AMENDED IN COMMITTEE
9/17/2026

FILE NO. 260722 RESOLUTION NO. 554-26

[Board Response - Civil Grand Jury Report – Fog of Warning: San Francisco's Warning System That Warns but Doesn't Inform]

Resolution responding to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court on the findings and recommendations contained in the 2025-2026 Civil Grand Jury Report, entitled "Fog of Warning: San Francisco's Warning System That Warns but Doesn't Inform;" and urging the Mayor to cause the implementation of accepted findings and recommendations through his 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 2025-2026 Civil Grand Jury Report, entitled "Fog of Warning: San Francisco's Warning System That Warns but Doesn't Inform" ("Report") is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 260722, 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. F14, F15, and F16, as well as Recommendation No. R6, contained in the subject Report; and

WHEREAS, Finding No. F14 states: "The resources dedicated to growing and maintaining AlertSF do not reflect the system's stated operational role as the foundation of the city's opt-in alerting;" and

WHEREAS, Finding No. F15 states: "No standing strategy exists for reaching visitors or commuters beyond event-specific campaigns;" and

WHEREAS, Finding No. F16 states: "No unified, mobile-first, multilingual public destination exists for emergency information;" and

WHEREAS, Recommendation No. R6 states: "By 1 July 2028, the Mayor and Board of Supervisors should determine whether to resource AlertSF to the extent set forth in DEM's study and, if not, determine what steps would be necessary for an AlertSF growth strategy;" 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. F14, F15, and F16, as well as Recommendation No. R6, contained in the subject 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. F14 for the following reasons: the funds dedicated to growing AlertSF audience do not reflect the system's importance; however, this is not the entire story. DEM's leadership itself has also not prioritized audience growth, putting expanded Watch Center coverage ahead in priority; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court that they agree with Finding No. F15 for the following reasons: DEM has not laid out any standing strategy for reaching visitors or commuters beyond event-specific campaigns; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court that they agree with Finding No. F16 for the following reasons: No unified, mobile-first, multilingual public destination exists for emergency information; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that Recommendation No. R6 will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable. This recommendation will be addressed in the City's annual budget process; 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 department heads and through the development of the annual budget.

City and County of San Francisco
Tails
Resolution

City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

File Number: 260722 **Date Passed:** September 29, 2026

Resolution responding to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court on the findings and recommendations contained in the 2025-2026 Civil Grand Jury Report, entitled "FOG OF WARNING: San Francisco's Warning System That Warns but Doesn't Inform;" and urging the Mayor to cause the implementation of accepted findings and recommendations through his department heads and through the development of the annual budget.

September 17, 2026 Government Audit and Oversight Committee - AMENDED, AN AMENDMENT OF THE WHOLE BEARING SAME TITLE

September 17, 2026 Government Audit and Oversight Committee - RECOMMENDED AS AMENDED

September 29, 2026 Board of Supervisors - ADOPTED

Ayes: 11 - Chan, Chen, Dorsey, Fielder, Mahmood, Mandelman, Melgar, Sauter, Sherrill, Walton and Wong

File No. 260722

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was ADOPTED on 9/29/2026 by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board

Unsigned

Daniel Lurie
Mayor

10/09/2026

Date Approved

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution, not being signed by the Mayor within the time limit as set forth in Section 3.103 of the Charter, or time waived pursuant to Board Rule 2.14.2, became effective without his approval in accordance with the provision of said Section 3.103 of the Charter or Board Rule 2.14.2.

Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board

10/09/2026

Date

File No. 260722