October 14, 2016

The Honorable John K. Stewart
Presiding Judge
Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco
400 McAllister Street
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Judge Stewart:


The Board of Supervisors Government Audit and Oversight Committee conducted a public hearing on September 1, 2016, to discuss the findings and recommendations of the Civil Grand Jury and the departments’ responses to the Report.

The following City departments submitted a response to the Civil Grand Jury (copies enclosed):

- City Attorney’s Office, received July 29, 2016
- District Attorney’s Office, received August 19, 2016
- Mayor’s Office submitted a consolidated response for the Mayor’s Office of Public Policy and Finance, Mayor’s Office of Legislative and Government Affairs, Office of the City Administrator (respectively the Office of Civic Engagement and Immigrant Affairs), Planning Department, Police Department, Public Works, and the Department of Technology, received on August 19, 2016

The Report was heard in Committee, and Resolution No. 389-16 was prepared for the Board of Supervisors’ approval that formally accepted or rejected the findings and recommendations. The Board of Supervisors provided the required response on September 13, 2016 (copy enclosed).

If you have any questions, please contact Erica Major at (415) 554-4441.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board
c: Members, Board of Supervisors
   Honorable John K. Stewart, Presiding Judge
   Kathie Lowry, 2016-2017 San Francisco Civil Grand Jury
   Kitsaun King, 2016-2017 San Francisco Civil Grand Jury
   Jay Cunningham, 2015-2016 San Francisco Civil Grand Jury
   Alison Scott, 2015-2016 San Francisco Civil Grand Jury
   Kate Howard, Mayor’s Office
   Kelly Kirkpatrick, Mayor’s Office
   Nicole Elliott, Mayor’s Office
   Ben Rosenfield, Office of the Controller
   Todd Rydstrom, Office of the Controller
   Asja Steeves, Office of the Controller
   Jon Givner, City Attorney’s Office
   Toney D. Chaplin, Police Department
   Christine Fountain, Police Department
   Mohammed Nuru, Public Works
   Frank Lee, Public Works
   John Rahaim, Planning Department
   AnMarie Rodgers, Planning Department
   Adrienne Pon, Office of Civic Engagement and Immigrant Affairs
   Melissa Chan, Office of Civic Engagement and Immigrant Affairs
   Miguel Gamino, Department of Technology
   David German, Department of Technology
   Severin Campbell, Budget and Legislative Analyst
   Debra Newman, Budget and Legislative Analyst
   Jadie Wasilco, Budget and Legislative Analyst
[Board Response - Civil Grand Jury - Auto Burglary in San Francisco]

Resolution responding to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court on the findings and recommendations contained in the 2015-2016 Civil Grand Jury Report, entitled "Auto Burglary in San Francisco," and urging the Mayor to cause the implementation of accepted findings and recommendations through his/her department heads and through the development of the annual budget. (Government Audit and Oversight Committee)

9/13/2016 Board of Supervisors - ADOPTED
   Ayes: 11 - Avalos, Breed, Campos, Cohen, Farrell, Kim, Mar, Peskin, Tang, Wiener and Yee

9/22/2016 Mayor - APPROVED

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

CLERK'S CERTIFICATE
I do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution is a full, true, and correct copy of the original thereof on file in this office.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the official seal of the City and County of San Francisco.

October 12, 2016
Date

Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board
[Board Response - Civil Grand Jury - Auto Burglary in San Francisco]

Resolution responding to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court on the findings and recommendations contained in the 2015-2016 Civil Grand Jury Report, entitled “Auto Burglary in San Francisco;” and urging the Mayor to cause the implementation of accepted findings and recommendations through his/her department heads and through the development of the annual budget.

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

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

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

WHEREAS, In accordance with San Francisco Administrative Code, Section 2.10(b), the Controller must report to the Board of Supervisors on the implementation of recommendations that pertain to fiscal matters that were considered at a public hearing held by a Board of Supervisors Committee; and
WHEREAS, The 2015-2016 Civil Grand Jury Report, entitled "Auto Burglary in San Francisco" (Report) is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 160612, which is hereby declared to be a part of this Resolution as if set forth fully herein; and

WHEREAS, The Civil Grand Jury has requested that the Board of Supervisors respond to Finding Nos. F.A.1, F.C.1 and F.F.1, as well as, Recommendation Nos. R.A.1, R.C.1, R.D.5, R.E.3.d and R.F.1 contained in the subject Report; and

WHEREAS, Finding No. F.A.1 states: "While the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) command staff has steadily added qualified officers to a new centralized unit, known as the Patrol Bureau Task Force, the unit will not be fully effective until it is outfitted with appropriate vehicles (vehicles not easily identified as City-owned cars) for surveillance;" and

WHEREAS, Finding No. F.C.1 states: "Complicated cases involving prolific auto burglars are specially handled by three different units: the reviewing Assistant District Attorney (ADA) of auto crimes, the Gang Unit, and the Crime Strategies Unit. Each unit’s unique perspective may impede the pooling of information needed to develop best practices for prosecuting organized criminals;" and

WHEREAS, Finding No. F.F.1 states: "Visitors/tourists, often targeted for crime, have unique needs that can often be foreseen and prepared for by victims’ services organizations;" and

WHEREAS, Recommendation No. R.A.1 states: "Ensure the Patrol Bureau Task Force (PBTF) has adequate resources, including investigators, a dedicated crime analyst, and necessary vehicles, equipment, and technology to expand surveillance and apprehension;" and

WHEREAS, Recommendation No. R.C.1 states: "Establish a serial crimes unit as a counterpart to the SFPD’s Patrol Unit Task Force and its future serial crimes unit (R.A.5.). The
unit's mission would be to prosecute cross-district, serial property crimes by organized career criminals;” and

WHEREAS, Recommendation No. R.D.5 states: “Require the District Attorney to present to the Government Audit and Oversight (GAO) Committee the comparative analysis (R.D.4) and annual report (R.C.3.) of the crime strategies unit, including significant findings and recommendations;” and

WHEREAS, Recommendation No. R.E.3.d states: “Support funding to expand the Community Ambassador's Program;” and

WHEREAS, Recommendation No. R.F.1 states: “Use the customary legislative process to review, vet, refine and vote to approve a resolution for a visitor and tourist protection and assistance program;” and

WHEREAS, in accordance with California Penal Code, Section 933.05(c), the Board of Supervisors must respond, within 90 days of receipt, to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court on Finding Nos. F.A.1, F.C.1 and F.F.1, as well as, Recommendation Nos. R.A.1, R.C.1, R.D.5, R.E.3.d and R.F.1 contained in the Report; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court that they agree with Finding No. F.A.1 for the reasons as stated in the Mayor's response to the Civil Grand Jury; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that they disagree partially with Finding No. F.C.1 for reasons as follows: Units that review cases are in frequent communication. Moreover, the unique perspectives of the reviewing Assistant District Attorney of auto crimes, the gang unit and crime strategies unit improve collaboration of pooling information to develop best practices for prosecuting organized criminals; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that they agree with Finding No. F.F.1; and, be it
FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that Recommendation No. R.A.1 has been implemented for reasons as follows: SFPD evaluates staffing levels of all divisions within the department as part of its budget development process each year. Staffing evaluation includes additional staffing and investigators to PBTF. SFPD has met with vendors and is evaluating additional equipment and technology to enhance the operations of PBTF that could be requested in connection with future budget requests. SFPD plans to allocate crime analysts to the investigations division which includes PBTF in the next three months; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that Recommendation No. R.C.1 has been implemented and will be further expanded for reasons as follows: In the summer of 2015 the crime strategies unit initiated the security camera interactive map project; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that Recommendation No. R.D.5 has been and will continue to be implemented as evidence of the comprehensive presentation of the District Attorney's Office at the September 1, 2016, Government Audit and Oversight Committee; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that Recommendation No. R.E.3.d has been implemented for reasons as follows: Relative to Community Benefit Districts this recommendation has been and will continue to be implemented and expanded; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that Recommendation No. R.F.1 will not be implemented for reasons as follows: It is not necessary to use the legislative process necessarily to accomplish these goals for a tourist protection and assistance program; and, be it
FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors urges the Mayor to cause the implementation of the accepted findings and recommendations through his/her department heads and through the development of the annual budget.