf](#)

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Chair Ronen and Members of the Budget and Appropriations Committee,

Please see the attached letter regarding our support of the Welcome Ambassador Program as well as funding for the Economic Core. We encourage your support of these important investments. Additionally, I wanted to share some of the overwhelmingly positive feedback that we have received from the Welcome Ambassador program from the public. You can find those communications [here](#).

Thanks,
Joe



San Francisco Travel - President & CEO |
E president@sftravel.com | T 415.227.2606

San Francisco Travel | One Front Street, Suite 2900 | San Francisco, CA 94111
sftravel.com | Follow us on [Facebook](#) + [Twitter](#)

San Francisco Named the "World's Best City" by Time Out Magazine





June 16, 2022

Dear Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am writing on behalf of the San Francisco Travel Association. We are a not for profit organization that promotes San Francisco as a global destination. San Francisco has been disproportionately impacted by the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic. One of the most impactful and positive investments that has helped us welcome back business and leisure visitors is the Welcome Ambassador Program which launched last fall.

Prior to the pandemic, tourism was San Francisco's number one economy welcoming over 26 million visitors who spent over \$10 billion in our city. Tourism employs over 86,000 individuals supporting our small businesses, restaurants, accommodations, attractions and arts and cultural institutions. Additionally, tourism brought in over \$800 million in taxes to the City, which helps to provide essential services and employ essential workers.

Since the launch of the Welcome Ambassadors program, we have been able to employ over 100 ambassadors at any given time and deploy up to 50 ambassadors on the street daily. These ambassadors are strategically stationed at the busiest transit stations in the economic core as well as highly trafficked visitor destinations such as Chinatown, Fisherman's Wharf and around Moscone Center. We receive daily feedback from the public about how the ambassadors have made them feel safer, helped them navigate San Francisco, provide a restaurant recommendation, or give a recommended itinerary for their day. In fact, an independent survey found that nearly 80% of visitors said the Welcome Ambassadors made them feel more welcome in San Francisco and more than 90% of visitors indicated that they were likely or certain to recommend San Francisco as a place to visit because of their interaction with an Ambassador.

Additionally, the group meeting attendees that have gathered to meet at Moscone Center since the launch of this program have had only positive experiences with the Welcome Ambassadors. In discussions with our group meeting clients, we are told time and time again that the Welcome Ambassador program is giving San Francisco the competitive edge in retaining and booking new business. This is an essential tool to continue to build back business at Moscone Center which brings in billions of dollars annually.

Please support the funding to allow for events and activations in the city's core as well as for the Welcome Ambassadors so we can continue this important programming which is greatly improving the visitor experience to San Francisco. This investment will more than pay for itself with repeat leisure and business visitors in years to come.

Sincerely,

Joe D'Alessandro
President and CEO

From: [Sam Bastida](#)
To: [Jalipa Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Meeting ID: 2487 533 8802 # #
Date: Thursday, June 16, 2022 9:17:55 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

I have worked day shift security at the De Young for over 6 years. I have never seen the museums be so short staffed for security. This poses a risk to the safety of the visitors, staff and priceless art collection. Much of the art and artifacts has no barriers, or glass over the artwork and can easily be damaged by children or people who are unfamiliar with the fragility and cultural value of the pieces. This happens regularly and the galleries need attendants which are not there. We have been asked to patrol the Osher gallery with one person, this area is 7 individual waller rooms with approximately 60 works of art inside, no velvet ropes, glass, or other barriers exist between the art and the visitors. Additionally there is no one staffed at the exit of the cafe into the museum to check for food, so it is constantly brought into the galleries.

Most concerning to me is that there are absolutely not enough security staff to evacuate the galleries in the event of a fire alarm. Twice I have seen fire alarms where doors were left open on the buildings exterior and there were not enough guards to evacuate correctly. All guards are required to clock out for lunch for an hour a day this leaves us extremely at risk for harm of the visitors in the event of a real evacuation. The fire panel is currently out of order to security control, it has been for weeks and we are required to check it only once an hour manually. This is incredibly irresponsible, there needs to be a guard standing by the panel at all times. We are regularly forced to work extended hours and off hour shifts due to the short staffing. Please provide us with the security officers required to create a reasonably safe experience for the visitors and the cultural value of the art.

From: [Adrienne Gembala](#)
To: [Jalipa Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [DPH-mdavidson](#)
Subject: SF Budget Adjustments
Date: Wednesday, June 15, 2022 5:05:55 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Budget and Appropriations Committee:

Thank you for your leadership and efforts to keep our neighbors safe and secure through the COVID pandemic. I'm proud of the way our City responded in the pandemic – particularly in the area of supporting community food programs.

While the immediacy of the COVID crisis has waned, food insecurity has not. In fact, pressures have increased. San Francisco-Marin Food Bank's Food Locator is seeing 4x the number of visits of people looking for food, in addition to the Food Bank seeing a 40% increase in CalFresh signups, 21% increase in Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) signups, and 45% increase in meals provided to seniors and adults with disabilities.

Demand for community food security programs is increasing as inflation surges. Soaring inflation is not only impacting demand for service, it is significantly increasing the cost to community organizations in delivering food security programs. This has an impact not only on demand for services, but the cost of providing that service. From February 2021-February 2022, grocery prices rose 12.1% overall, and an average of 50% increased cost for eggs and a 35% hike for flour.

Other funding from federal sources (FEMA, Federal COVID relief bills) have ended, leaving organizations with little choice but to wind down operations just as community need is spiking.

Our food system was already in an emergency pre-pandemic with one if four San Franciscans experiencing food insecurity, disproportionately impacting communities of color. COVID just magnified a deeply rooted problem, exacerbating inequities, making it unconscionable to continue to ignore the crisis in front of us.

Supporting continued food security programs will have a positive impact on an estimated 70,000 households (not unduplicated) served by community programs about to be cut. I urge you to provide full funding at current levels for community food programming for the next 2 years - \$12M in FY 23 and \$30M in FY24.

In community,

[Adrienne Gembala](#)
adriennegembala@gmail.com
661 645 5569

From: [Hyde Street Studios](#)
To: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: In Support of SF OEWD full funding for Mid-Market/Tenderloin Community Based Safety Program
Date: Wednesday, June 15, 2022 2:26:55 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Honorable Supervisors Ronen, Walton, Safai, Mar, and Chan,

Please support Mayor London Breed's full budget proposal for community ambassadors through SF OEWD's Community Based Safety Program in Mid-Market/Tenderloin. This program has been a tremendous support to our community and must continue.

The current budget proposal will allow the program to not only maintain the current deployment and allow for the possibility of continuing and expanding these services into the evening hours and additional areas for businesses, community events, arts, and culture. The budget would support approximately 138, 12-hour posts per day covering 72 block faces. This provides meaningful employment and life skills to more than 250 ambassadors who may otherwise have extreme barriers to employment.

The program has dramatically improved the safety, cleanliness, and general livability throughout its existence. But there is still a lot of work to do and it is critical we continue and build upon these services.

We at Hyde Street Studios are very pleased and encouraged by the progress being made in the Tenderloin through this program and its partnership with Urban Alchemy. It's a program that's clearly starting from a place of compassion and is making the streets safer for all Tenderloin residents. We've seen Hyde Street in front of our business go from a dangerous open-air drug marketplace to a much safer and more inviting environment. Continuation and expansion of this program is very needed and has our utmost support.

Thank you for your time.

Jack Kertzman
Studio Manager

Hyde Street Studios
245 Hyde St.
San Francisco, CA 94102

Studio Phone: (415)-441-8934
Email: info@hydestreet.com
Website: www.hydestreet.com

From: [Danny Sauter](#)
To: [Jalipa Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Budget Request: Community Convener Funding for San Francisco Neighborhood Centers
Date: Wednesday, June 15, 2022 12:44:16 PM
Attachments: [SFNCT - Community Convener Funding Budget Letter.pdf](#)

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hello Clerk Jalipa,

Please find attached a letter from San Francisco Neighborhood Centers requesting \$150,000 from DCYF for our Community Convener Funding program.

I have also sent this to department heads and Budget & Appropriations Committee Members. Please let me know if anything else is needed on my side to make sure this request is received.

Thank you!

--

Danny Sauter
(415) 562-6441

Executive Director
[Neighborhood Centers Together](#)



NEIGHBORHOOD CENTERS TOGETHER

San Francisco Neighborhood Centers Call for Community Convener Funding to Advance Children & Family Recovery

Our Members

SAN FRANCISCO - May 17, 2022

Bernal Heights
Neighborhood Center

TO: Mayor London N. Breed & Department of Children, Youth & Their Families (DCYF)

Booker T. Washington
Community Services
Center

San Francisco Neighborhood Centers Together (SFNCT) is a collaborative of eight neighborhood centers throughout the city that collectively serve more than 9,000 residents every year. Our largest single client population is youth. Our centers, from Chinatown to the Richmond, from the Fillmore to the Mission, have been on the front lines serving youth and families throughout the COVID-19 pandemic.

Cameron House

Good Samaritan
Family Resource
Center

Given this, we have great interest in the "[Mayor's Children & Family Recovery Plan](#)," which charts a much needed 3-5 year citywide strategy to help children and families recover from the impacts of COVID-19. We ask that you prioritize the recommendations of this plan in the upcoming budget. In particular, we believe that our neighborhood centers can be a key partner in achieving the following goals:

I.T. Bookman
Community Center

Potrero Hill
Neighborhood House

Richmond
Neighborhood Center

TEL HI Neighborhood
Center

- **Access/Navigation & Systems Change:** Strategy 1b calls for the co-location of services by utilizing "trusted places," and further calls to shift the paradigm from "come to us" to "be where the families are." San Francisco's Neighborhood Centers are this place. Our centers have built a deep history of trust through decades of service tailored to the specific needs of our respective communities.
- **Safety & Healing:** Strategy 2a emphasizes the need to create neighborhood cohesion and belonging. It calls for spaces for neighbors to come together, for community volunteering, and culturally relevant neighborhood events. These programs all have a common need: space. Our neighborhood centers offer an incredible resource that, with the right resources, can be activated to offer badly needed space for community events to be held.


To help DCYF achieve these strategies that are instrumental to children & family recovery, **we are requesting \$150,000 in funding from DCYF to restore the Community Convener program** for our neighborhood centers. With this funding, our eight neighborhood centers could fund hours for a staff person to host community groups at our centers and cover additional insurance for these events. This would enable community meetings, safety workshops, and town halls to be held at our neighborhood

centers and bring communities together to build resilience and unity. This was last funded by DCYF in 2008, leaving a decade-plus gap in which our neighborhood centers have not been able to serve their communities to the fullest extent possible.

We look forward to continued engagement with DCYF to ensure that our neighborhood centers are partners in the critical work of recovery for our city's children and families.

In Community,

Danny Sauter

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Daniel J. Sauter". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Executive Director
San Francisco Neighborhood Centers Together

Nestor L. Fernandez

Executive Director
TEL HI Neighborhood Center

Gina Dacus

Executive Director
Bernal Heights Neighborhood Center

Shakirah Simley

Executive Director
Booker T. Washington Community Services Center

Felisia Thibodeaux

Executive Director
I.T. Bookman Community Center

Michael Lee

Executive Director
Cameron House

Michelle Cusano

Executive Director
Richmond Neighborhood Center

From: [Emily Chung](#)
To: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: ITEM #4 Support SF OEWD full funding for Mid-Market/Tenderloin Community Based Safety Program - ambassador program
Date: Wednesday, June 15, 2022 9:24:43 AM
Attachments: [image886280.png](#)

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Honorable Supervisors Ronen, Walton, Safai, Mar, and Chan,

Please support Mayor London Breed's full budget proposal for community ambassadors through SF OEWD's Community Based Safety Program in Mid-Market/Tenderloin. This program has been a tremendous support to our community and must continue.

The current budget proposal will allow the program to not only maintain the current deployment and allow for the possibility of continuing and expanding these services into the evening hours and additional areas for businesses, community events, arts, and culture. The budget would support approximately 138, 12-hour posts per day covering 72 block faces. This provides meaningful employment and life skills to more than 250 ambassadors who may otherwise have extreme barriers to employment.

The program has dramatically improved the safety, cleanliness, and general livability throughout its existence. But there is still a lot of work to do and it is critical we continue and build upon these services.

Our hotel located on Market and 7th street. The community ambassadors really make a big difference. We had guests wanted to cancel reservation and leave right the way because of the street condition at night. You can easily find comments about the evening safety concern and comments around drug use in the area. Our guests and employee safety are our top priority. The city needs business and tax money to run. And we need city to help with these issues.

Best,

Emily Chung




EMILY CHUNG DIRECTOR OF FINANCE & INTERIM GENERAL MANAGER

YOTEL SAN FRANCISCO

1095 MARKET STREET, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94103, USA

T +1 415-829-0038



THINK BEFORE YOU PRINT!

PLEASE DON'T READ ANYTHING THAT IS NOT INTENDED FOR YOU AS IT MAY BE CONFIDENTIAL INCLUDING ANY MAIL OR ATTACHMENTS THAT COME FROM YOTEL. IF YOU GET ANYTHING FROM US THAT YOU DON'T THINK THAT YOU SHOULD HAVE PLEASE LET US KNOW AND DELETE IT.
THANK YOU.

From: [Michelle Mansour](#)
To: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: ITEM #4 Support SF OEWD full funding for Mid-Market/Tenderloin Community Based Safety Program - ambassador program
Date: Tuesday, June 14, 2022 5:29:06 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Honorable Supervisors Ronen, Walton, Safai, Mar, and Chan,

Root Division has been a part of San Francisco's cultural fabric for 20 years through our education and community services. Our attendance, public safety, and programming has been greatly impacted by the challenges that we face on 1131 Mission street.

Please support Mayor London Breed's full budget proposal for community ambassadors through SF OEWD's Community Based Safety Program in Mid-Market/Tenderloin. This program has been a tremendous support to our community and must continue.

The program has dramatically improved the safety, cleanliness, and general livability throughout its existence. But there is still a lot of work to do and it is critical we continue and build upon these services.

The current budget proposal will allow the program to not only maintain the current deployment and allow for the possibility of continuing and expanding these services into the evening hours and additional areas for businesses, community events, arts, and culture. The budget would support approximately 138, 12-hour posts per day covering 72 block faces. This provides meaningful employment and life skills to more than 250 ambassadors who may otherwise have extreme barriers to employment.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best,

Michelle

(Cultural Worker in District 6)

Michelle Mansour
Executive Director
pronouns: she/her

Root Division

1131 Mission Street (at 7th), San Francisco, CA 94103
michelle@rootdivision.org | 415.863.7668 | rootdivision.org

#Support RD today! rootdivision.org/giving

From: [Harlo Pippenger](#)
To: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Urging you to fund social housing, which Mayor Breed ignored
Date: Tuesday, June 14, 2022 5:16:22 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Brent Jalipa,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to fund the social housing recommendations that Mayor Breed refused to include in her proposed budget, through both the add-back process and other financing tools at your disposal.

As you know, voters resoundingly approved November 2020's Prop K to authorize 10,000 units of Public Housing for All, and passed Prop I to raise around \$140 million this upcoming year for social housing. Taken together, Props I and K represent a clear expression from the voters to fund and create social housing: affordable housing for everyone that is focused on working people.

However, the Mayor refused to fund most of the recommendations produced by the Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board (HSFOB). Her proposal also cuts MOHCD's budget by \$52 million, while increasing spending on the Police and Sheriff by \$51 million and \$30 million respectively. This is despite us living through an affordable housing crisis that will require BILLIONS of dollars a year in funding for SF to hit its RHNA goals.

I urge you to deliver on the will of the voters, by funding through add-backs and all other means at your disposal the ignored recommendations, which include:

1. \$300,000 to study a new agency to create Public Housing for All. This is add-back request E085 in the Budget Justice Coalition's list.
2. City staffing, feasibility analyses, and NOFAs to study and support innovative social housing models
3. The acquisition of land to build social housing
4. Construction of new social housing
5. Expansion of the Small Sites Program

This would be the second budget cycle in a row where the Mayor has refused to seriously fund social housing. MOHCD has failed to partner meaningfully with the HSFOB on supporting the community's vision for social housing. And it's not for a lack of trying; the HSFOB spent months developing spending recommendations, with community input from grassroots organizations, labor unions, and non-profit housing developers.

I urge you to ensure all unfunded social housing recommendations are incorporated into the

FY 2022-23 budget. The voters have spoken, and it's time to deliver on the mandate promised by Props I and K two years ago.

Thank you,

Harlo Pippenger

Harlo.p.pippenger@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94131

From: [Rachel Welles](#)
To: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: ITEM #4 Support SF OEWD full funding for Mid-Market/Tenderloin Community Based Safety Program - ambassador program
Date: Tuesday, June 14, 2022 5:15:37 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Honorable Supervisors Ronen, Walton, Safai, Mar, and Chan,

Root Division has been a part of San Francisco's cultural fabric for 20 years through our education and community services. Our attendance, public safety and programming has been greatly impacted by the challenges that we face on 1131 Mission street.

Please support Mayor London Breed's full budget proposal for community ambassadors through SF OEWD's Community Based Safety Program in Mid-Market/Tenderloin. This program has been a tremendous support to our community and must continue.

The program has dramatically improved the safety, cleanliness, and general livability throughout its existence. But there is still a lot of work to do and it is critical we continue and build upon these services.

The current budget proposal will allow the program to not only maintain the current deployment and allow for the possibility of continuing and expanding these services into the evening hours and additional areas for businesses, community events, arts, and culture. The budget would support approximately 138, 12-hour posts per day covering 72 block faces. This provides meaningful employment and life skills to more than 250 ambassadors who may otherwise have extreme barriers to employment.

Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,
Rachel

Resident of District 5
Cultural Worker in District 6

Rachel Welles she/her

Operations Manager

Root Division

rachel@rootdivision.org | rootdivision.org

Office #: (415) 863-7668

1131 Mission St, San Francisco, CA 94103

From: [Megan Murray](#)
To: [Jalipa Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: ITEM #4 Support SF OEWD full funding for Mid-Market/Tenderloin Community Based Safety Program - ambassador program
Date: Tuesday, June 14, 2022 4:25:58 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Honorable Supervisors Ronen, Walton, Safai, Mar, and Chan,

Please support Mayor London Breed's full budget proposal for community ambassadors through SF OEWD's Community Based Safety Program in Mid-Market/Tenderloin. This program has been a tremendous support to our community and must continue.

The current budget proposal will allow the program to not only maintain the current deployment and allow for the possibility of continuing and expanding these services into the evening hours and additional areas for businesses, community events, arts, and culture. The budget would support approximately 138, 12-hour posts per day covering 72 block faces. This provides meaningful employment and life skills to more than 250 ambassadors who may otherwise have extreme barriers to employment.

The program has dramatically improved the safety, cleanliness, and general livability throughout its existence. But there is still a lot of work to do and it is critical we continue and build upon these services.

Thank you,
Megan Murray

Megan Murray | Audience Services Manager | American Conservatory Theater | 415 Geary Street, San Francisco, CA 94102 | 415-439-2392

Theater. Classes. Community.

Learn more at act-sf.org

Donate online at act-sf.org/support

From: [Dian](#)
To: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: ITEM #4 Support SF OEWD full funding for Mid-Market/Tenderloin Community Based Safety Program - ambassador program
Date: Tuesday, June 14, 2022 4:17:20 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Honorable Supervisors Ronen, Walton, Safai, Mar, and Chan,

Please support Mayor London Breed's full budget proposal for community ambassadors through SF OEWD's Community Based Safety Program in Mid-Market/Tenderloin. This program has been a tremendous support to our community and must continue.

The current budget proposal will allow the program to not only maintain the current deployment and allow for the possibility of continuing and expanding these services into the evening hours and additional areas for businesses, community events, arts, and culture. The budget would support approximately 138, 12-hour posts per day covering 72 block faces. This provides meaningful employment and life skills to more than 250 ambassadors who may otherwise have extreme barriers to employment.

The program has dramatically improved safety, cleanliness, and general livability throughout its existence. But there is still a lot of work to do and it is critical we continue and build upon these services.

Thank you!

*Dian Liu
Resident and homeowner
1075 Market St*

From: [Jennifer Kiss](#)
To: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: ITEM #4 Support SF OEWD full funding for Mid-Market/Tenderloin Community Based Safety Program - ambassador program
Date: Tuesday, June 14, 2022 4:16:26 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Honorable Supervisors Ronen, Walton, Safai, Mar, and Chan,

Please support Mayor London Breed's full budget proposal for community ambassadors through SF OEWD's Community Based Safety Program in Mid-Market/Tenderloin. This program has been a tremendous support to our community and must continue.

The current budget proposal will allow the program to not only maintain the current deployment and allow for the possibility of continuing and expanding these services into the evening hours and additional areas for businesses, community events, arts, and culture. The budget would support approximately 138, 12-hour posts per day covering 72 block faces.

Not only does the community ambassador program dramatically improve public safety, it provides meaningful employment and life skills to more than 250 ambassadors who may otherwise have extreme barriers to employment. It's an essential win-win.

The program has significantly improved safety, cleanliness, general livability and business viability for residents and business owners in the Tenderloin/Mid-Market neighborhood throughout its existence. It is critical we continue to build upon the advances made.

Jennifer Kiss
Member-at-Large
Tenderloin Community Benefit District

Former VP Programs, Tenderloin Health Improvement Partnership
Saint Francis Foundation

From: [Isabel Manchester](#)
To: [Jalipa Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: ITEM #4 Support SF OEWD full funding for Mid-Market/Tenderloin Community Based Safety Program - ambassador program
Date: Tuesday, June 14, 2022 4:15:57 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Honorable Supervisors Ronen, Walton, Safai, Mar, and Chan,

I am the general partner over here at the Phoenix Hotel and I am asking you to please support Mayor London Breed's full budget proposal for community ambassadors through SF OEWD's Community Based Safety Program in Mid-Market/Tenderloin. This program has been a tremendous support to our community and must continue. We need to increase the presence of the ambassadors in the Tenderloin so that we can walk freely and without danger.

The program has dramatically improved the safety, cleanliness, and general livability throughout its existence. But there is still a lot of work to do and it is critical we continue and build upon these services. To lay off this plan now would be a huge mistake.

I am free to discuss in detail should anyone have specific questions.

Isabel Manchester
Managing Partner
Phoenix Hotel
415-290-5006

The Phoenix Hotel | CHAMBERS eat + drink

601 Eddy Street
San Francisco, CA 94109

415.290.5006
isabel@phoenixsf.com

From: [Frances Fleetwood](#)
To: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: ITEM #4 Support SF OEWD full funding for Mid-Market/Tenderloin Community Based Safety Program - ambassador program
Date: Tuesday, June 14, 2022 4:13:46 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Honorable Supervisors Ronen, Walton, Safai, Mar, and Chan,

Please support Mayor London Breed's full budget proposal for community ambassadors through SF OEWD's Community Based Safety Program in Mid-Market/Tenderloin. This program has been a tremendous support to our community and must continue.

The current budget proposal will allow the program to not only maintain the current deployment and allow for the possibility of continuing and expanding these services into the evening hours and additional areas for businesses, community events, arts, and culture. The budget would support approximately 138, 12-hour posts per day covering 72 block faces. This provides meaningful employment and life skills to more than 250 ambassadors who may otherwise have extreme barriers to employment.

The program has dramatically improved the safety, cleanliness, and general livability throughout its existence. But there is still a lot of work to do and it is critical we continue and build upon these services.

My name is Frances Wilkinson and I am an employee at Root Division, located in SOMA at 1131 Market Street. The ambassador program impacts the safety of our neighborhood and should be extended to include all of soma.

Thank you.

Frances Fleetwood
Art Programs Manager
pronouns: they/them

Root Division
1131 Mission Street (at 7th), San Francisco, CA 94103
frances@rootdivision.org | rootdivision.org

#Support RD today! rootdivision.org/giving

From: [Rebecca Mora](#)
To: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Fund our neighborhood hubs!!!
Date: Monday, June 13, 2022 4:23:41 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hi London + Brent,

3rd generation mission resident here. Our community was the most vulnerable during the pandemic serving majority of frontline positions to keep your city afloat. DO NOT count us out now that the budgeting is in process. FUND OUR LTF AND LPEC HUBS!!

This document is for internal use only. It is not to be distributed outside the City of San Francisco. It is not to be used for any other purpose.

Dear Budget Committee:
Please consider the Security Staff shortage in light of the fact that we have no one in several roles. Please consider ALL staff leave positions: PENDING, VACANT, RESIGNED.
Thank you for your attention to this important issue.
Respectfully,
[redacted]
5/19/2022

SECURITY SHORTAGE: DEPT. # 61

5/19/2022

1	Coffey, Jane	36		71	X
2	Motley, James	37		72	X
3	Wong, Darwin	38	Matthews, Iquawie	73	X
4		39	Freeman, Christian	74	X
5	Torrano, Biagio	40	Alvarez, Issei		
6		41	Rose, Michael		
7	Rozewicz, Rebecca	42	Dunn, Kellan		
8	Tiomico, Serafin	43	Serrano, Ah		Supervisor/s
9	Serrano, Ricardo	44	Phillips, Melvin	1	de Guzman, Albert
10	Kirby, Chris	45	Faverin, Nelson	2	Smithwick, Patrick
11	Whitley, Monica	46	Gacheru, Wallace	3	Atkins, Beverly
12	Conit, maria	47	Serrano, Alejandro	4	Cooper, Rochelle
13	Galicia, Robert	48	Sayeg, Amjad	5	Rodriguez, Ramiro ?
14	Usi, Marina	49	Tamboong, Dennis	6	Van Noland, Paul
15	Matanguihan, John	50	Moody, Stepa	7	Lowe, Ethel ?
16	Davis, Teresa	51	Gatlin, John	8	
17	Toji, Larry	52	Lowe, Ethel ?		Per Diem Officers
18	Atanacio, Jeffrey	53	Bastida, Sam	1	
19	Espadilla, Jeffrey	54	Chan, William	2	
20		55	Lacayo, Arnoldo	3	
21	Lopez, Mayra	56	Causo, Jorge	4	
22	Tutson, Deborah	57		5	
23	White, James	58	Lingad, Christian	6	
24	Daigle, Erik	59	Dadabhoi, M	7	
25	Johnson, Raina	60	Campbell, D	8	
26		61	Sitou, Ken	9	
27	Fung, Bruce	62	Finigan, Mark	10	
28		63		11	
29	Lacebal, Gualberto	64	Singh, Jasvir	12	
30	Boone, Zenell	65	X	13	
31	Terry, Roland	66	X	14	
32		67	X	15	
33	Wong, Danny	68	X		
34		69	X		
35	Caballero, Ruel	70	X		

X = Salary Savings v/s Public Safety
[redacted] = Officers that have not worked for the last 2 months to 2+ years. [No provisional officers have been hired in their place.]

Over 20 officers and 3 supervisors short staffed

From: [Mark Finigan](#)
To: [Jalipa Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Meeting ID: 2487 533 8802
Date: Thursday, June 16, 2022 10:03:19 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

I wish I could be there in person but I am at work. I would like to direct your attention to the woefully inadequate staffing levels we are experiencing at the de Young museum. And this moment I am on my ninth hour of a sixteen hour double shift. I work three double shifts per week.

Working long hours is bad for the museum. People make mistakes when they are fatigued, and I am no exception. As I am responsible for responding to emergencies, any mistakes I make may impact the lives of others and you can well imagine the liabilities that may result.

Please give some consideration to hiring people to bring our staffing levels up to adequate levels.

Thank you.

Mark Finigan.

From: [Marchon Tatmon](#)
To: [Jalipa Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [DPH-mdavidson](#)
Subject: HSA Budget for Food Security
Date: Thursday, June 16, 2022 11:20:51 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Budget and Appropriations Committee:

Thank you for your leadership and efforts to keep our neighbors safe and secure through the COVID pandemic. I'm proud of the way our City responded in the pandemic – particularly in the area of supporting community food programs.

While the immediacy of the COVID crisis has waned, food insecurity has not. In fact, pressures have increased. San Francisco-Marin Food Bank's Food Locator is seeing 4x the number of visits of people looking for food, in addition to the Food Bank seeing a 40% increase in CalFresh signups, 21% increase in Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) signups, and 45% increase in meals provided to seniors and adults with disabilities.

1 in 5 neighbors was at risk of hunger before the pandemic. The San Francisco-Marin Food Bank is currently distributing food to around 55,000 households every week, up from an average of 50,000 last year and 32,000 before the pandemic.

Demand for community food security programs is increasing as inflation surges. Soaring inflation is not only impacting demand for service, it is significantly increasing the cost to community organizations in delivering food security programs. This has an impact not only on demand for services, but the cost of providing that service. From February 2021-February 2022, grocery prices rose 12.1% overall, and an average of 50% increased cost for eggs and a 35% hike for flour.

Other funding from federal sources (FEMA, Federal COVID relief bills) have ended, leaving organizations with little choice but to wind down operations just as community need is spiking.

Our food system was already in an emergency pre-pandemic with one if four San Franciscans experiencing food insecurity, disproportionately impacting communities of color. COVID just magnified a deeply rooted problem, exacerbating inequities, making it unconscionable to continue to ignore the crisis in front of us.

Supporting continued food security programs will have a positive impact to an estimated 70,000 households (not unduplicated) served by community programs about to be cut. I urge you to provide full funding at current levels for community food programming for the next 2 years - \$12M in FY 23 and \$30M in FY24.

In community,

Marchon



Marchon Tatmon, MPA

Senior Government Affairs Manager

San Francisco-Marin Food Bank

O:415-282-1907, ext. 238

M:415-815-6441

www.sfmfoodbank.org

2550 Kerner Boulevard
San Rafael, CA 94901

900 Pennsylvania Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94107



From: [Nadia Rahman](#)
To: [Jalipa Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [DPH-mdavidson](#)
Subject: Support for Full Funding for Community Food Programs
Date: Thursday, June 16, 2022 11:27:20 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Budget and Appropriations Committee:

Thank you for your leadership and efforts to keep our neighbors safe and secure through the COVID pandemic. I'm proud of the way San Francisco responded in the pandemic – particularly in the area of trying to ensure that no one goes hungry through community food programs.

While the immediacy of the COVID crisis has waned, food insecurity is still a current and present danger. The stats clearly indicate that people are seeking help in terms of food assistance: **San Francisco-Marin Food Bank's Food Locator is seeing 4x the number of visits of people looking for food, in addition to the Food Bank seeing a 40% increase in CalFresh signups, 21% increase in Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) signups, and 45% increase in meals provided to seniors and adults with disabilities.**

Demand for community food security programs is increasing as inflation surges. Soaring inflation is not only impacting demand for service, it is significantly increasing the cost to community organizations in delivering food security programs. This has an impact not only on demand for services, but the cost of providing that service. From February 2021-February 2022, grocery prices rose 12.1% overall, and an average of 50% increased cost for eggs and a 35% hike for flour.

Other funding from federal sources (FEMA, Federal COVID relief bills) has ended, leaving community programs with little choice but to wind down operations just as community need is spiking.

Our food system was already in an emergency pre-pandemic with **1 in every 4 San Franciscans experiencing food insecurity**, disproportionately impacting communities of color. COVID just magnified a deeply rooted problem, exacerbating inequities, making it unconscionable to continue to ignore the crisis in front of us.

Supporting continued food security programs will have a positive impact on an estimated 70,000 households served by community programs about to be shuttered. We cannot let our neighbors go hungry - no one should go hungry in a city as wealthy as San Francisco. **My ask of you is to provide full funding at current levels for community food programming for the next 2 years - \$12M in FY 23 and \$30M in FY24.**

Sincerely,

Nadia Rahman 駱雯
She / Her
[@nadiarahmansf](#)

[Instagram](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Facebook](#) | [LinkedIn](#) | [Medium](#)

rahman-consulting.com

Are you registered to vote? Check your status and register to vote at Vote.org.

From: [Stephanie Lehman](#)
To: [John Fong AD19](#)
Subject: Funding for police budget
Date: Thursday, June 16, 2022 11:56:48 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

- Supervisors,

My name is Stephanie and I am calling in to urge you to approve the budget of Mayor Breed's critical plan to provide adequate funding to hire and keep law enforcement. As you know, the police department currently needs to add more than 500 officers to meet the recommended level of staffing. As a resident living here since 1996, I can tell you from experience that the streets have become less safe. In the last year, my car was stolen from in front of my home and my neighbor was held up at gun point in front of her home while walking her dog at 6am. We need more police and we need to support them. In fact, a poll by the chamber of commerce reveals that 80% of San Franciscans want an increase in the number of police in high crime areas, and 75% want an increase of police in busy areas. San Franciscans value their police officers and so should this Board.

Volume of police required for public safety is a separate and distinct issue from police reform and I sincerely hope that when considering this comprehensive plan, the two concepts will not be conflated by this Board. I cannot imagine asking any professional to take a job where they get no support, no funding and no respect. I am sure this Board would not think it correct to hire teachers, for example, without adequate pay, staffing or supplies and our police deserve the same level of respect and support as any other professionals, so they can do their best work. I expect The Board of Supervisors to focus on delivering the many public safety needs in Mayor Breed's plan. Incentives to recruit and retain officers are smart and worthwhile policies that will help us continue to build a diverse and well trained police department. Recruitment and retainment is important in any profession, but none more so than in a profession where we ask people to put their lives on the line every day. It is incumbent upon us to make sure that our officers have everything they need to return safely after their shifts to their homes and to their own families. Our police officers are completely vital to the community at large, and should have everything they need to be successful at their jobs.

If this Board wants its constituents to believe it cares even a little about keeping the City safe to residents, tourists and businesses you will vote to approve the Mayor's budget for this important plan to provide adequate funding to hire and retain law enforcement.

Sincerely,
Stephanie Lehman (Delegate AD19)

From: [Andy Ollove](#)
To: [Jalipa Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Public Comment to the SF Board of Supervisors Budget and Appropriations Committee
Date: Thursday, June 16, 2022 1:59:31 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

RE: San Francisco Providers Call for Funding to Sustain Citywide Food Security Effort

Dear Members of the Budget & Appropriations Committee,

Fresh Approach is writing this letter to strongly request that your Committee, the Office of Mayor London Breed, and the full Board of Supervisors prioritize the basic human needs of San Franciscans by continuing full funding to the community-based food providers funded through Human Services Agency Community Food Coordination Group.

We ask that the Board and Mayor's Office take action to fill the funding gap of \$12 million in food security funding in FY 22-23, as well as funding the gap in \$30 million in FY 23-24. To support this work, we also ask that the HSA Community Food Coordination group be retained.

As a recipient of this funding for this past year, we've supported more than 300 families and 800 individual San Franciscans with healthy food resources every week. In particular, the food we provide is sourced exclusively from regional BIPOC farms and supports the ongoing work of two farmers market associations within the city (Agricultural Institute of Marin and Pacific Coast Farmers' Market Association.) This project equally supports the nutrition security of low-income communities of color, but also the economic resiliency of our local farmers, therefore strengthening our entire food system.

This spending is the only food security funding specifically to support people of color in San Francisco. We estimate that these grants directly support at least 70,000 households that are otherwise underserved, ineligible, or too dispersed to utilize other overburdened food security access points. All of our coalition member organizations have reported either steady demand for services or an increase in demand.

Thank you

--

Andy Ollove | Food Access Program Director (he/him)

Fresh Approach: Making Healthy Food More Accessible in the Bay Area

[5060 Commercial Circle Ste. C, Concord, CA 94520](#)

C: [443-600-6497](tel:443-600-6497) | freshapproach.org | andyollove@freshapproach.org

From: [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Letter of Support
Date: Thursday, June 16, 2022 3:28:48 PM
Attachments: [Sheriff letter support BofSups case management 6 16 22.docx](#)

For file

Alisa Somera

Legislative Deputy Director
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
415.554.7711 direct | 415.554.5163 fax
alisa.somera@sfgov.org

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

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

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:** Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 16, 2022 1:55 PM  
**To:** BOS-Supervisors <bos-supervisors@sfgov.org>; BOS-Legislative Aides <bos-legislative\_aides@sfgov.org>  
**Cc:** Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>; Laxamana, Junko (BOS) <junko.laxamana@sfgov.org>; Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** FW: Letter of Support

**From:** Roma Guy <[romapguy@gmail.com](mailto:romapguy@gmail.com)>

**Date:** June 16, 2022 at 1:01:41 PM PDT

**To:** Hillary Ronen <[Hillary.Ronen@sfgov.org](mailto:Hillary.Ronen@sfgov.org)>

**Cc:** Gordon Mar <[gordonmar@yahoo.com](mailto:gordonmar@yahoo.com)>, Ahsha Safai <[ahsha.safai@sfgov.org](mailto:ahsha.safai@sfgov.org)>, Shamann Walton <[shamann.walton@sfgov.org](mailto:shamann.walton@sfgov.org)>, [ChanStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:ChanStaff@sfgov.org)

**Subject: Letter of Support**

Dear Supervisor Ronen, Chair of Budget & Appropriations and Budget & Finance Committee:

Please find attached a letter Supporting the Sheriff budget request for new case management system for incarcerated in SF.

Modernizing the Sheriff's case management system's need is a key public investment and has been strongly recommended for almost a decade. I have been in support since I was a Co-Chair of Work Group to Re-Envision the Jail Replacement Project (JRP), 2016.

Thank you for your consideration and bringing forth this critical function to improvements in transparency and accountability of Criminal Justice System.

Sincerely,

Roma Guy

[romapguy@gmail.com](mailto:romapguy@gmail.com)

415-652-2710

CC: members of both Budget & Appropriations and Budget & Finance Committees

**From:** [Meg Davidson](#)  
**To:** [Jalipa Brent \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment on Budget: San Francisco Providers Call for Funding to Sustain Citywide Food Security Efforts  
**Date:** Thursday, June 16, 2022 4:43:25 PM  
**Attachments:** [Public Comment - HSA Food Security Budget - SF Food Security Coalition.pdf](#)

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hello Brent,

Thank you for accepting Public Comment with regard to the proposed Budget. Below (and attached if preferred) is the Public Comment of the SF Food Security Providers Coalition. Please let me know if there is anything else you need from our group to ensure our Comment is recorded in the ledger.

Dear Members of the Budget & Appropriations Committee,

We are submitting this Public Comment to strongly request that your Committee, the Office of Mayor London Breed, and the full Board of Supervisors prioritize the basic human needs of San Franciscans by continuing full funding of the community-based food providers funded through Human Services Agency Community Food Coordination Group.

**We ask that the Board and Mayor's Office take action to fill the funding gap of \$12 million in food security funding in FY 22-23, as well as funding the gap of \$30 million in FY 23-24.**

To support this work, we also ask that the HSA Community Food Coordination group be retained. We are grateful for the partnership of HSA and the Mayor's Office in allowing the Agency to repurpose savings from their budget to continue these programs for an additional seven months, but this is not sufficient to meet the burgeoning need for food across the city. Combined with cuts in food security funding across other departments and decreases in Federal support, we are facing a funding cliff. With little warning and despite surging need, providers are being asked to wind down this life-sustaining work.

**This amount of funding, \$12 million in FY 22-23 and \$30 million in FY 23-24, is not "addbackable," so we respectfully request the full support of this Committee and the entire Board of Supervisors to work with the Mayor's Budget Office to creatively make this funding whole on behalf of our clients in every zip code in the city.**

This spending is the only food security funding specifically to support people of color in San Francisco. We estimate that these grants directly support at least 70,000 households that are otherwise underserved, ineligible, or too dispersed to utilize other overburdened food security access points. All of our coalition member organizations have reported either steady demand for services or an increase in demand.

Our food system is in peril – a worsening drought, food costs increasing by an average 7% and

an inflation rate at 8.3% are just small signs of what could be exacerbated if the predicted recession happens over the next year. The reality of hunger is much deeper than this fourth wave of the pandemic, and the lowest income families we collectively serve will be hit hardest. One in four San Franciscans were experiencing food insecurity *before* the pandemic. We have used the last two years to elevate more community-based food access solutions, building solidarity and efficiency to meet a need that is clearer now than ever.

In the absence of a centralized food security department, you wisely made the investment in the grantees of HSA's Community Food Coordination team. Community organizations involved include:

- Chinatown Community Development Center
- SF New Deal
- The San Francisco African American Faith Based Coalition
- CANA
- Farming Hope
- HOMEY
- La Raza Community Resource Center
- TNDC
- EatSF Grocery Voucher Program
- Bayanihan Equity Center
- Bayview Hunters Point Community Advocates
- Bayview Hunters Point Foundation
- United Council of Human Services
- Booker T. Washington Community Service Center
- Excelsior Works! (fiscally sponsored by Chinese Progressive Association)
- Curry Senior Center
- City Hope
- HealingWELL
- Tenderloin Community Benefit District
- Dolores Street Community Services
- Fresh Approach
- Glide Foundation
- San Francisco-Marin Food Bank
- Food as Medicine Collaborative
- Mission Meals Coalition

We have coalesced into a dedicated and expert group building toward more affordable, efficient, non-duplicative, and coordinated systems. This working group serves San Franciscans across the entire city, from Excelsior to Treasure Island. Through this particular funding, we supported food security that was not funded before but was deeply needed in the community, particularly in this more community-informed and neighborhood-based way.

We have piloted incredible work, and learned during the last two years how to promote more resilient and effective food security – now is not the time to scale back to a few overburdened food sites. Because of these critical funds, we have built relationships with community partners and the people we serve, creating safe and vibrant environments for folks facing food insecurity to be treated with dignity and care. Some of the infrastructure that existed pre-pandemic no longer exists or has had to reduce service, particularly smaller distributed sites at churches and community centers. Through these new programs, millions of dollars have been disbursed to over 100 small businesses and their workers, providing recurring revenue and an opportunity for neighborhood scale solutions. Cutting this funding will further the hardship on small businesses and their workers who continue to feel the tremendous impact of the pandemic.

Economic turbulence and skyrocketing costs contribute to continued heightened food insecurity, even as we try to move forward from the immediate crisis of Covid. According to research from the city's Food Security Task Force, since the beginning of the pandemic we have seen a 40% increase in CalFresh signups, 21% increase in WIC signups, and 45% increase in meals provided to seniors and adults with disabilities.

We ask for your help in championing this work of more coordinated and effective food security. We believe this is a humble ask – food prices in San Francisco have skyrocketed, with an average 50% increased cost for eggs and 35% hike for flour, just this year. Pandemic EBT for families with children is temporary. To make matters worse, the Federal CalFresh emergency allotments are scheduled to lapse as soon as the Federal Public Health Emergency ends in mid-July. This convergence spells a future perfect storm that we are not prepared to weather.

We need community-led solutions grounded in health equity, racial justice, environmental sustainability, and economic justice. The HSA Community Food Coordination grantees represent all of these issues through a food justice lens driven by the people we serve.

We are excited to continue building out your initial vision for a stronger, more equitable, livable, and resilient San Francisco. We hope to continue making you proud in supporting all San Franciscans. We strongly encourage you to continue to fund HSA's Community Food Coordination grantees at the current level.

Sincerely,  
Shakirah Simley, Executive Director

**Booker T. Washington Community Service Center**

Tanis Crosby, Executive Director  
**San Francisco-Marin Food Bank**

Jamie Stark, Executive Director

**Farming Hope**

Hai Chi Vu, Interim Director

**Excelsior Works!**

Jacob Bindman, Chief Program Officer

**SF New Deal**

J. Michelle Pierce, Executive Director

**Bayview Hunters Point Community Advocates**

Laura deTar, Executive Director

**Fresh Approach**

Gabriel Medina, Executive Director

**La Raza Community Resource Center**

Wes Saver, Policy Manager

**Glide Foundation**

Lundi Lennon, Program Manager

**City Hope San Francisco**

Roberto Eligio Alfaro, Executive Director

**Homies Organizing the Mission to Empower Youth (HOMEY)**

Greg Moore, Director

**Tenderloin Community Benefit District Safe Passage**

Andy Naja-Riese, Chief Executive Officer

**Agricultural Institute of Marin**

Allen Moy, Executive Director

**Pacific Coast Farmers' Market Association**

**Meg Davidson**

Director, Policy & Advocacy

Pronouns: she/her/hers

San Francisco-Marin Food Bank

o: 415-282-1907, ext. 225 | m: 802-233-2472

# TAKE PART IN CHANGE

It takes a community.  
Donate. Volunteer.





**SAN FRANCISCO - June 16, 2022**

**Public Comment to the SF Board of Supervisors Budget and Appropriations Committee**

**RE: San Francisco Providers Call for Funding to Sustain Citywide Food Security Efforts**

Directed to:

The Honorable Hillary Ronen, Supervisor & Chair of the Budget and Appropriations Committee

The Honorable Shamann Walton, President of the Board of Supervisors

The Honorable Connie Chan, Supervisor

The Honorable Gordon Mar, Supervisor

The Honorable Ahsha Safai, Supervisor

Dear Members of the Budget & Appropriations Committee,

We are submitting this Public Comment to strongly request that your Committee, the Office of Mayor London Breed, and the full Board of Supervisors prioritize the basic human needs of San Franciscans by continuing full funding to the community-based food providers funded through Human Services Agency Community Food Coordination Group.

We ask that the Board and Mayor's Office take action to fill the funding gap of \$12 million in food security funding in FY 22-23, as well as funding the gap of \$30 million in FY 23-24. To support this work, we also ask that the HSA Community Food Coordination group be retained. We are grateful for the partnership of HSA and the Mayor's Office in allowing the Agency to repurpose savings from their budget to continue these programs for an additional seven months, but this is not sufficient to meet the burgeoning need for food across the city. Combined with cuts in food security funding across other departments and decreases in Federal support, we are facing a funding cliff. With little warning and despite surging need, providers are being asked to wind down this life-sustaining work.

**This amount of funding, \$12 million in FY 22-23 and \$30 million in FY 23-24, is not "addbackable," so we respectfully request the full support of this Committee and the entire Board of Supervisors to work with the Mayor's Budget Office to creatively make this funding whole on behalf of our clients in every zip code in the city.**

This spending is the only food security funding specifically to support people of color in San Francisco. We estimate that these grants directly support at least 70,000 households that are otherwise underserved, ineligible, or too dispersed to utilize other overburdened food security access points. All of our coalition member organizations have reported either steady demand for services or an increase in demand.

Our food system is in peril – a worsening drought, food costs increasing by an average 7% and an inflation rate at 8.3% are just small signs of what could be exacerbated if the predicted recession happens over the next year. The reality of hunger is much deeper than this fourth wave of the pandemic, and the lowest income families we collectively serve will be hit hardest. One in four San Franciscans were experiencing food insecurity *before* the pandemic. We have used the last two years to elevate more community-based food access solutions, building solidarity and efficiency to meet a need that is clearer now than ever.

In the absence of a centralized food security department, you wisely made the investment in the grantees of HSA's Community Food Coordination team. Community organizations involved include:

- Chinatown Community Development Center
- SF New Deal
- The San Francisco African American Faith Based Coalition
- CANA
- Farming Hope
- HOMEY
- La Raza Community Resource Center
- TNDC
- EatSF Grocery Voucher Program
- Bayanihan Equity Center
- Bayview Hunters Point Community Advocates
- Bayview Hunters Point Foundation
- United Council of Human Services
- Booker T. Washington Community Service Center
- Excelsior Works! (fiscally sponsored by Chinese Progressive Association)
- Curry Senior Center
- City Hope
- HealingWELL
- Tenderloin Community Benefit District
- Dolores Street Community Services
- Fresh Approach
- Glide Foundation
- San Francisco-Marin Food Bank
- Food as Medicine Collaborative
- Mission Meals Coalition

We have coalesced into a dedicated and expert group building toward more affordable, efficient, non-duplicative, and coordinated systems. This working group serves San Franciscans across the entire

city, from Excelsior to Treasure Island. Through this particular funding, we supported food security that was not funded before but was deeply needed in the community, particularly in this more community-informed and neighborhood-based way.

We have piloted incredible work, and learned during the last two years how to promote more resilient and effective food security – now is not the time to scale back to a few overburdened food sites. Because of these critical funds, we have built relationships with community partners and the people we serve, creating safe and vibrant environments for folks facing food insecurity to be treated with dignity and care. Some of the infrastructure that existed pre-pandemic no longer exists or has had to reduce service, particularly smaller distributed sites at churches and community centers. Through these new programs, millions of dollars have been disbursed to over 100 small businesses and their workers, providing recurring revenue and an opportunity for neighborhood scale solutions. Cutting this funding will further the hardship on small businesses and their workers who continue to feel the tremendous impact of the pandemic.

Economic turbulence and skyrocketing costs contribute to continued heightened food insecurity, even as we try to move forward from the immediate crisis of Covid. According to research from the city's Food Security Task Force, since the beginning of the pandemic we have seen a 40% increase in CalFresh signups, 21% increase in WIC signups, and 45% increase in meals provided to seniors and adults with disabilities.

We ask for your help in championing this work of more coordinated and effective food security. We believe this is a humble ask – food prices in San Francisco have skyrocketed, with an average 50% increased cost for eggs and 35% hike for flour, just this year. Pandemic EBT for families with children is temporary. To make matters worse, the Federal CalFresh emergency allotments are scheduled to lapse as soon as the Federal Public Health Emergency ends in mid-July. This convergence spells a future perfect storm that we are not prepared to weather.

We need community-led solutions grounded in health equity, racial justice, environmental sustainability, and economic justice. The HSA Community Food Coordination grantees represent all of these issues through a food justice lens driven by the people we serve.

We are excited to continue building out your initial vision for a stronger, more equitable, livable, and resilient San Francisco. We hope to continue making you proud in supporting all San Franciscans. We strongly encourage you to continue to fund HSA's Community Food Coordination grantees at the current level.

Sincerely,

Shakirah Simley, Executive Director  
**Booker T. Washington Community Service Center**

Tanis Crosby, Executive Director  
**San Francisco-Marin Food Bank**

Jamie Stark, Executive Director  
**Farming Hope**

Hai Chi Vu, Interim Director  
**Excelsior Works!**

Jacob Bindman, Chief Program Officer  
**SF New Deal**

J. Michelle Pierce, Executive Director  
**Bayview Hunters Point Community Advocates**

Laura deTar, Executive Director  
**Fresh Approach**

Gabriel Medina, Executive Director  
**La Raza Community Resource Center**

Wes Saver, Policy Manager  
**Glide Foundation**

Lundi Lennon, Program Manager  
**City Hope San Francisco**

Roberto Eligio Alfaro, Executive Director  
**Homies Organizing the Mission to Empower Youth (HOMEY)**

Greg Moore, Director  
**Tenderloin Community Benefit District Safe Passage**

Andy Naja-Riese, Chief Executive Officer  
**Agricultural Institute of Marin**

Allen Moy, Executive Director  
**Pacific Coast Farmers' Market Association**

**From:** [Simon Bertrang](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Nils Behnke](#); [Emma Jarvis](#); [Katie Conry](#); [DPH-naomi-laco](#); [Adama Bryant](#); [Pratibha Tekkey](#); [Michael Vuong](#); [Katherine Au](#); [Gloria](#)  
**Subject:** Please approve \$4M for the Tenderloin Community  
**Date:** Thursday, June 16, 2022 6:06:01 PM  
**Attachments:** [TLCBD letter to preserve \\$4M for the TL.pdf](#)

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors, the Budget Committee and Supervisor Preston:

In March and April of 2022, the TLCBD worked with several other community partners (St. Anthony's, La Cocina, Tenderloin Museum, Weekend Adventures, Kroc Center, La Voz Latina, and Boys & Girls Club) to present a Tenderloin Community Budget to the Mayor's Office. This was a community-led effort that reflects many of our priorities and hopes for the future of the Tenderloin.

We shared our community budget priorities with the Planning Department as soon as we heard they would be leading sustained operations in the neighborhood. We recently learned that the Mayor's office has allocated about \$4 million to the Planning Department for safe passage, community activations, cultural parties, open space, and other events in the Tenderloin and we are confident in and excited about partnership with them.

We are asking that money NOT be put in a reserve as recommended by the Budget and Legislative Analyst. It is imperative to our community and to sustained operations in the Tenderloin that these funds are easily accessible.

If you have any questions about the priorities or would like more information about who we worked with to develop them, please don't hesitate to call.

Yours,  
Simon Bertrang  
Executive Director  
917-548-3682

--

Tenderloin Community Benefit District  
512 Ellis Street  
San Francisco, CA 94109  
[simon@tlcbd.org](mailto:simon@tlcbd.org)  
[www.tlcbd.org](http://www.tlcbd.org) | (o) 415-292-4812 x101 | (c) 917-548-3682  
... a Vibrant Community for ALL.

[Subscribe to Tenderloin Talk](#), a twice monthly e-newsletter of TLCBD's work and other neighborhood happenings.

16 June 2022

Dear Board of Supervisors, the Budget Committee and Supervisor Preston:

In March and April of 2022, the TLCBD worked with several other community partners (St. Anthony's, La Cocina, Tenderloin Museum, Weekend Adventures, Kroc Center, La Voz Latina, and Boys & Girls Club) to present a Tenderloin Community Budget to the Mayor's Office. This was a community-led effort that reflects many of our priorities and hopes for the future of the Tenderloin.

We shared our community budget priorities with the Planning Department as soon as we heard they would be leading sustained operations in the neighborhood. We recently learned that the Mayor's office has allocated about \$4 million to the Planning Department for safe passage, community activations, cultural parties, open space, and other events in the Tenderloin and we are confident in and excited about partnership with them.

**We are asking that money NOT be put in a reserve as recommended by the Budget and Legislative Analyst. It is imperative to our community and to sustained operations in the Tenderloin that these funds are easily accessible.**

If you have any questions about the priorities or would like more information about who we worked with to develop them, please don't hesitate to call.

Yours,



Simon Bertrang  
Executive Director  
917-548-3682

cc: St Anthony's  
La Cocina  
Tenderloin Museum  
Weekend Adventures  
Kroc Center  
La Voz Latina  
Boys & Girls Club, Tenderloin Clubhouse

**From:** [Ken Sitou](#)  
**To:** [DEM-MCayabyab](#); [McConkey, Susan \(FAM\)](#); [DEM - T Shannon](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Albert DeGuzman](#); [DEM - H Gray](#); [Patrick Smithwick](#); [Paul Van Noland](#); [Raina J.](#)  
**Subject:** Hold Over Problem In Fine Art Security Department  
**Date:** Thursday, June 16, 2022 6:54:13 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Managers,

I, Ken Sitou, Fine Art Department, Security Guard, am filing a complaint on June 16, 2022, in regarding to holding me, Dayshift Officer, over to work Swing shift with only 30 minutes notice before my Day shift ends. At 1700, Supervisor Smithwick notifies me that I need to be hold over to work Swing Shift because the supervisors couldn't find anyone to work. The problem is I only have 30 minutes notice from the supervisor that I am force to stay and work. I have a family and 3 years old child that I need to take care of. This department cannot function properly when Supervisors and the management only gave me 30 minutes notice of force hold over.

In addition, 30 minutes notice is not enough for me to plan accordingly for my family. I was stressful to find alternative of who and how to pick up my son from the day care. If the management has better planning of staffing such as "Hires More Officers" I wouldn't be having this unnecessary stress.

Moreover, this security department does not have enough staffs to work. Instead of holding the officers to work on another shifts which he or she did not sign up for it, the department has empty positions that should be hire for additional Permanent Officers to fill in. The reasons the Supervisors couldn't find people to work is because 1/3 of our Security Officers are on leave. The department hires per diem but they are not permanent officers to safe guard the city building and city arts. In addition, Fine Arts needs permanent officers to safe guard the museum. Therefore, if the security department is well staff then there should not be a 30 minutes notice of force hold over and causes me to have unnecessary stress to take care of my own personal obligations and commitments.

Thank you for reading the concerns and complaint. Director Tabari Shannon, please response this email with inputs of how to make this department better especially on low staffing issues. I can't wait to hear your response.

Sincerely,

Ken Sitou  
8202 Security Guard  
Fine Art Museum



**From:** [Dennis Tamboong](#)  
**To:** [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Meeting ID: 2487 533 8802 # #  
**Date:** Wednesday, June 15, 2022 9:26:30 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

I am writing to inform you about the continuing short-staffing issues at the Security Department of the Fine Arts Museum of San Francisco.

In April 17, 2022 we have a total of 21 Security Officers out of the much needed 32 at the de Young Museum. The staffing we only have that day are as follows, on the second floor galleries both McEvoy Wing, Africa, and Oceania galleries which totals to 12 galleries, only 2 per diem Museum Guards were posted. If one of them goes to break that leaves with only 1 available officer on the floor to patrol 12 galleries. Imagine one of many scenarios that if there is a person who has a medical emergency and that one Officer could not respond right away and time is of the essence? Imagine there was a fire or earthquake, who will evacuate those second floor galleries with multiple fire doors and emergency exits. Who will make sure no one is left behind or no one will go back and be in danger. That is only on the second floor galleries.

The First floor galleries have some similar staffing of only 2 Officers for 12 galleries(5 in Wattis galleries and 7 in Osher galleries). The remaining positions are in Special galleries and our control center which is also short staffed.

This is one of many days that we are short staffed which is almost everyday.

With short staffing we clearly cannot protect properly the public and the city properties.

Protection of City owned Permanent Collections worth millions of dollars is paramount but more importantly is the Public Safety of our people.

We are in dire need our staffing levels.

Sincerely,  
Dennis Tamboong  
8202 Public Safety Officer FAMSF

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)

**From:** [Rebecca Rozewicz](#)  
**To:** [Jalipa Brent \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Meeting ID : 2487 533 8802 ##  
**Date:** Wednesday, June 15, 2022 9:15:48 PM  
**Attachments:** [IMG\\_8309.PNG](#)

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors,

I have been sending emails, like the one below, to the management of the Fine Arts Museums (Dept. #61) in order to bring attention to our short-staffing crisis. The answer I receive is always, "The City won't let us hire". How can this be true? I will not accept that the City does not wish to sufficiently protect museum staff, visitors, artworks, etc.... Please conduct an audit of budgeted #8226, #8202 and #8228 positions in Dept. 61 in order to understand why attention to this critical security shortage is being ignored.

Thank you for listening to my concerns. I wish I could speak at this meeting in person but I must attend to my civil service obligations at the deYoung museum. The Obama Portraits Tour will open to the public this weekend and we are expecting thousands of visitors. Hopefully, you will come see them sometime in the next two months. You are more than welcome to visit and Happy Juneteenth!

Truly,  
Rebecca Rozewicz  
#8226 Museum Guard  
SEIU

**Subject: Fwd: Short-Staffing on Free Saturday 4/9/2022**

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** Rebecca Rozewicz <[rrozewicz@famsf.org](mailto:rrozewicz@famsf.org)>  
**Date:** Sat, Apr 9, 2022 at 2:12 PM  
**Subject:** Short-Staffing on Free Saturday 4/9/2022  
**To:** Tabari Shannon <[tshannon@famsf.org](mailto:tshannon@famsf.org)>  
**CC:** Melissa Cayabyab <[mcayabyab@famsf.org](mailto:mcayabyab@famsf.org)>, Raina J. <[ms.rjohnson@yahoo.com](mailto:ms.rjohnson@yahoo.com)>, Susan McConkey <[smcconkey@famsf.org](mailto:smcconkey@famsf.org)>, Thomas Campbell <[tcampbell@famsf.org](mailto:tcampbell@famsf.org)>

Good afternoon Tabari,

Today is Free Saturday and we are severely short-staffed at the deYoung. For instance, while officers are on their unpaid lunch hour, there is only one officer to watch 10 galleries in the McEvoy wing. I am posted in Africa, Oceania and New Guinea today. When I take my unpaid lunch, there is no officer coverage for that hour.

Visitor services is also short-staffed today. The public must pay to see the Patrick Kelly exhibit if they enter through the front of the gallery or they can simply help themselves without tickets through the back gallery because there is no security or VEX personnel posted.

Our Free Saturday attendance is usually 2,000 visitors throughout the day. The deYoung was initially budgeted for 30 officers daily and now tries to run on less than 20. ( Not counting Herbst Galleries ).

How does Security begin to safeguard the public, staff, art and building with only one third of it's workforce? Where are the updated evacuation procedures scaled down to the present staffing? With more visitors with disabilities attending the museum, where are the additional officers who can assist them?

We are continuing to ask these health & safety questions but have not received answers. That is the reason for my email today. We anticipate higher visitorship with Guo Pei opening next week at the Legion, not to mention Bouquets To Art and the Obama Portraits coming around the corner at the deYoung. We do not wish to be left in the dark. We wish to be prepared.

We are working on site daily and feel the responsibility for the safety of everyone who enters the museums. We believe that there are approximately 29 individuals who passed the #8202 exam and have anticipated welcoming new hires to the department, yet we are shorter staffed now than pre-pandemic days.

Through our SEIU 1021 Union, we believe in "STAFFING-UP" at Dept. #61 : Fine Arts Museums Of San Francisco. Please give us the necessary, budgeted permanent security personnel to maintain our Health & Safety commitment to the City, our Staff and to the Public.

Thank you for listening to our concerns.

Truly,  
Rebecca

Sent from my iPhone

We, the undersigned Public Safety Museum Officers, attest that it is imperative that Dept. #61 be fully staffed and trained to meet the needs of our world class institutions: the deYoung Museum and the Palace of the Legion of Honor.

We are privileged with the honor to and the responsibility for safeguarding the staff, public, art works and buildings on a 24/7 basis. Since the opening of the new deYoung museum in Golden Gate Park in 2005, visitorship has increased dramatically through social outreach programs and mayoral proclaimed "free access days" while the security force has been dramatically reduced. The pandemic was responsible for weakening our safety standards even more. We need to grow our Security Dept., not shrink it.

Our mission is to increase the City Security presence in the Museums now and to meet the demands of the future. We can only achieve our goals with consistent, mandatory safe-staffing levels and continuous training in our Museums.

Thank you.

|                            |           |
|----------------------------|-----------|
| 1. Winston White, #8226    | 4/27/22   |
| 2. DENNIS TAMBOONG, #8202  | 04/27/22  |
| 3. BRUCE FUNG, #8226       | 4/27/22   |
| 4. Samuel Bastida, #8202   | 4/27/22   |
| 5. Rebecca Rzewicz, #8226  | 4/27/2022 |
| 6. Ben Denson, #8202       | 4/27/22   |
| 7. Chris Kibbe, #8226      | 4/19/22   |
| 8. PLUG CORNUCCI, #8226    | 4/27/22   |
| 9. Iqbal Manna, #8226      | 4/27/22   |
| 10. Ken Sitou, #8201       | 4/27/22   |
| 11. Arnoldo Lacayo, #8202  | 4/27/22   |
| 12. Teresa I. Davis, #8202 | 4/27/22   |



|                          |      |           |
|--------------------------|------|-----------|
| 13. JEFFREY ESPADINA     | 8226 | 4/27/22   |
| 14. DEFECK CAMPBELL      | 8202 | 4/27/22   |
| 15. JASON DAVIS          | 8202 | 4/27/22   |
| 16. JAMES MAREY          | 8202 | 4/27/22   |
| 17. LEE SUTHERLAND       | 8228 | 4/27/22   |
| 18. NELSON FAVENIR       | 8226 | 04/28/22  |
| 19. STEPA MACK           | 8202 | 04/28/22  |
| 20. BEVERLY ATKINS       | 8228 | 4/28/22   |
| 21. LORENZASUNO          | 8202 | 4/28/22   |
| 22. RICHARD DUNJADA      | 8202 | 4/28/22   |
| 23. MARK FINIGAN         | 8202 | 4/28/2022 |
| 24. MARYA LOPEZ          | 8202 | 4/28/2022 |
| 25. JASUR SINGH          | 8202 | 04/28/22  |
| 26. MICHAEL ROSE         | 8226 | 4/29/22   |
| 27. MARINA VSI           | 8226 | 4/30/2022 |
| 28. CHARLETTA GIBT       | 8202 | 4/30/22   |
| 29. DAVID WELCH          | 8202 | 4/30/22   |
| 30. PAUL VANDER          | 8226 | 04/30/22  |
| 31. EDWARD SMOLOVITZ     | 8226 | 04/30/22  |
| 32. AHMED SERRANO        | 8226 | 4/30/22   |
| 33. OSMAN KHAN           | 8202 | 5/1/22    |
| 34. M. CENIT             | 8226 | 5/2/2022  |
| 35. G. TAYY              | 8202 | 05/02/22  |
| 36. JAMES WELCH          | 8202 | 05/02/22  |
| 37. ERICK DAIGLE         | 8226 | 05/3/22   |
| 38. MUHAMMAD DADARHAI    | 8202 | 05-08-22  |
| 39. PETER GEE            | 8202 | 05-08-22  |
| 40. PHILIPAS HAILEMICHAL | 8202 | 05-08-22  |
| 41. TESSIE J. ALVAREZ    | 8226 | 05/08/22  |
| 42. AUGUST DE GUZMAN     | 8226 | 05/17/22  |
| 43. ROSITA IRENEO        | 8202 | 05/18/22  |
| 44. CAIGURI WOOD         | 8202 | 5/18/22   |
| 45. SHAADAN AHMED        | 8202 | 5/18/22   |
| 46. JACHELLE LOPEZ       | 8202 | 5/19/22   |

This message is from within the City email system. Do not open files or attachments from unknown sources.

Dear Representative,

I would like to personally thank the following public safety officers for their dedication and commitment to the City of Houston. Please help to provide public safety to our City tomorrow. Thank you.

Very,  
[redacted]  
City of Houston  
2022-11-01

We, the undersigned Public Safety Museum Officers, attend must it is  
to the City of Houston, and for fully officers and trained to meet the needs of our  
world class institutions, the remaining Museum and the Palace of the Legation of  
Honor.

We are privileged with the honor to and the responsibility for safeguarding the  
city's public art works and buildings on a 24/7 basis. Since the opening of the  
new museum, we have been working hard to ensure that the public can access  
access daily, while the security force has been dramatically reduced. The  
pandemic was responsible for weakening our safety standards even more. We  
need to grow our Security Dept., not shrink it.

Our mission is to increase the City Security  
presence in the Museums now and to meet the demands of the future. We can  
only achieve our goals with consistent, mandatory safety training levels and  
continuous training in our Museums.

Thank you.

|                  |      |      |         |
|------------------|------|------|---------|
| 1. Blacker, Mike | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 2. [redacted]    | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 3. [redacted]    | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 4. [redacted]    | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 5. [redacted]    | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 6. [redacted]    | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 7. [redacted]    | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 8. [redacted]    | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 9. [redacted]    | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 10. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 11. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 12. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 13. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 14. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 15. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 16. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 17. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 18. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 19. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 20. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 21. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 22. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 23. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 24. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 25. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 26. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 27. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 28. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 29. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 30. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 31. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 32. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 33. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 34. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 35. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 36. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 37. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 38. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 39. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 40. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 41. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 42. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 43. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 44. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 45. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 46. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 47. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 48. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 49. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 50. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 51. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 52. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 53. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 54. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 55. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 56. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 57. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 58. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 59. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 60. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 61. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 62. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 63. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 64. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 65. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 66. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 67. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 68. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 69. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 70. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 71. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 72. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 73. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 74. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 75. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 76. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 77. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 78. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 79. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 80. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 81. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 82. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 83. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 84. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 85. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 86. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 87. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 88. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 89. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 90. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 91. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 92. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 93. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 94. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 95. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 96. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 97. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 98. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 99. [redacted]   | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |
| 100. [redacted]  | 8000 | 8000 | 4/27/22 |

**From:** [Carl Harris](#)  
**To:** [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Urging you to fund social housing, which Mayor Breed ignored  
**Date:** Sunday, June 12, 2022 8:53:32 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Brent Jalipa,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I live in district 5. I moved to San Francisco 5 years ago. My husband and I are just about able to scrape by to pay for one of the cheapest condos in the city. While I've lived here I've seen friends struggle with housing. People I care about have left the city and their community to move to places where it's cheaper to live. I want to live in a city where all kinds of people can afford to make a life: artists, teachers, health workers, drag queens. We urgently need to increase the supply of housing at all income levels to ease the housing crisis in San Francisco.

I am writing to urge you to fund the social housing recommendations that Mayor Breed refused to include in her proposed budget, through both the add-back process and other financing tools at your disposal.

As you know, voters resoundingly approved November 2020's Prop K to authorize 10,000 units of Public Housing for All, and passed Prop I to raise around \$140 million this upcoming year for social housing. Taken together, Props I and K represent a clear expression from the voters to fund and create social housing: affordable housing for everyone that is focused on working people.

However, the Mayor refused to fund most of the recommendations produced by the Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board (HSFOB). Her proposal also cuts MOHCD's budget by \$52 million, while increasing spending on the Police and Sheriff by \$51 million and \$30 million respectively. This is despite us living through an affordable housing crisis that will require BILLIONS of dollars a year in funding for SF to hit its RHNA goals.

I urge you to deliver on the will of the voters, by funding through add-backs and all other means at your disposal the ignored recommendations, which include:

1. \$300,000 to study a new agency to create Public Housing for All. This is add-back request E085 in the Budget Justice Coalition's list.
2. City staffing, feasibility analyses, and NOFAs to study and support innovative social housing models
3. The acquisition of land to build social housing
4. Construction of new social housing
5. Expansion of the Small Sites Program



This would be the second budget cycle in a row where the Mayor has refused to seriously fund social housing. MOHCD has failed to partner meaningfully with the HSFOB on supporting the community's vision for social housing. And it's not for a lack of trying; the HSFOB spent months developing spending recommendations, with community input from grassroots organizations, labor unions, and non-profit housing developers.

I urge you to ensure all unfunded social housing recommendations are incorporated into the FY 2022-23 budget. The voters have spoken, and it's time to deliver on the mandate promised by Props I and K two years ago.

Thank you,

Carl Harris  
carlharr@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94115

**From:** [Stephanie Ellis](#)  
**To:** [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Urging you to fund social housing, which Mayor Breed ignored  
**Date:** Sunday, June 12, 2022 6:08:38 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Brent Jalipa,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

My name is Stephanie Ellis. I live in District 8. I bought my condo in 2004. I became an owner for the first time. Most of my life, as a single parent and professor, I rented. I had help from my family to make the downpayment. I was lucky to have the support. When I moved in, my mortgage was higher than comparable apartment rent. Now my mortgage is 1/4 of what a comparable SF apartment would be. I believe that a city will be more vibrant and diverse if there is housing that is not subject to speculative real estate.

I am writing to urge you to fund the social housing recommendations that Mayor Breed refused to include in her proposed budget, through both the add-back process and other financing tools at your disposal.

As you know, voters resoundingly approved November 2020's Prop K to authorize 10,000 units of Public Housing for All, and passed Prop I to raise around \$140 million this upcoming year for social housing. Taken together, Props I and K represent a clear expression from the voters to fund and create social housing: affordable housing for everyone that is focused on working people.

However, the Mayor refused to fund most of the recommendations produced by the Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board (HSFOB). Her proposal also cuts MOHCD's budget by \$52 million, while increasing spending on the Police and Sheriff by \$51 million and \$30 million respectively. This is despite us living through an affordable housing crisis that will require BILLIONS of dollars a year in funding for SF to hit its RHNA goals.

I urge you to deliver on the will of the voters, by funding through add-backs and all other means at your disposal the ignored recommendations, which include:

1. \$300,000 to study a new agency to create Public Housing for All. This is add-back request E085 in the Budget Justice Coalition's list.
2. City staffing, feasibility analyses, and NOFAs to study and support innovative social housing models
3. The acquisition of land to build social housing
4. Construction of new social housing
5. Expansion of the Small Sites Program

This would be the second budget cycle in a row where the Mayor has refused to seriously fund social housing. MOHCD has failed to partner meaningfully with the HSFOB on supporting the community's vision for social housing. And it's not for a lack of trying; the HSFOB spent months developing spending recommendations, with community input from grassroots organizations, labor unions, and non-profit housing developers.

I urge you to ensure all unfunded social housing recommendations are incorporated into the FY 2022-23 budget. The voters have spoken, and it's time to deliver on the mandate promised by Props I and K two years ago.

Thank you,

Stephanie Ellis  
stephanie\_ellis@me.com  
870 Church St # 1  
San Francisco, California 94114

**From:** [Nora Engel-Hall](#)  
**To:** [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Urging you to fund social housing, which Mayor Breed ignored  
**Date:** Sunday, June 12, 2022 2:53:50 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Brent Jalipa,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to fund the social housing recommendations that Mayor Breed refused to include in her proposed budget, through both the add-back process and other financing tools at your disposal.

As you know, voters resoundingly approved November 2020's Prop K to authorize 10,000 units of Public Housing for All, and passed Prop I to raise around \$140 million this upcoming year for social housing. Taken together, Props I and K represent a clear expression from the voters to fund and create social housing: affordable housing for everyone that is focused on working people.

However, the Mayor refused to fund most of the recommendations produced by the Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board (HSFOB). Her proposal also cuts MOHCD's budget by \$52 million, while increasing spending on the Police and Sheriff by \$51 million and \$30 million respectively. This is despite us living through an affordable housing crisis that will require BILLIONS of dollars a year in funding for SF to hit its RHNA goals.

I urge you to deliver on the will of the voters, by funding through add-backs and all other means at your disposal the ignored recommendations, which include:

1. \$300,000 to study a new agency to create Public Housing for All. This is add-back request E085 in the Budget Justice Coalition's list.
2. City staffing, feasibility analyses, and NOFAs to study and support innovative social housing models
3. The acquisition of land to build social housing
4. Construction of new social housing
5. Expansion of the Small Sites Program

This would be the second budget cycle in a row where the Mayor has refused to seriously fund social housing. MOHCD has failed to partner meaningfully with the HSFOB on supporting the community's vision for social housing. And it's not for a lack of trying; the HSFOB spent months developing spending recommendations, with community input from grassroots organizations, labor unions, and non-profit housing developers.

I urge you to ensure all unfunded social housing recommendations are incorporated into the

FY 2022-23 budget. The voters have spoken, and it's time to deliver on the mandate promised by Props I and K two years ago.

Thank you,

Nora Engel-Hall  
n.engelhall@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94107-3425

**From:** [Todd Snyder](#)  
**To:** [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Urging you to fund social housing, which Mayor Breed ignored  
**Date:** Sunday, June 12, 2022 9:58:14 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Brent Jalipa,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to fund the social housing recommendations that Mayor Breed refused to include in her proposed budget, through both the add-back process and other financing tools at your disposal.

As you know, voters resoundingly approved November 2020's Prop K to authorize 10,000 units of Public Housing for All, and passed Prop I to raise around \$140 million this upcoming year for social housing. Taken together, Props I and K represent a clear expression from the voters to fund and create social housing: affordable housing for everyone that is focused on working people.

However, the Mayor refused to fund most of the recommendations produced by the Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board (HSFOB). Her proposal also cuts MOHCD's budget by \$52 million, while increasing spending on the Police and Sheriff by \$51 million and \$30 million respectively. This is despite us living through an affordable housing crisis that will require BILLIONS of dollars a year in funding for SF to hit its RHNA goals.

I urge you to deliver on the will of the voters, by funding through add-backs and all other means at your disposal the ignored recommendations, which include:

1. \$300,000 to study a new agency to create Public Housing for All. This is add-back request E085 in the Budget Justice Coalition's list.
2. City staffing, feasibility analyses, and NOFAs to study and support innovative social housing models
3. The acquisition of land to build social housing
4. Construction of new social housing
5. Expansion of the Small Sites Program

This would be the second budget cycle in a row where the Mayor has refused to seriously fund social housing. MOHCD has failed to partner meaningfully with the HSFOB on supporting the community's vision for social housing. And it's not for a lack of trying; the HSFOB spent months developing spending recommendations, with community input from grassroots organizations, labor unions, and non-profit housing developers.

I urge you to ensure all unfunded social housing recommendations are incorporated into the

FY 2022-23 budget. The voters have spoken, and it's time to deliver on the mandate promised by Props I and K two years ago.

Thank you,

Todd Snyder  
toddclarksnyder@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94115

**From:** [Laila Solaris](#)  
**To:** [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Urging you to fund social housing, which Mayor Breed ignored  
**Date:** Sunday, June 12, 2022 9:29:29 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Brent Jalipa,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to fund the social housing recommendations that Mayor Breed refused to include in her proposed budget, through both the add-back process and other financing tools at your disposal.

As you know, voters resoundingly approved November 2020's Prop K to authorize 10,000 units of Public Housing for All, and passed Prop I to raise around \$140 million this upcoming year for social housing. Taken together, Props I and K represent a clear expression from the voters to fund and create social housing: affordable housing for everyone that is focused on working people.

However, the Mayor refused to fund most of the recommendations produced by the Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board (HSFOB). Her proposal also cuts MOHCD's budget by \$52 million, while increasing spending on the Police and Sheriff by \$51 million and \$30 million respectively. This is despite us living through an affordable housing crisis that will require BILLIONS of dollars a year in funding for SF to hit its RHNA goals.

I urge you to deliver on the will of the voters, by funding through add-backs and all other means at your disposal the ignored recommendations, which include:

1. \$300,000 to study a new agency to create Public Housing for All. This is add-back request E085 in the Budget Justice Coalition's list.
2. City staffing, feasibility analyses, and NOFAs to study and support innovative social housing models
3. The acquisition of land to build social housing
4. Construction of new social housing
5. Expansion of the Small Sites Program

This would be the second budget cycle in a row where the Mayor has refused to seriously fund social housing. MOHCD has failed to partner meaningfully with the HSFOB on supporting the community's vision for social housing. And it's not for a lack of trying; the HSFOB spent months developing spending recommendations, with community input from grassroots organizations, labor unions, and non-profit housing developers.

I urge you to ensure all unfunded social housing recommendations are incorporated into the



FY 2022-23 budget. The voters have spoken, and it's time to deliver on the mandate promised by Props I and K two years ago.

Thank you,

Laila Solaris

[lailasolaris@gmail.com](mailto:lailasolaris@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94121

**From:** [Gary Gregerson](#)  
**To:** [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Urging you to fund social housing, which Mayor Breed ignored  
**Date:** Saturday, June 11, 2022 12:14:15 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Brent Jalipa,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to fund the social housing recommendations that Mayor Breed refused to include in her proposed budget, through both the add-back process and other financing tools at your disposal.

As you know, voters resoundingly approved November 2020's Prop K to authorize 10,000 units of Public Housing for All, and passed Prop I to raise around \$140 million this upcoming year for social housing. Taken together, Props I and K represent a clear expression from the voters to fund and create social housing: affordable housing for everyone that is focused on working people.

However, the Mayor refused to fund most of the recommendations produced by the Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board (HSFOB). Her proposal also cuts MOHCD's budget by \$52 million, while increasing spending on the Police and Sheriff by \$51 million and \$30 million respectively. This is despite us living through an affordable housing crisis that will require BILLIONS of dollars a year in funding for SF to hit its RHNA goals.

I urge you to deliver on the will of the voters, by funding through add-backs and all other means at your disposal the ignored recommendations, which include:

1. \$300,000 to study a new agency to create Public Housing for All. This is add-back request E085 in the Budget Justice Coalition's list.
2. City staffing, feasibility analyses, and NOFAs to study and support innovative social housing models
3. The acquisition of land to build social housing
4. Construction of new social housing
5. Expansion of the Small Sites Program

This would be the second budget cycle in a row where the Mayor has refused to seriously fund social housing. MOHCD has failed to partner meaningfully with the HSFOB on supporting the community's vision for social housing. And it's not for a lack of trying; the HSFOB spent months developing spending recommendations, with community input from grassroots organizations, labor unions, and non-profit housing developers.

I urge you to ensure all unfunded social housing recommendations are incorporated into the

FY 2022-23 budget. The voters have spoken, and it's time to deliver on the mandate promised by Props I and K two years ago.

Thank you,

Gary Gregerson  
dmfeelings@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94109

**From:** [luis.garcia](#)  
**To:** [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)  
**Subject:** Fund LTF and LPEC Budget  
**Date:** Saturday, June 11, 2022 9:50:17 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Good Morning Mayor, Breed and Mr. Jalipa,

I write to both of you to urge you to please to reconsider the budget cuts that will affect our community hubs. Community hubs that provide so many essential services to our most vulnerable population that include but is not limited to covid testing, and food pantry. Again, for the sake of our city, please add to LTF and LPEC budget.

Thank you so much,

Luis Garcia

**From:** [Frankie Burton](#)  
**To:** [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Urging you to fund social housing, which Mayor Breed ignored  
**Date:** Friday, June 10, 2022 10:31:07 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Brent Jalipa,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to fund the social housing recommendations that Mayor Breed refused to include in her proposed budget, through both the add-back process and other financing tools at your disposal.

As you know, voters resoundingly approved November 2020's Prop K to authorize 10,000 units of Public Housing for All, and passed Prop I to raise around \$140 million this upcoming year for social housing. Taken together, Props I and K represent a clear expression from the voters to fund and create social housing: affordable housing for everyone that is focused on working people.

However, the Mayor refused to fund most of the recommendations produced by the Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board (HSFOB). Her proposal also cuts MOHCD's budget by \$52 million, while increasing spending on the Police and Sheriff by \$51 million and \$30 million respectively. This is despite us living through an affordable housing crisis that will require BILLIONS of dollars a year in funding for SF to hit its RHNA goals.

I urge you to deliver on the will of the voters, by funding through add-backs and all other means at your disposal the ignored recommendations, which include:

1. \$300,000 to study a new agency to create Public Housing for All. This is add-back request E085 in the Budget Justice Coalition's list.
2. City staffing, feasibility analyses, and NOFAs to study and support innovative social housing models
3. The acquisition of land to build social housing
4. Construction of new social housing
5. Expansion of the Small Sites Program

This would be the second budget cycle in a row where the Mayor has refused to seriously fund social housing. MOHCD has failed to partner meaningfully with the HSFOB on supporting the community's vision for social housing. And it's not for a lack of trying; the HSFOB spent months developing spending recommendations, with community input from grassroots organizations, labor unions, and non-profit housing developers.

I urge you to ensure all unfunded social housing recommendations are incorporated into the

FY 2022-23 budget. The voters have spoken, and it's time to deliver on the mandate promised by Props I and K two years ago.

Thank you,

Frankie Burton

frankieseysrelax@gmail.com

600 Stanyan St Apt 110

San Francisco, California 94117

**From:** [Terri Saul](#)  
**To:** [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Urging you to fund social housing, which Mayor Breed ignored  
**Date:** Friday, June 10, 2022 3:50:05 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Brent Jalipa,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to fund the social housing recommendations that Mayor Breed refused to include in her proposed budget, through both the add-back process and other financing tools at your disposal.

As you know, voters resoundingly approved November 2020's Prop K to authorize 10,000 units of Public Housing for All, and passed Prop I to raise around \$140 million this upcoming year for social housing. Taken together, Props I and K represent a clear expression from the voters to fund and create social housing: affordable housing for everyone that is focused on working people.

However, the Mayor refused to fund most of the recommendations produced by the Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board (HSFOB). Her proposal also cuts MOHCD's budget by \$52 million, while increasing spending on the Police and Sheriff by \$51 million and \$30 million respectively. This is despite us living through an affordable housing crisis that will require BILLIONS of dollars a year in funding for SF to hit its RHNA goals.

I urge you to deliver on the will of the voters, by funding through add-backs and all other means at your disposal the ignored recommendations, which include:

1. \$300,000 to study a new agency to create Public Housing for All. This is add-back request E085 in the Budget Justice Coalition's list.
2. City staffing, feasibility analyses, and NOFAs to study and support innovative social housing models
3. The acquisition of land to build social housing
4. Construction of new social housing
5. Expansion of the Small Sites Program

This would be the second budget cycle in a row where the Mayor has refused to seriously fund social housing. MOHCD has failed to partner meaningfully with the HSFOB on supporting the community's vision for social housing. And it's not for a lack of trying; the HSFOB spent months developing spending recommendations, with community input from grassroots organizations, labor unions, and non-profit housing developers.

I urge you to ensure all unfunded social housing recommendations are incorporated into the

FY 2022-23 budget. The voters have spoken, and it's time to deliver on the mandate promised by Props I and K two years ago.

Thank you,

Terri Saul  
terrisaul@gmail.com

Berkeley, California 94705



**From:** [Matt Carona](#)  
**To:** [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Jue, Tyrone \(ENV\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Fund the Climate Action Plan - and get the Hunters Point Shipyard cleanup right (Re: BAC 6/8 Item 4, # 220558)  
**Date:** Friday, June 10, 2022 9:48:21 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Supervisor Hillary Ronen,

Dear Supervisors,

San Francisco declared a Climate Emergency in 2019, and updated its Climate Action Plan in 2021. Merely publishing the plan does not accomplish the goals. Now, we must begin to take the actions that are outlined in the CAP, and we must do that NOW. Time is running out. It will require planning, courage and money.

I ask you first to fund the Department of the Environment's request for \$11M over two years. And to fund the other requests that community groups have outlined in budget requests which will provide additional funds for street tree planting, clean electrification pilots and incentives for eliminating fossil fuels in buildings and transportation.

I ask you to finally resolve the long-standing issues in Hunter's Point/Bayview with toxic and radioactive contamination which will become even more dangerous with sea level rise, as pointed out in the just-published Civil Grand Jury report.

It is time to act. We must do this work. You must provide the funding. Thank you.

Matt Carona  
Carona.matt@gmail.com  
63 Winfield Street, Unit A  
San Francisco, California 94110



**From:** [Haley Adams](#)  
**To:** [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Urging you to fund social housing, which Mayor Breed ignored  
**Date:** Friday, June 10, 2022 12:34:16 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Brent Jalipa,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I can't believe this wasn't a good portion of the budget. Please do something!

I am writing to urge you to fund the social housing recommendations that Mayor Breed refused to include in her proposed budget, through both the add-back process and other financing tools at your disposal.

As you know, voters resoundingly approved November 2020's Prop K to authorize 10,000 units of Public Housing for All, and passed Prop I to raise around \$140 million this upcoming year for social housing. Taken together, Props I and K represent a clear expression from the voters to fund and create social housing: affordable housing for everyone that is focused on working people.

However, the Mayor refused to fund most of the recommendations produced by the Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board (HSFOB). Her proposal also cuts MOHCD's budget by \$52 million, while increasing spending on the Police and Sheriff by \$51 million and \$30 million respectively. This is despite us living through an affordable housing crisis that will require BILLIONS of dollars a year in funding for SF to hit its RHNA goals.

I urge you to deliver on the will of the voters, by funding through add-backs and all other means at your disposal the ignored recommendations, which include:

1. \$300,000 to study a new agency to create Public Housing for All. This is add-back request E085 in the Budget Justice Coalition's list.
2. City staffing, feasibility analyses, and NOFAs to study and support innovative social housing models
3. The acquisition of land to build social housing
4. Construction of new social housing
5. Expansion of the Small Sites Program

This would be the second budget cycle in a row where the Mayor has refused to seriously fund social housing. MOHCD has failed to partner meaningfully with the HSFOB on supporting the community's vision for social housing. And it's not for a lack of trying; the HSFOB spent months developing spending recommendations, with community input from grassroots organizations, labor unions, and non-profit housing developers.

I urge you to ensure all unfunded social housing recommendations are incorporated into the FY 2022-23 budget. The voters have spoken, and it's time to deliver on the mandate promised by Props I and K two years ago.

Thank you,

Haley Adams  
hea.nox@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94110

**From:** [Sean San Jose](#)  
**To:** [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Urging you to fund social housing, which Mayor Breed ignored  
**Date:** Thursday, June 9, 2022 11:03:23 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Brent Jalipa,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to fund the social housing recommendations that Mayor Breed refused to include in her proposed budget, through both the add-back process and other financing tools at your disposal.

As you know, voters resoundingly approved November 2020's Prop K to authorize 10,000 units of Public Housing for All, and passed Prop I to raise around \$140 million this upcoming year for social housing. Taken together, Props I and K represent a clear expression from the voters to fund and create social housing: affordable housing for everyone that is focused on working people.

However, the Mayor refused to fund most of the recommendations produced by the Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board (HSFOB). Her proposal also cuts MOHCD's budget by \$52 million, while increasing spending on the Police and Sheriff by \$51 million and \$30 million respectively. This is despite us living through an affordable housing crisis that will require BILLIONS of dollars a year in funding for SF to hit its RHNA goals.

I urge you to deliver on the will of the voters, by funding through add-backs and all other means at your disposal the ignored recommendations, which include:

1. \$300,000 to study a new agency to create Public Housing for All. This is add-back request E085 in the Budget Justice Coalition's list.
2. City staffing, feasibility analyses, and NOFAs to study and support innovative social housing models
3. The acquisition of land to build social housing
4. Construction of new social housing
5. Expansion of the Small Sites Program

This would be the second budget cycle in a row where the Mayor has refused to seriously fund social housing. MOHCD has failed to partner meaningfully with the HSFOB on supporting the community's vision for social housing. And it's not for a lack of trying; the HSFOB spent months developing spending recommendations, with community input from grassroots organizations, labor unions, and non-profit housing developers.

I urge you to ensure all unfunded social housing recommendations are incorporated into the

FY 2022-23 budget. The voters have spoken, and it's time to deliver on the mandate promised by Props I and K two years ago.

Thank you,

Sean San Jose

seansanjova@yahoo.com

566 Lisbon St

San Francisco, California 94112

**From:** [alice.dues@gmail.com](mailto:alice.dues@gmail.com)  
**To:** [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Jue, Tyrone \(ENV\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Fund the Climate Action Plan - and get the Hunters Point Shipyard cleanup right (Re: BAC 6/8 Item 4, # 220558)  
**Date:** Thursday, June 9, 2022 9:55:08 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Supervisor Gordon Mar,

Dear Supervisors,

San Francisco declared a Climate Emergency in 2019, and updated its Climate Action Plan in 2021. Merely publishing the plan does not accomplish the goals. Now, we must begin to take the actions that are outlined in the CAP, and we must do that NOW. Time is running out. It will require planning, courage and money.

I ask you first to fund the Department of the Environment's request for \$11M over two years. And to fund the other requests that community groups have outlined in budget requests which will provide additional funds for street tree planting, clean electrification pilots and incentives for eliminating fossil fuels in buildings and transportation.

I ask you to finally resolve the long-standing issues in Hunter's Point/Bayview with toxic and radioactive contamination which will become even more dangerous with sea level rise, as pointed out in the just-published Civil Grand Jury report.

It is time to act. We must do this work. You must provide the funding. Thank you.

Thank you,

Alice Duesdieker, D4

[alice.dues@gmail.com](mailto:alice.dues@gmail.com)  
1850 39th Ave  
San Francisco, California 94122

**From:** [Dean Schaffer](#)  
**To:** [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Supporting CART  
**Date:** Thursday, June 9, 2022 9:41:23 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hi,

I'm a San Francisco resident and member of [SURJ SF](#) writing in support of [CART](#) in the SF budget. I strongly support a non-police response to homelessness for non-emergency calls to 311 & 911. We should allocate money to Department of Public Health (DPH) to create a new team that follows the CART model - a well paid, well trained, peer-based team that responds to 911 / 311 non-emergency homeless-related calls (for C level calls for service).

Thank you,

Dean Schaffer  
District 5 Resident



**From:** [Huitzi Herrera-Sobal](#)  
**To:** [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Urging you to fund social housing, which Mayor Breed ignored  
**Date:** Thursday, June 9, 2022 8:36:58 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Brent Jalipa,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to fund the social housing recommendations that Mayor Breed refused to include in her proposed budget, through both the add-back process and other financing tools at your disposal.

As you know, voters resoundingly approved November 2020's Prop K to authorize 10,000 units of Public Housing for All, and passed Prop I to raise around \$140 million this upcoming year for social housing. Taken together, Props I and K represent a clear expression from the voters to fund and create social housing: affordable housing for everyone that is focused on working people.

However, the Mayor refused to fund most of the recommendations produced by the Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board (HSFOB). Her proposal also cuts MOHCD's budget by \$52 million, while increasing spending on the Police and Sheriff by \$51 million and \$30 million respectively. This is despite us living through an affordable housing crisis that will require BILLIONS of dollars a year in funding for SF to hit its RHNA goals.

I urge you to deliver on the will of the voters, by funding through add-backs and all other means at your disposal the ignored recommendations, which include:

1. \$300,000 to study a new agency to create Public Housing for All. This is add-back request E085 in the Budget Justice Coalition's list.
2. City staffing, feasibility analyses, and NOFAs to study and support innovative social housing models
3. The acquisition of land to build social housing
4. Construction of new social housing
5. Expansion of the Small Sites Program

This would be the second budget cycle in a row where the Mayor has refused to seriously fund social housing. MOHCD has failed to partner meaningfully with the HSFOB on supporting the community's vision for social housing. And it's not for a lack of trying; the HSFOB spent months developing spending recommendations, with community input from grassroots organizations, labor unions, and non-profit housing developers.

I urge you to ensure all unfunded social housing recommendations are incorporated into the

FY 2022-23 budget. The voters have spoken, and it's time to deliver on the mandate promised by Props I and K two years ago.

Thank you,

Huitzi Herrera-Sobal  
huitzilin42@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94112

**From:** [Ranjit Chacko](#)  
**To:** [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Urging you to fund social housing, which Mayor Breed ignored  
**Date:** Thursday, June 9, 2022 6:02:01 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Brent Jalipa,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to fund the social housing recommendations that Mayor Breed refused to include in her proposed budget, through both the add-back process and other financing tools at your disposal.

As you know, voters resoundingly approved November 2020's Prop K to authorize 10,000 units of Public Housing for All, and passed Prop I to raise around \$140 million this upcoming year for social housing. Taken together, Props I and K represent a clear expression from the voters to fund and create social housing: affordable housing for everyone that is focused on working people.

However, the Mayor refused to fund most of the recommendations produced by the Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board (HSFOB). Her proposal also cuts MOHCD's budget by \$52 million, while increasing spending on the Police and Sheriff by \$51 million and \$30 million respectively. This is despite us living through an affordable housing crisis that will require BILLIONS of dollars a year in funding for SF to hit its RHNA goals.

I urge you to deliver on the will of the voters, by funding through add-backs and all other means at your disposal the ignored recommendations, which include:

1. \$300,000 to study a new agency to create Public Housing for All. This is add-back request E085 in the Budget Justice Coalition's list.
2. City staffing, feasibility analyses, and NOFAs to study and support innovative social housing models
3. The acquisition of land to build social housing
4. Construction of new social housing
5. Expansion of the Small Sites Program

This would be the second budget cycle in a row where the Mayor has refused to seriously fund social housing. MOHCD has failed to partner meaningfully with the HSFOB on supporting the community's vision for social housing. And it's not for a lack of trying; the HSFOB spent months developing spending recommendations, with community input from grassroots organizations, labor unions, and non-profit housing developers.

I urge you to ensure all unfunded social housing recommendations are incorporated into the

FY 2022-23 budget. The voters have spoken, and it's time to deliver on the mandate promised by Props I and K two years ago.

Thank you,

Ranjit Chacko  
rjchacko@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94117

**From:** [Eleanor Cox](#)  
**To:** [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Urging you to add-back funds for social housing in budget  
**Date:** Thursday, June 9, 2022 1:09:23 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Brent Jalipa,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am a renter in the Inner Sunset, located within the newly revised District 7 boundaries. I am writing to urge you to fund the social housing recommendations that Mayor Breed refused to include in her proposed budget, through both the add-back process and other financing tools at your disposal.

As you know, voters resoundingly approved November 2020's Prop K to authorize 10,000 units of Public Housing for All, and passed Prop I to raise around \$140 million this upcoming year for social housing. Taken together, Props I and K represent a clear expression from the voters to fund and create social housing: affordable housing for everyone that is focused on working people.

However, the Mayor refused to fund most of the recommendations produced by the Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board (HSFOB). Her proposal also cuts MOHCD's budget by \$52 million, while increasing spending on the Police and Sheriff by \$51 million and \$30 million respectively. This is despite us living through an affordable housing crisis that will require BILLIONS of dollars a year in funding for SF to hit its RHNA goals.

I urge you to deliver on the will of the voters, by funding through add-backs and all other means at your disposal the ignored recommendations, which include:

1. \$300,000 to study a new agency to create Public Housing for All. This is add-back request E085 in the Budget Justice Coalition's list.
2. City staffing, feasibility analyses, and NOFAs to study and support innovative social housing models
3. The acquisition of land to build social housing
4. Construction of new social housing
5. Expansion of the Small Sites Program

This would be the second budget cycle in a row where the Mayor has refused to seriously fund social housing. MOHCD has failed to partner meaningfully with the HSFOB on supporting the community's vision for social housing. And it's not for a lack of trying; the HSFOB spent months developing spending recommendations, with community input from grassroots organizations, labor unions, and non-profit housing developers.

I urge you to ensure all unfunded social housing recommendations are incorporated into the FY 2022-23 budget. The voters have spoken, and it's time to deliver on the mandate promised by Props I and K two years ago.

Thank you,  
Eleanor

Eleanor Cox  
eleanor\_ruth@yahoo.com  
1291 16th Ave  
San Francisco , California 94122

**From:** [Gary Stein](#)  
**To:** [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Helping you , even if I need to Volunteer , face SF's use of empty spaces owned by the city  
**Date:** Thursday, June 9, 2022 12:23:53 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Brent Jalipa,

Dear Hillary Ronen

I am writing to urge you to fund the social housing recommendations that Mayor Breed refused to include in her proposed budget, through both the add-back process and other financing tools at your disposal.

As you know, voters resoundingly approved November 2020's Prop K to authorize 10,000 units of Public Housing for All, and passed Prop I to raise around \$140 million this upcoming year for social housing. Taken together, Props I and K represent a clear expression from the voters to fund and create social housing: affordable housing for everyone that is focused on working people.

However, the Mayor refused to fund most of the recommendations produced by the Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board (HSFOB). Her proposal also cuts MOHCD's budget by \$52 million, while increasing spending on the Police and Sheriff by \$51 million and \$30 million respectively. This is despite us living through an affordable housing crisis that will require BILLIONS of dollars a year in funding for SF to hit its RHNA goals.

I urge you to deliver on the will of the voters, by funding through add-backs and all other means at your disposal the ignored recommendations, which include:

1. \$300,000 to study a new agency to create Public Housing for All. This is add-back request E085 in the Budget Justice Coalition's list.
2. City staffing, feasibility analyses, and NOFAs to study and support innovative social housing models
3. The acquisition of land to build social housing
4. Construction of new social housing
5. Expansion of the Small Sites Program

This would be the second budget cycle in a row where the Mayor has refused to seriously fund social housing. MOHCD has failed to partner meaningfully with the HSFOB on supporting the community's vision for social housing. And it's not for a lack of trying; the HSFOB spent months developing spending recommendations, with community input from grassroots organizations, labor unions, and non-profit housing developers.

I urge you to ensure all unfunded social housing recommendations are incorporated into the

FY 2022-23 budget. The voters have spoken, and it's time to deliver on the mandate promised by Props I and K two years ago.

Apologies if this letter duplicates one I attempted to send earlier today

Sincerely

Gary Charles Stein

45 ONONDAGO AVE

P O Box 12043

831-212-7425

I Thank You if you are able to get in touch with me about this .

Gary Stein

[garythestein@gmail.com](mailto:garythestein@gmail.com)

San Francisco , California 94112



**From:** [Jenny Ly](#)  
**To:** [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** !Urging you to fund social housing, which Mayor Breed ignored!  
**Date:** Thursday, June 9, 2022 12:02:34 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Brent Jalipa,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to fund the social housing recommendations that Mayor Breed refused to include in her proposed budget, through both the add-back process and other financing tools at your disposal.

As you know, voters resoundingly approved November 2020's Prop K to authorize 10,000 units of Public Housing for All, and passed Prop I to raise around \$140 million this upcoming year for social housing. Taken together, Props I and K represent a clear expression from the voters to fund and create social housing: affordable housing for everyone that is focused on working people.

However, the Mayor refused to fund most of the recommendations produced by the Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board (HSFOB). Her proposal also cuts MOHCD's budget by \$52 million, while increasing spending on the Police and Sheriff by \$51 million and \$30 million respectively. This is despite us living through an affordable housing crisis that will require BILLIONS of dollars a year in funding for SF to hit its RHNA goals.

I urge you to deliver on the will of the voters, by funding through add-backs and all other means at your disposal the ignored recommendations, which include:

1. \$300,000 to study a new agency to create Public Housing for All. This is add-back request E085 in the Budget Justice Coalition's list.
2. City staffing, feasibility analyses, and NOFAs to study and support innovative social housing models
3. The acquisition of land to build social housing
4. Construction of new social housing
5. Expansion of the Small Sites Program

This would be the second budget cycle in a row where the Mayor has refused to seriously fund social housing. MOHCD has failed to partner meaningfully with the HSFOB on supporting the community's vision for social housing. And it's not for a lack of trying; the HSFOB spent months developing spending recommendations, with community input from grassroots organizations, labor unions, and non-profit housing developers.

I urge you to ensure all unfunded social housing recommendations are incorporated into the

FY 2022-23 budget. The voters have spoken, and it's time to deliver on the mandate promised by Props I and K two years ago.

Thank you,

Jenny Ly  
jennygiabaoly@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94122

**From:** [Erik Schnabel](#)  
**To:** [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Urging you to fund social housing, which Mayor Breed ignored  
**Date:** Thursday, June 9, 2022 10:58:55 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Brent Jalipa,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to fund the social housing recommendations that Mayor Breed refused to include in her proposed budget, through both the add-back process and other financing tools at your disposal.

As you know, voters resoundingly approved November 2020's Prop K to authorize 10,000 units of Public Housing for All, and passed Prop I to raise around \$140 million this upcoming year for social housing. Taken together, Props I and K represent a clear expression from the voters to fund and create social housing: affordable housing for everyone that is focused on working people.

However, the Mayor refused to fund most of the recommendations produced by the Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board (HSFOB). Her proposal also cuts MOHCD's budget by \$52 million, while increasing spending on the Police and Sheriff by \$51 million and \$30 million respectively. This is despite us living through an affordable housing crisis that will require BILLIONS of dollars a year in funding for SF to hit its RHNA goals.

I urge you to deliver on the will of the voters, by funding through add-backs and all other means at your disposal the ignored recommendations, which include:

1. \$300,000 to study a new agency to create Public Housing for All. This is add-back request E085 in the Budget Justice Coalition's list.
2. City staffing, feasibility analyses, and NOFAs to study and support innovative social housing models
3. The acquisition of land to build social housing
4. Construction of new social housing
5. Expansion of the Small Sites Program

This would be the second budget cycle in a row where the Mayor has refused to seriously fund social housing. MOHCD has failed to partner meaningfully with the HSFOB on supporting the community's vision for social housing. And it's not for a lack of trying; the HSFOB spent months developing spending recommendations, with community input from grassroots organizations, labor unions, and non-profit housing developers.

I urge you to ensure all unfunded social housing recommendations are incorporated into the

FY 2022-23 budget. The voters have spoken, and it's time to deliver on the mandate promised by Props I and K two years ago.

Thank you,

Erik Schnabel  
erikschnabel@hotmail.com

San Francisco , California 94134

**From:** [Alexandra Bryan](#)  
**To:** [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Urging you to fund social housing, which Mayor Breed ignored  
**Date:** Thursday, June 9, 2022 10:05:46 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Brent Jalipa,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to fund the social housing recommendations that Mayor Breed refused to include in her proposed budget, through both the add-back process and other financing tools at your disposal.

As you know, voters resoundingly approved November 2020's Prop K to authorize 10,000 units of Public Housing for All, and passed Prop I to raise around \$140 million this upcoming year for social housing. Taken together, Props I and K represent a clear expression from the voters to fund and create social housing: affordable housing for everyone that is focused on working people.

However, the Mayor refused to fund most of the recommendations produced by the Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board (HSFOB). Her proposal also cuts MOHCD's budget by \$52 million, while increasing spending on the Police and Sheriff by \$51 million and \$30 million respectively. This is despite us living through an affordable housing crisis that will require BILLIONS of dollars a year in funding for SF to hit its RHNA goals.

I urge you to deliver on the will of the voters, by funding through add-backs and all other means at your disposal the ignored recommendations, which include:

1. \$300,000 to study a new agency to create Public Housing for All. This is add-back request E085 in the Budget Justice Coalition's list.
2. City staffing, feasibility analyses, and NOFAs to study and support innovative social housing models
3. The acquisition of land to build social housing
4. Construction of new social housing
5. Expansion of the Small Sites Program

This would be the second budget cycle in a row where the Mayor has refused to seriously fund social housing. MOHCD has failed to partner meaningfully with the HSFOB on supporting the community's vision for social housing. And it's not for a lack of trying; the HSFOB spent months developing spending recommendations, with community input from grassroots organizations, labor unions, and non-profit housing developers.

I urge you to ensure all unfunded social housing recommendations are incorporated into the

FY 2022-23 budget. The voters have spoken, and it's time to deliver on the mandate promised by Props I and K two years ago.

Thank you,

Alexandra Bryan  
xandra2784@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94112

**From:** [Maggie Kan](#)  
**To:** [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Urging you to fund social housing, which Mayor Breed ignored  
**Date:** Thursday, June 9, 2022 10:00:21 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Brent Jalipa,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to fund the social housing recommendations that Mayor Breed refused to include in her proposed budget, through both the add-back process and other financing tools at your disposal.

As you know, voters resoundingly approved November 2020's Prop K to authorize 10,000 units of Public Housing for All, and passed Prop I to raise around \$140 million this upcoming year for social housing. Taken together, Props I and K represent a clear expression from the voters to fund and create social housing: affordable housing for everyone that is focused on working people.

However, the Mayor refused to fund most of the recommendations produced by the Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board (HSFOB). Her proposal also cuts MOHCD's budget by \$52 million, while increasing spending on the Police and Sheriff by \$51 million and \$30 million respectively. This is despite us living through an affordable housing crisis that will require BILLIONS of dollars a year in funding for SF to hit its RHNA goals.

I urge you to deliver on the will of the voters, by funding through add-backs and all other means at your disposal the ignored recommendations, which include:

1. \$300,000 to study a new agency to create Public Housing for All. This is add-back request E085 in the Budget Justice Coalition's list.
2. City staffing, feasibility analyses, and NOFAs to study and support innovative social housing models
3. The acquisition of land to build social housing
4. Construction of new social housing
5. Expansion of the Small Sites Program

This would be the second budget cycle in a row where the Mayor has refused to seriously fund social housing. MOHCD has failed to partner meaningfully with the HSFOB on supporting the community's vision for social housing. And it's not for a lack of trying; the HSFOB spent months developing spending recommendations, with community input from grassroots organizations, labor unions, and non-profit housing developers.

I urge you to ensure all unfunded social housing recommendations are incorporated into the

FY 2022-23 budget. The voters have spoken, and it's time to deliver on the mandate promised by Props I and K two years ago.

Thank you,  
Maggie Kan

Maggie Kan  
maggiepkan@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94110



**From:** [Gary Stein](#)  
**To:** [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Urging you to fund social housing, which Mayor Breed ignored  
**Date:** Thursday, June 9, 2022 9:51:18 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Brent Jalipa,

Dear Board of Supervisors, Especially Hillary Ronen

I am writing to urge you to fund the social housing recommendations that Mayor Breed refused to include in her proposed budget, through both the add-back process and other financing tools at your disposal.

As you know, voters resoundingly approved November 2020's Prop K to authorize 10,000 units of Public Housing for All, and passed Prop I to raise around \$140 million this upcoming year for social housing. Taken together, Props I and K represent a clear expression from the voters to fund and create social housing: affordable housing for everyone that is focused on working people.

However, the Mayor refused to fund most of the recommendations produced by the Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board (HSFOB). Her proposal also cuts MOHCD's budget by \$52 million, while increasing spending on the Police and Sheriff by \$51 million and \$30 million respectively. This is despite us living through an affordable housing crisis that will require BILLIONS of dollars a year in funding for SF to hit its RHNA goals.

I urge you to deliver on the will of the voters, by funding through add-backs and all other means at your disposal the ignored recommendations, which include:

1. \$300,000 to study a new agency to create Public Housing for All. This is add-back request E085 in the Budget Justice Coalition's list.
2. City staffing, feasibility analyses, and NOFAs to study and support innovative social housing models
3. The acquisition of land to build social housing
4. Construction of new social housing
5. Expansion of the Small Sites Program

This would be the second budget cycle in a row where the Mayor has refused to seriously fund social housing. MOHCD has failed to partner meaningfully with the HSFOB on supporting the community's vision for social housing. And it's not for a lack of trying; the HSFOB spent months developing spending recommendations, with community input from grassroots organizations, labor unions, and non-profit housing developers.

I urge you to ensure all unfunded social housing recommendations are incorporated into the

FY 2022-23 budget. The voters have spoken, and it's time to deliver on the mandate promised by Props I and K two years ago.

Please feel invited to contact me. I am especially interested Volunteering to help the City and County of San Francisco bring City owned property which is empty back into use.

Thank you, Sincerely

Gary Charles Stein  
831-212-7425

[garythestein@gmail.com](mailto:garythestein@gmail.com)

Gary Stein  
[garythebuilderstein@yahoo.com](mailto:garythebuilderstein@yahoo.com)

San Francisco, California 94112

**From:** [Dan Foldes](#)  
**To:** [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Urging you to fund social housing, which Mayor Breed ignored  
**Date:** Thursday, June 9, 2022 9:50:06 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Brent Jalipa,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to fund the social housing recommendations that Mayor Breed refused to include in her proposed budget, through both the add-back process and other financing tools at your disposal.

As you know, voters resoundingly approved November 2020's Prop K to authorize 10,000 units of Public Housing for All, and passed Prop I to raise around \$140 million this upcoming year for social housing. Taken together, Props I and K represent a clear expression from the voters to fund and create social housing: affordable housing for everyone that is focused on working people.

However, the Mayor refused to fund most of the recommendations produced by the Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board (HSFOB). Her proposal also cuts MOHCD's budget by \$52 million, while increasing spending on the Police and Sheriff by \$51 million and \$30 million respectively. This is despite us living through an affordable housing crisis that will require BILLIONS of dollars a year in funding for SF to hit its RHNA goals.

I urge you to deliver on the will of the voters, by funding through add-backs and all other means at your disposal the ignored recommendations, which include:

1. \$300,000 to study a new agency to create Public Housing for All. This is add-back request E085 in the Budget Justice Coalition's list.
2. City staffing, feasibility analyses, and NOFAs to study and support innovative social housing models
3. The acquisition of land to build social housing
4. Construction of new social housing
5. Expansion of the Small Sites Program

This would be the second budget cycle in a row where the Mayor has refused to seriously fund social housing. MOHCD has failed to partner meaningfully with the HSFOB on supporting the community's vision for social housing. And it's not for a lack of trying; the HSFOB spent months developing spending recommendations, with community input from grassroots organizations, labor unions, and non-profit housing developers.

I urge you to ensure all unfunded social housing recommendations are incorporated into the

FY 2022-23 budget. The voters have spoken, and it's time to deliver on the mandate promised by Props I and K two years ago.

Thank you,

Dan

Dan Foldes

[danfoldes@gmail.com](mailto:danfoldes@gmail.com)

SAN FRANCISCO, California 94117

**From:** [Laura Fraenza](#)  
**To:** [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Urging you to fund social housing, which Mayor Breed ignored  
**Date:** Thursday, June 9, 2022 9:43:57 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Brent Jalipa,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Hi there. I'm Laura Fraenza and I live in District 9.

Affording rent in San Francisco is a struggle for most of us, especially in these times (and even moreso if one is not fortunate enough to have lived in a rent-controlled apartment for many years) and we all fear getting priced out of the community we've lived in for over 30 years.

I am writing to urge you to fund the social housing recommendations that Mayor Breed refused to include in her proposed budget, through both the add-back process and other financing tools at your disposal.

It is distressing, especially in these difficult times for those suffering in the streets.

As you know, voters resoundingly approved November 2020's Prop K to authorize 10,000 units of Public Housing for All, and passed Prop I to raise around \$140 million this upcoming year for social housing.

Taken together, Props I and K represent a clear expression from the voters to fund and create social housing: affordable housing for everyone that is focused on working people.

However, the Mayor refused to fund most of the recommendations produced by the Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board (HSFOB).

Her proposal also cuts MOHCD's budget by \$52 million, while increasing spending on the Police and Sheriff by \$51 million and \$30 million respectively.

This is despite us living through an affordable housing crisis that will require BILLIONS of dollars a year in funding for SF to hit its RHNA goals.

I urge you to deliver on the will of the voters, by funding through add-backs and all other means at your disposal the ignored recommendations, which include:

1. \$300,000 to study a new agency to create Public Housing for All. This is add-back request E085 in the Budget Justice Coalition's list.
2. City staffing, feasibility analyses, and NOFAs to study and support innovative social housing

models

3. The acquisition of land to build social housing
4. Construction of new social housing
5. Expansion of the Small Sites Program

This would be the second budget cycle in a row where the Mayor has refused to seriously fund social housing.

MOHCD has failed to partner meaningfully with the HSFOB on supporting the community's vision for social housing. And it's not for a lack of trying; the HSFOB spent months developing spending recommendations, with community input from grassroots organizations, labor unions, and non-profit housing developers.

I urge you to ensure all unfunded social housing recommendations are incorporated into the FY 2022-23 budget. The voters have spoken, and it's time to deliver on the mandate promised by Props I and K two years ago.

Thank you,

Laura

Laura Fraenza  
elcaplaura@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94110

**From:** [Leticia Colnago](#)  
**To:** [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Urging you to fund social housing, which Mayor Breed ignored  
**Date:** Thursday, June 9, 2022 9:37:02 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Brent Jalipa,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

My name is Leticia and I'm a newly redistricted member of District 9, previously of District 8. I've lived in the city for years and I've seen the housing situation get progressively worse. It's clear to me the market is incapable of building housing at the speed and affordability levels required to make a significant impact on our housing crisis. We need to make a public investment in housing if we're to have any hope of getting out of this mess.

I am writing to urge you to fund the social housing recommendations that Mayor Breed refused to include in her proposed budget, through both the add-back process and other financing tools at your disposal.

As you know, voters resoundingly approved November 2020's Prop K to authorize 10,000 units of Public Housing for All, and passed Prop I to raise around \$140 million this upcoming year for social housing. Taken together, Props I and K represent a clear expression from the voters to fund and create social housing: affordable housing for everyone that is focused on working people.

However, the Mayor refused to fund most of the recommendations produced by the Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board (HSFOB). Her proposal also cuts MOHCD's budget by \$52 million, while increasing spending on the Police and Sheriff by \$51 million and \$30 million respectively. This is despite us living through an affordable housing crisis that will require BILLIONS of dollars a year in funding for SF to hit its RHNA goals.

I urge you to deliver on the will of the voters, by funding through add-backs and all other means at your disposal the ignored recommendations, which include:

1. \$300,000 to study a new agency to create Public Housing for All. This is add-back request E085 in the Budget Justice Coalition's list.
2. City staffing, feasibility analyses, and NOFAs to study and support innovative social housing models
3. The acquisition of land to build social housing
4. Construction of new social housing
5. Expansion of the Small Sites Program

This would be the second budget cycle in a row where the Mayor has refused to seriously fund

social housing. MOHCD has failed to partner meaningfully with the HSFOB on supporting the community's vision for social housing. And it's not for a lack of trying; the HSFOB spent months developing spending recommendations, with community input from grassroots organizations, labor unions, and non-profit housing developers.

I urge you to ensure all unfunded social housing recommendations are incorporated into the FY 2022-23 budget. The voters have spoken, and it's time to deliver on the mandate promised by Props I and K two years ago.

Thank you,

Leticia Colnago  
leticiacolnago@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94103



**From:** [Rick Girling](#)  
**To:** [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Urging you to fund social housing, which Mayor Breed ignored  
**Date:** Thursday, June 9, 2022 9:36:58 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Brent Jalipa,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

It is impossible to reach our affordable housing goals without government sponsored social housing. Real estate developers would have you think that a mix of 30% "affordable" and 70% market rate will solve our problem. They are lying. Don't be deceived.

I am writing to urge you to fund the social housing recommendations that Mayor Breed refused to include in her proposed budget, through both the add-back process and other financing tools at your disposal.

As you know, voters resoundingly approved November 2020's Prop K to authorize 10,000 units of Public Housing for All, and passed Prop I to raise around \$140 million this upcoming year for social housing. Taken together, Props I and K represent a clear expression from the voters to fund and create social housing: affordable housing for everyone that is focused on working people.

However, the Mayor refused to fund most of the recommendations produced by the Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board (HSFOB). Her proposal also cuts MOHCD's budget by \$52 million, while increasing spending on the Police and Sheriff by \$51 million and \$30 million respectively. This is despite us living through an affordable housing crisis that will require BILLIONS of dollars a year in funding for SF to hit its RHNA goals.

I urge you to deliver on the will of the voters, by funding through add-backs and all other means at your disposal the ignored recommendations, which include:

1. \$300,000 to study a new agency to create Public Housing for All. This is add-back request E085 in the Budget Justice Coalition's list.
2. City staffing, feasibility analyses, and NOFAs to study and support innovative social housing models
3. The acquisition of land to build social housing
4. Construction of new social housing
5. Expansion of the Small Sites Program

This would be the second budget cycle in a row where the Mayor has refused to seriously fund social housing. MOHCD has failed to partner meaningfully with the HSFOB on supporting the community's vision for social housing. And it's not for a lack of trying; the HSFOB spent

months developing spending recommendations, with community input from grassroots organizations, labor unions, and non-profit housing developers.

I urge you to ensure all unfunded social housing recommendations are incorporated into the FY 2022-23 budget. The voters have spoken, and it's time to deliver on the mandate promised by Props I and K two years ago.

Thank you,

Rick Girling

[rzgirling@gmail.com](mailto:rzgirling@gmail.com)

182 Banks St, San Francisco, CA 94110, United States

SF, California 94110

**From:** [Deborah Brubaker](#)  
**To:** [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Urging you to fund social housing, which Mayor Breed ignored  
**Date:** Thursday, June 9, 2022 9:29:13 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Brent Jalipa,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to fund the social housing recommendations that Mayor Breed refused to include in her proposed budget, through both the add-back process and other financing tools at your disposal.

As you know, voters resoundingly approved November 2020's Prop K to authorize 10,000 units of Public Housing for All, and passed Prop I to raise around \$140 million this upcoming year for social housing. Taken together, Props I and K represent a clear expression from the voters to fund and create social housing: affordable housing for everyone that is focused on working people. I am one of those working people. I have been living in my home as a renter for just about 44 years. The landlord is selling the house and I cannot afford to buy it. I can't afford to move into any house or apartment in San Francisco. It's just now pandering to rich people. People who are not middle class workers, but upper middle and beyond.

Now our Mayor has refused to fund most of the recommendations produced by the Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board (HSFOB). Her proposal also cuts MOHCD's budget by \$52 million, while increasing spending on the Police and Sheriff by \$51 million and \$30 million respectively. This is despite us living through an affordable housing crisis that will require BILLIONS of dollars a year in funding for SF to hit its RHNA goals.

Please, I urge you to deliver on the will of the voters, by funding through add-backs and all other means at your disposal the ignored recommendations, which include:

1. \$300,000 to study a new agency to create Public Housing for All. This is add-back request E085 in the Budget Justice Coalition's list.
2. City staffing, feasibility analyses, and NOFAs to study and support innovative social housing models
3. The acquisition of land to build social housing
4. Construction of new social housing
5. Expansion of the Small Sites Program

This would be the second budget cycle in a row where the Mayor has refused to seriously fund social housing. MOHCD has failed to partner meaningfully with the HSFOB on supporting the community's vision for social housing. And it's not for a lack of trying; the HSFOB spent

months developing spending recommendations, with community input from grassroots organizations, labor unions, and non-profit housing developers.

I urge you to ensure all unfunded social housing recommendations are incorporated into the FY 2022-23 budget. The voters have spoken, and it's time to deliver on the mandate promised by Props I and K two years ago.

Thank you,

Deborah Brubaker  
debbiebrusf@gmail.com  
139 Harold Ave  
San Francisco, California 94112

**From:** [Leslie Simon](#)  
**To:** [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Urging you to fund social housing, which Mayor Breed ignored  
**Date:** Thursday, June 9, 2022 8:49:36 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Brent Jalipa,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a City College teacher, I have watched while many students, often with young families, have been priced out of San Francisco. If not for social housing, renowned artists, the late Yolanda Lopez and Rene Yanez, who both contributed so much to the cultural life of our city, would have been forced out of San Francisco.

I am writing to urge you to fund the social housing recommendations that Mayor Breed refused to include in her proposed budget, through both the add-back process and other financing tools at your disposal.

As you know, voters resoundingly approved November 2020's Prop K to authorize 10,000 units of Public Housing for All, and passed Prop I to raise around \$140 million this upcoming year for social housing. Taken together, Props I and K represent a clear expression from the voters to fund and create social housing: affordable housing for everyone that is focused on working people.

However, the Mayor refused to fund most of the recommendations produced by the Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board (HSFOB). Her proposal also cuts MOHCD's budget by \$52 million, while increasing spending on the Police and Sheriff by \$51 million and \$30 million respectively. This is despite us living through an affordable housing crisis that will require BILLIONS of dollars a year in funding for SF to hit its RHNA goals.

I urge you to deliver on the will of the voters, by funding through add-backs and all other means at your disposal the ignored recommendations, which include:

1. \$300,000 to study a new agency to create Public Housing for All. This is add-back request E085 in the Budget Justice Coalition's list.
2. City staffing, feasibility analyses, and NOFAs to study and support innovative social housing models
3. The acquisition of land to build social housing
4. Construction of new social housing
5. Expansion of the Small Sites Program

This would be the second budget cycle in a row where the Mayor has refused to seriously fund social housing. MOHCD has failed to partner meaningfully with the HSFOB on supporting the

community's vision for social housing. And it's not for a lack of trying; the HSFOB spent months developing spending recommendations, with community input from grassroots organizations, labor unions, and non-profit housing developers.

I urge you to ensure all unfunded social housing recommendations are incorporated into the FY 2022-23 budget. The voters have spoken, and it's time to deliver on the mandate promised by Props I and K two years ago.

Thank you,

Leslie Simon  
simscha@sbcglobal.net

San Francisco, California 94110

**From:** [Ken Lundgreen](#)  
**To:** [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Urging you to fund social housing, which Mayor Breed ignored  
**Date:** Thursday, June 9, 2022 8:43:33 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Brent Jalipa,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to fund the social housing recommendations that Mayor Breed refused to include in her proposed budget, through both the add-back process and other financing tools at your disposal.

As you know, voters resoundingly approved November 2020's Prop K to authorize 10,000 units of Public Housing for All, and passed Prop I to raise around \$140 million this upcoming year for social housing. Taken together, Props I and K represent a clear expression from the voters to fund and create social housing: affordable housing for everyone that is focused on working people.

However, the Mayor refused to fund most of the recommendations produced by the Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board (HSFOB). Her proposal also cuts MOHCD's budget by \$52 million, while increasing spending on the Police and Sheriff by \$51 million and \$30 million respectively. This is despite us living through an affordable housing crisis that will require BILLIONS of dollars a year in funding for SF to hit its RHNA goals.

I urge you to deliver on the will of the voters, by funding through add-backs and all other means at your disposal the ignored recommendations, which include:

1. \$300,000 to study a new agency to create Public Housing for All. This is add-back request E085 in the Budget Justice Coalition's list.
2. City staffing, feasibility analyses, and NOFAs to study and support innovative social housing models
3. The acquisition of land to build social housing
4. Construction of new social housing
5. Expansion of the Small Sites Program

This would be the second budget cycle in a row where the Mayor has refused to seriously fund social housing. MOHCD has failed to partner meaningfully with the HSFOB on supporting the community's vision for social housing. And it's not for a lack of trying; the HSFOB spent months developing spending recommendations, with community input from grassroots organizations, labor unions, and non-profit housing developers.

I urge you to ensure all unfunded social housing recommendations are incorporated into the

FY 2022-23 budget. The voters have spoken, and it's time to deliver on the mandate promised by Props I and K two years ago.

Thank you,

Ken Lundgreen  
spinstarholomeme001@gmail.com

, Puerto Rico 941-09



**From:** [Michael LaBriola](#)  
**To:** [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Urging you to fund social housing, which Mayor Breed ignored  
**Date:** Thursday, June 9, 2022 8:38:19 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Brent Jalipa,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to fund the social housing recommendations that Mayor Breed refused to include in her proposed budget, through both the add-back process and other financing tools at your disposal.

As you know, voters resoundingly approved November 2020's Prop K to authorize 10,000 units of Public Housing for All, and passed Prop I to raise around \$140 million this upcoming year for social housing. Taken together, Props I and K represent a clear expression from the voters to fund and create social housing: affordable housing for everyone that is focused on working people.

However, the Mayor refused to fund most of the recommendations produced by the Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board (HSFOB). Her proposal also cuts MOHCD's budget by \$52 million, while increasing spending on the Police and Sheriff by \$51 million and \$30 million respectively. This is despite us living through an affordable housing crisis that will require BILLIONS of dollars a year in funding for SF to hit its RHNA goals.

I urge you to deliver on the will of the voters, by funding through add-backs and all other means at your disposal the ignored recommendations, which include:

1. \$300,000 to study a new agency to create Public Housing for All. This is add-back request E085 in the Budget Justice Coalition's list.
2. City staffing, feasibility analyses, and NOFAs to study and support innovative social housing models
3. The acquisition of land to build social housing
4. Construction of new social housing
5. Expansion of the Small Sites Program

This would be the second budget cycle in a row where the Mayor has refused to seriously fund social housing. MOHCD has failed to partner meaningfully with the HSFOB on supporting the community's vision for social housing. And it's not for a lack of trying; the HSFOB spent months developing spending recommendations, with community input from grassroots organizations, labor unions, and non-profit housing developers.

I urge you to ensure all unfunded social housing recommendations are incorporated into the

FY 2022-23 budget. The voters have spoken, and it's time to deliver on the mandate promised by Props I and K two years ago.

Thank you,

Michael LaBriola  
michael\_labriola@yahoo.com

San Francisco, California 94110

**From:** [Giorgia Peckman](#)  
**To:** [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Urging you to fund social housing, which Mayor Breed ignored  
**Date:** Thursday, June 9, 2022 8:21:59 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Brent Jalipa,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to fund the social housing recommendations that Mayor Breed refused to include in her proposed budget, through both the add-back process and other financing tools at your disposal.

As a born and raised San Franciscan who has committed to calling this city home as an adult, my heart breaks daily to see the disconnect between our city's values and reputation as a compassionate, radical, and innovated national leader in social policy, and the material reality of so many residents currently living on the street. I am tired of seeing the Board of Supervisors and our mayor continue to fail the people of our city—housed and unhoused—by refusing to leverage tech-based capital and actualize ALREADY APPROVED propositions and funding into tangible initiatives and developments to address our city's public health and human rights crisis.

As you know, voters resoundingly approved November 2020's Prop K to authorize 10,000 units of Public Housing for All, and passed Prop I to raise around \$140 million this upcoming year for social housing. Taken together, Props I and K represent a clear expression from the voters to fund and create social housing: affordable housing for everyone that is focused on working people.

However, the Mayor refused to fund most of the recommendations produced by the Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board (HSFOB). Her proposal also cuts MOHCD's budget by \$52 million, while increasing spending on the Police and Sheriff by \$51 million and \$30 million respectively. This is despite us living through an affordable housing crisis that will require BILLIONS of dollars a year in funding for SF to hit its RHNA goals.

I urge you to deliver on the will of the voters, by funding through add-backs and all other means at your disposal the ignored recommendations, which include:

1. \$300,000 to study a new agency to create Public Housing for All. This is add-back request E085 in the Budget Justice Coalition's list.
2. City staffing, feasibility analyses, and NOFAs to study and support innovative social housing models
3. The acquisition of land to build social housing

4. Construction of new social housing
5. Expansion of the Small Sites Program

This would be the second budget cycle in a row where the Mayor has refused to seriously fund social housing. MOHCD has failed to partner meaningfully with the HSFOB on supporting the community's vision for social housing. And it's not for a lack of trying; the HSFOB spent months developing spending recommendations, with community input from grassroots organizations, labor unions, and non-profit housing developers.

I urge you to ensure all unfunded social housing recommendations are incorporated into the FY 2022-23 budget. The voters have spoken, and it's time to deliver on the mandate promised by Props I and K two years ago.

Thank you,  
Giorgia

Giorgia Peckman  
giorgiasage@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94110

**From:** [Connor Kelley](#)  
**To:** [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Urging you to fund social housing, which Mayor Breed ignored  
**Date:** Thursday, June 9, 2022 8:18:21 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Brent Jalipa,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

My name is Connor Kelley and I'm a resident of District 10 in Potrero Hill. I am writing to urge you to fund the social housing recommendations that Mayor Breed refused to include in her proposed budget, through both the add-back process and other financing tools at your disposal.

As you know, voters resoundingly approved November 2020's Prop K to authorize 10,000 units of Public Housing for All, and passed Prop I to raise around \$140 million this upcoming year for social housing. Taken together, Props I and K represent a clear expression from the voters to fund and create social housing: affordable housing for everyone that is focused on working people.

However, the Mayor refused to fund most of the recommendations produced by the Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board (HSFOB). Her proposal also cuts MOHCD's budget by \$52 million, while increasing spending on the Police and Sheriff by \$51 million and \$30 million respectively. This is despite us living through an affordable housing crisis that will require BILLIONS of dollars a year in funding for SF to hit its RHNA goals.

I urge you to deliver on the will of the voters, by funding through add-backs and all other means at your disposal the ignored recommendations, which include:

1. \$300,000 to study a new agency to create Public Housing for All. This is add-back request E085 in the Budget Justice Coalition's list.
2. City staffing, feasibility analyses, and NOFAs to study and support innovative social housing models
3. The acquisition of land to build social housing
4. Construction of new social housing
5. Expansion of the Small Sites Program

This would be the second budget cycle in a row where the Mayor has refused to seriously fund social housing. MOHCD has failed to partner meaningfully with the HSFOB on supporting the community's vision for social housing. And it's not for a lack of trying; the HSFOB spent months developing spending recommendations, with community input from grassroots organizations, labor unions, and non-profit housing developers.

I urge you to ensure all unfunded social housing recommendations are incorporated into the FY 2022-23 budget. The voters have spoken, and it's time to deliver on the mandate promised by Props I and K two years ago.

Thank you,  
Connor Kelley

Connor Kelley  
ckelley876@gmail.com  
829 22nd St  
San Francisco, California 94107

**From:** [Shirley Mei](#)  
**To:** [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Urging you to fund social housing, which Mayor Breed ignored  
**Date:** Thursday, June 9, 2022 8:12:38 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Brent Jalipa,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to fund the social housing recommendations that Mayor Breed refused to include in her proposed budget, through both the add-back process and other financing tools at your disposal.

As you know, voters resoundingly approved November 2020's Prop K to authorize 10,000 units of Public Housing for All, and passed Prop I to raise around \$140 million this upcoming year for social housing. Taken together, Props I and K represent a clear expression from the voters to fund and create social housing: affordable housing for everyone that is focused on working people.

However, the Mayor refused to fund most of the recommendations produced by the Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board (HSFOB). Her proposal also cuts MOHCD's budget by \$52 million, while increasing spending on the Police and Sheriff by \$51 million and \$30 million respectively. This is despite us living through an affordable housing crisis that will require BILLIONS of dollars a year in funding for SF to hit its RHNA goals.

I urge you to deliver on the will of the voters, by funding through add-backs and all other means at your disposal the ignored recommendations, which include:

1. \$300,000 to study a new agency to create Public Housing for All. This is add-back request E085 in the Budget Justice Coalition's list.
2. City staffing, feasibility analyses, and NOFAs to study and support innovative social housing models
3. The acquisition of land to build social housing
4. Construction of new social housing
5. Expansion of the Small Sites Program

This would be the second budget cycle in a row where the Mayor has refused to seriously fund social housing. MOHCD has failed to partner meaningfully with the HSFOB on supporting the community's vision for social housing. And it's not for a lack of trying; the HSFOB spent months developing spending recommendations, with community input from grassroots organizations, labor unions, and non-profit housing developers.

I urge you to ensure all unfunded social housing recommendations are incorporated into the

FY 2022-23 budget. The voters have spoken, and it's time to deliver on the mandate promised by Props I and K two years ago.

Thank you,

Shirley Mei  
mei.shirley@yahoo.com

San Francisco , California 94115



**From:** [Aaron Goodman](#)  
**To:** [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Urging you to fund social housing, which Mayor Breed ignored  
**Date:** Thursday, June 9, 2022 8:12:17 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Brent Jalipa,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to fund the social housing recommendations that Mayor Breed refused to include in her proposed budget, through both the add-back process and other financing tools at your disposal.

As you know, voters resoundingly approved November 2020's Prop K to authorize 10,000 units of Public Housing for All, and passed Prop I to raise around \$140 million this upcoming year for social housing. Taken together, Props I and K represent a clear expression from the voters to fund and create social housing: affordable housing for everyone that is focused on working people.

However, the Mayor refused to fund most of the recommendations produced by the Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board (HSFOB). Her proposal also cuts MOHCD's budget by \$52 million, while increasing spending on the Police and Sheriff by \$51 million and \$30 million respectively. This is despite us living through an affordable housing crisis that will require BILLIONS of dollars a year in funding for SF to hit its RHNA goals.

I urge you to deliver on the will of the voters, by funding through add-backs and all other means at your disposal the ignored recommendations, which include:

1. \$300,000 to study a new agency to create Public Housing for All. This is add-back request E085 in the Budget Justice Coalition's list.
2. City staffing, feasibility analyses, and NOFAs to study and support innovative social housing models
3. The acquisition of land to build social housing
4. Construction of new social housing
5. Expansion of the Small Sites Program
6. Buy back large sites like Stonestown or Parkmerced for stock and needs including possibly SOTA site.

This would be the second budget cycle in a row where the Mayor has refused to seriously fund social housing. MOHCD has failed to partner meaningfully with the HSFOB on supporting the community's vision for social housing. And it's not for a lack of trying; the HSFOB spent months developing spending recommendations, with community input from grassroots

organizations, labor unions, and non-profit housing developers.

I urge you to ensure all unfunded social housing recommendations are incorporated into the FY 2022-23 budget. The voters have spoken, and it's time to deliver on the mandate promised by Props I and K two years ago.

Thank you,

Aaron Goodman  
amgodman@yahoo.com

San Francisco, California 94112

**From:** [Peter Lee](#)  
**To:** [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Urging you to fund social housing, which Mayor Breed ignored  
**Date:** Thursday, June 9, 2022 8:08:09 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Brent Jalipa,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to fund the social housing recommendations that Mayor Breed refused to include in her proposed budget, through both the add-back process and other financing tools at your disposal.

As you know, voters resoundingly approved November 2020's Prop K to authorize 10,000 units of Public Housing for All, and passed Prop I to raise around \$140 million this upcoming year for social housing. Taken together, Props I and K represent a clear expression from the voters to fund and create social housing: affordable housing for everyone that is focused on working people.

However, the Mayor refused to fund most of the recommendations produced by the Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board (HSFOB). Her proposal also cuts MOHCD's budget by \$52 million, while increasing spending on the Police and Sheriff by \$51 million and \$30 million respectively. This is despite us living through an affordable housing crisis that will require BILLIONS of dollars a year in funding for SF to hit its RHNA goals.

I urge you to deliver on the will of the voters, by funding through add-backs and all other means at your disposal the ignored recommendations, which include:

1. \$300,000 to study a new agency to create Public Housing for All. This is add-back request E085 in the Budget Justice Coalition's list.
2. City staffing, feasibility analyses, and NOFAs to study and support innovative social housing models
3. The acquisition of land to build social housing
4. Construction of new social housing
5. Expansion of the Small Sites Program

This would be the second budget cycle in a row where the Mayor has refused to seriously fund social housing. MOHCD has failed to partner meaningfully with the HSFOB on supporting the community's vision for social housing. And it's not for a lack of trying; the HSFOB spent months developing spending recommendations, with community input from grassroots organizations, labor unions, and non-profit housing developers.

I urge you to ensure all unfunded social housing recommendations are incorporated into the

FY 2022-23 budget. The voters have spoken, and it's time to deliver on the mandate promised by Props I and K two years ago.

Thank you,

Peter Lee  
peterboothlee@hotmail.com

San Francisco, California 94118

**From:** [Justin Truong](#)  
**To:** [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Urging you to fund social housing, which Mayor Breed ignored  
**Date:** Thursday, June 9, 2022 8:02:30 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Brent Jalipa,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to fund the social housing recommendations that Mayor Breed refused to include in her proposed budget, through both the add-back process and other financing tools at your disposal.

As you know, voters resoundingly approved November 2020's Prop K to authorize 10,000 units of Public Housing for All, and passed Prop I to raise around \$140 million this upcoming year for social housing. Taken together, Props I and K represent a clear expression from the voters to fund and create social housing: affordable housing for everyone that is focused on working people.

However, the Mayor refused to fund most of the recommendations produced by the Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board (HSFOB). Her proposal also cuts MOHCD's budget by \$52 million, while increasing spending on the Police and Sheriff by \$51 million and \$30 million respectively. This is despite us living through an affordable housing crisis that will require BILLIONS of dollars a year in funding for SF to hit its RHNA goals.

I urge you to deliver on the will of the voters, by funding through add-backs and all other means at your disposal the ignored recommendations, which include:

1. \$300,000 to study a new agency to create Public Housing for All. This is add-back request E085 in the Budget Justice Coalition's list.
2. City staffing, feasibility analyses, and NOFAs to study and support innovative social housing models
3. The acquisition of land to build social housing
4. Construction of new social housing
5. Expansion of the Small Sites Program

This would be the second budget cycle in a row where the Mayor has refused to seriously fund social housing. MOHCD has failed to partner meaningfully with the HSFOB on supporting the community's vision for social housing. And it's not for a lack of trying; the HSFOB spent months developing spending recommendations, with community input from grassroots organizations, labor unions, and non-profit housing developers.

I urge you to ensure all unfunded social housing recommendations are incorporated into the

FY 2022-23 budget. The voters have spoken, and it's time to deliver on the mandate promised by Props I and K two years ago.

Thank you,

Justin Truong  
justintruong56@gmail.com

San Francisco , California 94112

**From:** [Andrea gallardo](#)  
**To:** [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Urging you to fund social housing, which Mayor Breed ignored  
**Date:** Thursday, June 9, 2022 7:50:57 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Brent Jalipa,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to fund the social housing recommendations that Mayor Breed refused to include in her proposed budget, through both the add-back process and other financing tools at your disposal.

As you know, voters resoundingly approved November 2020's Prop K to authorize 10,000 units of Public Housing for All, and passed Prop I to raise around \$140 million this upcoming year for social housing. Taken together, Props I and K represent a clear expression from the voters to fund and create social housing: affordable housing for everyone that is focused on working people.

However, the Mayor refused to fund most of the recommendations produced by the Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board (HSFOB). Her proposal also cuts MOHCD's budget by \$52 million, while increasing spending on the Police and Sheriff by \$51 million and \$30 million respectively. This is despite us living through an affordable housing crisis that will require BILLIONS of dollars a year in funding for SF to hit its RHNA goals.

I urge you to deliver on the will of the voters, by funding through add-backs and all other means at your disposal the ignored recommendations, which include:

1. \$300,000 to study a new agency to create Public Housing for All. This is add-back request E085 in the Budget Justice Coalition's list.
2. City staffing, feasibility analyses, and NOFAs to study and support innovative social housing models
3. The acquisition of land to build social housing
4. Construction of new social housing
5. Expansion of the Small Sites Program

This would be the second budget cycle in a row where the Mayor has refused to seriously fund social housing. MOHCD has failed to partner meaningfully with the HSFOB on supporting the community's vision for social housing. And it's not for a lack of trying; the HSFOB spent months developing spending recommendations, with community input from grassroots organizations, labor unions, and non-profit housing developers.

I urge you to ensure all unfunded social housing recommendations are incorporated into the

FY 2022-23 budget. The voters have spoken, and it's time to deliver on the mandate promised by Props I and K two years ago.

Thank you,

Andrea gallardo  
andreagallrd0@gmail.com

San Francisco , California 94112



**From:** [Tuhina Das](#)  
**To:** [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Urging you to fund social housing, which Mayor Breed ignored  
**Date:** Thursday, June 9, 2022 7:43:17 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Brent Jalipa,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to fund the social housing recommendations that Mayor Breed refused to include in her proposed budget, through both the add-back process and other financing tools at your disposal.

As you know, voters resoundingly approved November 2020's Prop K to authorize 10,000 units of Public Housing for All, and passed Prop I to raise around \$140 million this upcoming year for social housing. Taken together, Props I and K represent a clear expression from the voters to fund and create social housing: affordable housing for everyone that is focused on working people.

However, the Mayor refused to fund most of the recommendations produced by the Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board (HSFOB). Her proposal also cuts MOHCD's budget by \$52 million, while increasing spending on the Police and Sheriff by \$51 million and \$30 million respectively. This is despite us living through an affordable housing crisis that will require BILLIONS of dollars a year in funding for SF to hit its RHNA goals.

I urge you to deliver on the will of the voters, by funding through add-backs and all other means at your disposal the ignored recommendations, which include:

1. \$300,000 to study a new agency to create Public Housing for All. This is add-back request E085 in the Budget Justice Coalition's list.
2. City staffing, feasibility analyses, and NOFAs to study and support innovative social housing models
3. The acquisition of land to build social housing
4. Construction of new social housing
5. Expansion of the Small Sites Program

This would be the second budget cycle in a row where the Mayor has refused to seriously fund social housing. MOHCD has failed to partner meaningfully with the HSFOB on supporting the community's vision for social housing. And it's not for a lack of trying; the HSFOB spent months developing spending recommendations, with community input from grassroots organizations, labor unions, and non-profit housing developers.

I urge you to ensure all unfunded social housing recommendations are incorporated into the

FY 2022-23 budget. The voters have spoken, and it's time to deliver on the mandate promised by Props I and K two years ago.

Thank you,

Tuhina Das  
tuhina22.d@gmail.com  
1354 24th Ave  
San Francisco, California 94122

**From:** [My Hoan Nguyen](#)  
**To:** [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Urging you to fund social housing, which Mayor Breed ignored  
**Date:** Thursday, June 9, 2022 7:42:53 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Brent Jalipa,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to fund the social housing recommendations that Mayor Breed refused to include in her proposed budget, through both the add-back process and other financing tools at your disposal.

As you know, voters resoundingly approved November 2020's Prop K to authorize 10,000 units of Public Housing for All, and passed Prop I to raise around \$140 million this upcoming year for social housing. Taken together, Props I and K represent a clear expression from the voters to fund and create social housing: affordable housing for everyone that is focused on working people.

However, the Mayor refused to fund most of the recommendations produced by the Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board (HSFOB). Her proposal also cuts MOHCD's budget by \$52 million, while increasing spending on the Police and Sheriff by \$51 million and \$30 million respectively. This is despite us living through an affordable housing crisis that will require BILLIONS of dollars a year in funding for SF to hit its RHNA goals.

I urge you to deliver on the will of the voters, by funding through add-backs and all other means at your disposal the ignored recommendations, which include:

1. \$300,000 to study a new agency to create Public Housing for All. This is add-back request E085 in the Budget Justice Coalition's list.
2. City staffing, feasibility analyses, and NOFAs to study and support innovative social housing models
3. The acquisition of land to build social housing
4. Construction of new social housing
5. Expansion of the Small Sites Program

This would be the second budget cycle in a row where the Mayor has refused to seriously fund social housing. MOHCD has failed to partner meaningfully with the HSFOB on supporting the community's vision for social housing. And it's not for a lack of trying; the HSFOB spent months developing spending recommendations, with community input from grassroots organizations, labor unions, and non-profit housing developers.

I urge you to ensure all unfunded social housing recommendations are incorporated into the

FY 2022-23 budget. The voters have spoken, and it's time to deliver on the mandate promised by Props I and K two years ago.

Thank you,

My Hoan Nguyen  
ngynmy@gmail.com

Garberville, California 95542

**From:** [Sarah Mehl](#)  
**To:** [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Urging you to fund social housing, which Mayor Breed ignored  
**Date:** Thursday, June 9, 2022 7:39:51 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Brent Jalipa,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to fund the social housing recommendations that Mayor Breed refused to include in her proposed budget, through both the add-back process and other financing tools at your disposal.

As you know, voters resoundingly approved November 2020's Prop K to authorize 10,000 units of Public Housing for All, and passed Prop I to raise around \$140 million this upcoming year for social housing. Taken together, Props I and K represent a clear expression from the voters to fund and create social housing: affordable housing for everyone that is focused on working people.

However, the Mayor refused to fund most of the recommendations produced by the Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board (HSFOB). Her proposal also cuts MOHCD's budget by \$52 million, while increasing spending on the Police and Sheriff by \$51 million and \$30 million respectively. This is despite us living through an affordable housing crisis that will require BILLIONS of dollars a year in funding for SF to hit its RHNA goals.

I urge you to deliver on the will of the voters, by funding through add-backs and all other means at your disposal the ignored recommendations, which include:

1. \$300,000 to study a new agency to create Public Housing for All. This is add-back request E085 in the Budget Justice Coalition's list.
2. City staffing, feasibility analyses, and NOFAs to study and support innovative social housing models
3. The acquisition of land to build social housing
4. Construction of new social housing
5. Expansion of the Small Sites Program

This would be the second budget cycle in a row where the Mayor has refused to seriously fund social housing. MOHCD has failed to partner meaningfully with the HSFOB on supporting the community's vision for social housing. And it's not for a lack of trying; the HSFOB spent months developing spending recommendations, with community input from grassroots organizations, labor unions, and non-profit housing developers.

I urge you to ensure all unfunded social housing recommendations are incorporated into the

FY 2022-23 budget. The voters have spoken, and it's time to deliver on the mandate promised by Props I and K two years ago.

Thank you,

Sarah Mehl

sarahb.mehl@gmail.com

3416 Taraval St Apt 3

San Francisco, California 94116

**From:** [Bradley Heinz](#)  
**To:** [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Urging you to fund social housing, which Mayor Breed ignored  
**Date:** Thursday, June 9, 2022 7:37:05 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Brent Jalipa,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am a UCSF Medical Student, and I see every day how housing is a crisis for our collective health.

I am writing to urge you to fund the social housing recommendations that Mayor Breed refused to include in her proposed budget, through both the add-back process and other financing tools at your disposal.

As you know, voters resoundingly approved November 2020's Prop K to authorize 10,000 units of Public Housing for All, and passed Prop I to raise around \$140 million this upcoming year for social housing. Taken together, Props I and K represent a clear expression from the voters to fund and create social housing: affordable housing for everyone that is focused on working people.

However, the Mayor refused to fund most of the recommendations produced by the Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board (HSFOB). Her proposal also cuts MOHCD's budget by \$52 million, while increasing spending on the Police and Sheriff by \$51 million and \$30 million respectively. This is despite us living through an affordable housing crisis that will require BILLIONS of dollars a year in funding for SF to hit its RHNA goals.

I urge you to deliver on the will of the voters, by funding through add-backs and all other means at your disposal the ignored recommendations, which include:

1. \$300,000 to study a new agency to create Public Housing for All. This is add-back request E085 in the Budget Justice Coalition's list.
2. City staffing, feasibility analyses, and NOFAs to study and support innovative social housing models
3. The acquisition of land to build social housing
4. Construction of new social housing
5. Expansion of the Small Sites Program

This would be the second budget cycle in a row where the Mayor has refused to seriously fund social housing. MOHCD has failed to partner meaningfully with the HSFOB on supporting the community's vision for social housing. And it's not for a lack of trying; the HSFOB spent months developing spending recommendations, with community input from grassroots

organizations, labor unions, and non-profit housing developers.

I urge you to ensure all unfunded social housing recommendations are incorporated into the FY 2022-23 budget. The voters have spoken, and it's time to deliver on the mandate promised by Props I and K two years ago.

Thank you,

Bradley Heinz  
bradley.heinz@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94114



**From:** [Justin Truong](#)  
**To:** [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Jue, Tyrone \(ENV\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Fund the Climate Action Plan - and get the Hunters Point Shipyard cleanup right (Re: BAC 6/8 Item 4, # 220558)  
**Date:** Thursday, June 9, 2022 7:23:07 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Supervisor Ahsha Safai,

Dear Supervisors,

San Francisco declared a Climate Emergency in 2019, and updated its Climate Action Plan in 2021. Merely publishing the plan does not accomplish the goals. Now, we must begin to take the actions that are outlined in the CAP, and we must do that NOW. Time is running out. It will require planning, courage and money.

I ask you first to fund the Department of the Environment's request for \$11M over two years. And to fund the other requests that community groups have outlined in budget requests which will provide additional funds for street tree planting, clean electrification pilots and incentives for eliminating fossil fuels in buildings and transportation.

I ask you to finally resolve the long-standing issues in Hunter's Point/Bayview with toxic and radioactive contamination which will become even more dangerous with sea level rise, as pointed out in the just-published Civil Grand Jury report.

It is time to act. We must do this work. You must provide the funding. Thank you.

Justin Truong  
justintruong56@gmail.com  
33 Junior Terrace  
San Francisco, California 94112

**From:** [Laksh Bhasin](#)  
**To:** [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Urging you to fund social housing, which Mayor Breed ignored  
**Date:** Thursday, June 9, 2022 12:38:33 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Brent Jalipa,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

My name is Laksh Bhasin and I was a coauthor of November 2020's Proposition K, which authorized 10,000 units of Public Housing for All. I am writing to urge you to fund the social housing recommendations that Mayor Breed refused to include in her proposed budget, through both the add-back process and other financing tools at your disposal.

As you know, voters resoundingly approved Prop K with 74% of the vote, and passed Prop I to raise around \$140 million this upcoming year for social housing. Taken together, Props I and K represent a clear expression from the voters to fund and create social housing: affordable housing for everyone that is focused on working people.

However, the Mayor refused to fund most of the recommendations produced by the Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board (HSFOB). Her proposal also cuts MOHCD's budget by \$52 million, while increasing spending on the Police and Sheriff by \$51 million and \$30 million respectively. This is despite us living through an affordable housing crisis that will require BILLIONS of dollars a year in funding for SF to hit its RHNA goals.

I urge you to deliver on the will of the voters, by funding through add-backs and all other means at your disposal the ignored recommendations, which include:

1. \$300,000 to study a new agency to create Public Housing for All. This is add-back request E085 in the Budget Justice Coalition's list.
2. City staffing, feasibility analyses, and NOFAs to study and support innovative social housing models
3. The acquisition of land to build social housing
4. Construction of new social housing
5. Expansion of the Small Sites Program

This would be the second budget cycle in a row where the Mayor has refused to seriously fund social housing. MOHCD has failed to partner meaningfully with the HSFOB on supporting the community's vision for social housing. And it's not for a lack of trying; the HSFOB spent months developing spending recommendations, with community input from grassroots organizations, labor unions, and non-profit housing developers.

I urge you to ensure all unfunded social housing recommendations are incorporated into the

FY 2022-23 budget. The voters have spoken, and it's time to deliver on the mandate promised by Props I and K two years ago.

Thank you,

Laksh Bhasin

[lakshbhasindeveloper@gmail.com](mailto:lakshbhasindeveloper@gmail.com)

Redwood City, California 94063

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR  
SAN FRANCISCO



RECEIVED  
OFFICE OF SUPERVISORS  
SAN FRANCISCO  
JUN -1 PM 1:20

LONDON N. BREED  
MAYOR

TO: President Shamann Walton, President of the Board of Supervisors  
FROM: Ashley Groffenberger, Mayor's Budget Director  
DATE: June 1, 2022  
RE: 30-Day Waiver Requests

---

President Walton,

The Mayor's Office respectfully requests 30-day hold waivers for the following pieces of trailing legislation:

- Police Code - Fixed Place Outdoor Amplified Sound Permit and License Fees
- Agreement Amendment – Francisco Park Agreement
- Accept and Expend Grants - Recurring State Grant Funds - Department of Public Health – FY 2022-2023
- Administrative Code - Deputy Fire Chiefs
- Retroactive Accept and Expend Grant - State of California - #CaliforniansForAll Youth Jobs Corps Program Grant - Up to \$11,790,072
- Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, operating as Successor Agency to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, Fiscal Year 2022-23 Budget – Bond Issuance Not to Exceed \$99,680,000
- Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, operating as Successor Agency to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, Fiscal Year 2022-23 Interim Budget
- Homelessness and Supportive Housing Fund - FYs 2022-2023 and 2023-2024 Expenditure Plan
- Administrative Code - Reproduction and Notary Fees - Department of Administrative Services
- Administrative Code - Police Vehicle Theft Crime Fund Surcharge
- Resolution Adjusting the Access Line Tax with the Consumer Price Index of 2022
- Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund Tax Designation Ceiling
- Ordinance Authorizing Tax-Exempt and/or Taxable Certificates of Participation (Multiple Capital Improvement Projects) - Not to Exceed \$140,000,000
- Business and Tax Regulations, Health Codes - Emergency Medical Services Fees
- Trial Courts Courthouse Construction Fund - Rescission of Superior Court Surcharges for Court Construction
- Health Code - Patient Rates for Fiscal Years 2022-2023 and 2023-2024
- Park Code - Marina West Harbor Fees

Should you have any questions, please contact Tom Paulino at 415-554-6153.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'A. Groffenberger', followed by a horizontal line.

Ashley Groffenberger  
Mayor's Budget Director



President, Board of Supervisors  
District 10

City and County of San  
Francisco

---

**SHAMANN WALTON**

---

**MEMORANDUM**

---

DATE: June 6, 2022

TO: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors  
Board of Supervisors Legislative Division

FROM: President Shamann Walton

CC: Anne Pearson, Deputy City Attorney  
Tom Paulino, Mayor's Office

SUBJECT: **30-Day Waivers Granted for Budget Related Items**

---

Dear Madam Clerk and Legislative Division Staff,

I am hereby granting the 30-day waiver request for the following Budget related items introduced and requested by the Mayor on June 1, 2022:

- 220666 Proposed Interim Budget and Appropriation Ordinance for Departments - FYs 2022-2023 and 2023-2024
- 220667 Proposed Interim Annual Salary Ordinance - FYs 2022-2023 and 2023-2024
- 220669 Budget and Appropriation Ordinance for Departments - FYs 2022-2023 and 2023-2024
- 220670 Annual Salary Ordinance - FYs 2022-2023 and 2023-2024
- 220678 Police Code - Fixed Place Outdoor Amplified Sound Permit and License Fees
- 220679 Administrative Code - Deputy Fire Chiefs
- 220680 Administrative Code - Police Vehicle Theft Crime Fund Surcharge
- 220681 Administrative Code - Reproduction and Notary Fees - Department of Administrative Services
- 220682 Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund Tax Designation Ceiling
- 220683 Ordinance Authorizing Tax-Exempt and/or Taxable Certificates of Participation (Multiple Capital Improvement Projects) - Not to Exceed \$140,000,000
- 220684 Business and Tax Regulations, Health Codes - Emergency Medical Services Fees
- 220685 Trial Courts Courthouse Construction Fund - Rescission of Superior Court Surcharges for Court Construction
- 220686 Health Code - Patient Rates for Fiscal Years 2022-2023 and 2023-2024
- 220687 Park Code - Marina West Harbor Fees

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR  
SAN FRANCISCO



RECEIVED  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
SAN FRANCISCO  
LONDON N. BREED  
MAYOR  
JUN -1 PM 1:19

BY                     

To: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors  
From: Ashley Groffenberger, Mayor's Budget Director  
Date: June 1, 2022  
Re: Mayor's FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24 Budget Submission

---

Madam Clerk,

In accordance with City and County of San Francisco Charter, Article IX, Section 9.100, the Mayor's Office hereby submits the Mayor's proposed budget by June 1<sup>st</sup>, corresponding legislation, and related materials for Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-23 and FY 2023-24.

In addition to the Mayor's Proposed FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24 Budget Book, the following items are included in the Mayor's submission:

- The Annual Appropriation Ordinance and Annual Salary Ordinance, along with Administrative Provisions
- The proposed budget for the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure for FY 2022-23
- 28 separate pieces of trailing legislation (see list attached)
- A Transfer of Function letter detailing the transfer of positions from one City department to another
- An Interim Exception letter
- A letter addressing funding levels for nonprofit corporations or public entities for the coming two fiscal years
- Memo to the Board President requesting for 30-day rule waivers on ordinances
- A list of technical adjustments to the budgets for select departments submitted on May 1

Please note the following:

- Technical adjustments to the June 1 budget are being prepared, but are not submitted with this set of materials.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "A. Groffenberger", followed by a horizontal line.

Ashley Groffenberger  
Mayor's Budget Director

cc: Members of the Board of Supervisors  
Budget & Legislative Analyst's Office  
Controller

| DEPT | Item                                                     | Description                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Type of Legislation | File # |
|------|----------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|--------|
| ADM  | Critical Repair/Recovery Stimulus COPs                   | Authorizes COPs to finance or refinance the capital plan in the budget.                                                                                                                                         | Ordinance           |        |
| ADM  | Entertainment Commission Fee Changes                     | Fee decrease for fixed speakers due to the Commission's "Just Add Music" initiative.                                                                                                                            | Ordinance           |        |
| ADM  | Reproduction and Notary Fee Changes                      | Fee increase for a variety of printing and scanning services at the Permit Center.                                                                                                                              | Ordinance           |        |
| ADM  | Prop J Continuation                                      | Moscone Convention Center.                                                                                                                                                                                      | Resolution          |        |
| ADM  | Prop J Continuation                                      | Fleet security services.                                                                                                                                                                                        | Resolution          |        |
| ADM  | Prop J Continuation                                      | Real estate security services.                                                                                                                                                                                  | Resolution          |        |
| ADM  | Prop J Continuation                                      | Real estate custodial services.                                                                                                                                                                                 | Resolution          |        |
| BOS  | Prop J Continuation                                      | Budget Legislative Analyst (BLA).                                                                                                                                                                               | Resolution          |        |
| CAT  | Courthouse Construction Fund                             | The Board adopted an ordinance last year terminating the Fund, which was established in 1992, because the courthouse construction project is complete and fully financed. This ordinance completes the process. | Ordinance           |        |
| CON  | Access Line Tax                                          | Sets Access Line Tax. Revenues assumed in budget.                                                                                                                                                               | Resolution          |        |
| CON  | Neighborhood Beautification Fund                         | Neighborhood Beautification Fund contribution levels assumed in budget.                                                                                                                                         | Ordinance           |        |
| DEM  | EMSA Fee Changes                                         | Changing the fee structure for EMSA fees that are charged to hospitals.                                                                                                                                         | Ordinance           |        |
| DPH  | Recurring State Grants                                   | Accept and expend for annual, recurring state grant funds.                                                                                                                                                      | Resolution          |        |
| DPH  | Patient Rates                                            | Amending the Health Code to set patient rates and rates for other services provided by the Department of Public Health.                                                                                         | Ordinance           |        |
| DPH  | Prop J Continuation                                      | Clinic security services.                                                                                                                                                                                       | Resolution          |        |
| DPW  | Prop J Continuation                                      | Security services.                                                                                                                                                                                              | Resolution          |        |
| FIR  | Organizational Changes in the City's Administrative Code | Changing the City's Administrative Code to transition the Chief of EMS position up a Deputy Chief position.                                                                                                     | Ordinance           |        |
| HRC  | State Grant Acceptance                                   | Acceptance of the state-funded California for All grant for the Opportunities for All program.                                                                                                                  | Resolution          |        |
| HSA  | Prop J Continuation                                      | Security services.                                                                                                                                                                                              | Resolution          |        |
| HSH  | CAAP Legislation                                         | Annual legislation for CAAP housing with funding from HSA.                                                                                                                                                      | Resolution          |        |
| HSH  | Prop J Continuation                                      | Security services.                                                                                                                                                                                              | Resolution          |        |
| MYR  | Prop J Continuation                                      | Security services.                                                                                                                                                                                              | Resolution          |        |



|     |                                            |                                                                                                                          |            |  |
|-----|--------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|--|
| POL | Police Vehicle Theft Crime Fund Surcharge  | Increasing the car registration surcharge. Funds will be used to deter, investigate, or prosecute vehicle theft crimes.  | Ordinance  |  |
| REC | Marina Dredging Surcharge                  | Imposing a surcharge to license fees at Marina West Harbor to pay for necessary dredging at the Harbor.                  | Ordinance  |  |
| REC | Francisco Park Conservancy Grant Agreement | Credits the Francisco Park Conservancy to offset unanticipated project cost increases incurred due to PG&E requirements. | Resolution |  |
| REG | Prop J Continuation                        | Assembly of vote by mail envelope services.                                                                              | Resolution |  |
| SHF | Prop J Continuation                        | Food services at county jails.                                                                                           | Resolution |  |
| TIS | Prop J Continuation                        | Mainframe system support.                                                                                                | Resolution |  |