August 17, 2018

The Honorable Terri L. Jackson
Presiding Judge, Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco
400 McAllister Street, Room 008
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Judge Jackson:

Pursuant to Penal Code sections 933 and 933.05, the following is in reply to the 2017-18 San Francisco Civil Grand Jury reports, Open Source Voting in San Francisco and Accessory Dwelling Units and Modular Housing. We would like to thank the Civil Grand Jury for their work.

The Civil Grand Jury's reports provided important findings and recommendations on each of the topics reported on in this session. We will use this work to inform future audit and project planning and communication with leadership, stakeholders, and the public on these issues.

If you have any questions about this response, please contact me or Deputy Controller Todd Rydstrom at 415-554-7500.

Respectfully submitted,

Ben Rosenfield
Controller

cc: Todd Rydstrom
Civil Grand Jury Report: Open Source Voting in San Francisco

Required Responses to Recommendations 5 and 6:

Recommendation 5

R5. Recommends the Office of the Controller set up a process to trigger review of city RFPs that only receive one bidder, and, when feasible, perform a market analysis to determine why the procurement process has not induced participation of additional vendors. This process should be in place by April 1, 2019. (F5, F6)

Response

Will not be implemented; Not warranted or reasonable.

The San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 21, Acquisition of Commodities and Services, already requires the City's Contracting Officers to "review solicitations to determine whether the solicitation could be altered and reissued in a manner that would be likely to attract responsive offers". Also, Administrative Code Chapter 6 provides guidance for construction and professional services contracting. Specifically, Section 6.23 (c), Procedure Upon Rejection or Failure of Bids, provides guidance to Department Heads on appropriate actions to take for no or one bid. Further, the Office of the Controller already conducts audits and investigations of the City's contracting procedures, including those relating to the Requests for Proposals process in fulfillment of the San Francisco Charter, Appendix F, Section F.1.106.

Recommendation 6

R6. Recommends the Office of the Controller evaluate the premium San Francisco pays for its Voting System compared to (1) the price paid by other California counties that use Ranked Choice Voting, and (2) the price paid by California counties that do not use RCV, and (3) the price paid by cities/Counties outside of California who use RCV. This analysis should be published by April 1, 2019. (F5, F6)

Response

Requires further analysis.

Based on the Office of Controller's preliminary analysis, there are no California counties using Ranked Choice Voting at this time. Moreover, Secretary of State has only approved Dominion's voting system for conducting ranked-choice voting elections. The Office of Controller's Office has identified the following non-California jurisdictions that currently use Ranked Choice Voting and could be used for future analysis, if needed:

- Basalt, CO
- Cambridge, MA
- Minneapolis, MN
- State of Maine
- Portland, ME
- Santa Fe, NM
- St. Louis Park, MN
- St. Paul, MN
- Takoma Park, MD
- Telluride, CO
Civil Grand Jury Report: Accessory Dwelling Units and Modular Housing

Required Responses to Recommendation 6:

Recommendation 6. Recommends the Department of Building Inspection work with the Department of the Controller to develop meaningful, outcome-based performance metrics on ADU permit approval duration, to be reported on OpenData starting January 2019. (F3, F4)

Response: The recommendation has not been, but will be, implemented in the future.

We will work with the Department of Building Inspection to develop one or more metrics on permitting of ADUs by January 2019. Depending on the data sources, content or related factors, we may publish such metrics in the Performance Scorecard section of the Controller’s website, or in another accessible format, to be determined in consultation with stakeholders.