



CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

DANIEL LURIE
MAYOR

Minutes of Special Meeting June 18, 2026

3:00 p.m.
Room 408, CITY HALL
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place

This meeting will be held in person at the location listed above. Members of the public may attend the meeting to observe and provide public comment at the physical meeting location listed above or by calling (415) 655-0001 and entering meeting id #2662 327 3259. Instructions for providing remote public comment are below.

LISTEN/PUBLIC COMMENT CALL-IN
USA is (415) 655-0001 | Access Code: #2662 327 3259
Press # twice to listen to the meeting via audio conference
Dial *3 when you are ready to queue

DANIEL LURIE, MAYOR

COMMISSIONERS

KATE FAVETTI
President
JACQUELINE MINOR
Vice President
THERESA M. LEE
VITUS LEUNG
ADAM WOOD

SANDRA ENG
Executive Officer

The public is encouraged to submit comments in advance of the meeting by email at civilservice@sfgov.org, or by voicemail message at the CSC Office main line at (628) 652-1100. Comments submitted by 5:00 pm the Friday before the meeting will be included in the record. **Effective January 1, 2025, public comment received by email or voicemail at least three hours prior to the start of a meeting will be provided to the members of the Civil Service Commission and will be posted on the Civil Service Commission website. These public comments will no longer be read aloud at meetings.** During commission meetings, members of the public may use the Civil Service Commission's dedicated public comment line (415) 655-0001, Access Code #2662 327 3259

I. CALL TO ORDER

3:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

President Kate Favetti	Present
Vice President Jacqueline P. Minor	Present
Commissioner Theresa M. Lee	Present
Commissioner Vitus Leung	Present
Commissioner Adam Wood	Present

President Kate Favetti presided.

II. REQUEST TO SPEAK ON ANY MATTER WITHIN THE JURISDICTION OF THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION BUT NOT APPEARING ON TODAY’S AGENDA

None.

III. ELECTION OF OFFICERS (File No. 0104-26-1) – Action Item

June 1, 2026: Postpone to the special meeting of June 18, 2026.

Speaker: Sandra Eng, Executive Director

Action: President Kate Favetti was elected as President for the term effective July 1, 2026 through June 30, 2027. (Vote of 5 to 0)

Action: Vice President Jacqueline P. Minor was elected as Vice President for the term effective July 1, 2026 through June 30, 2027. (Vote of 5 to 0)

IV. Review of Request for Approval of Proposed Personal Services Contract
#DHRPSC0006234 v0.01 from the Department of Building Inspection.

PSC	Department	Amount	Type of Service	Type of Approval	Duration
DHRPSC 0006234 – v0.01	Building Inspection	\$6,500,000	This request formalizes and expands the professional services framework for PermitSF Portal, the City's enterprise-wide permitting and licensing initiative powered by the OpenGov Cloud platform. OpenGov is a specialized, proprietary Software-as-a-Service (SaaS) "Public Service Platform" designed specifically for government agencies to replace fragmented legacy systems with a unified, digital "front door" for residents and businesses. Following an initial pilot phase that successfully launched the first five permit types (e.g., door/window replacements and fire alarms), the Department is now transitioning to a long-term implementation model. Services will be managed via a new Task Order process, where each departmental engagement is treated as a discrete phase following a hybrid agile-waterfall process. The immediate priority is the Construction Permitting phase, involving complex technical discovery and the migration of high-impact engineering workflows.	New	72 months

May 4, 2026: Continued to the meeting of May 18, 2026.

May 18, 2026: Following discussion and questions to the department, the Commission voted to continue to a future Special Meeting.

Speakers: Rebecca Mayer, Department of Building Inspection
Sarah Dennis Phillips, San Francisco Planning
Elizabeth Watty, San Francisco Planning
Emily Wallace, IFPTE Local 21
Teddy Sherbin, Employee/IFPTE Local 21 member
Ron Butler, Employee/IFPTE Local 21 member
Carol Isen, Human Resources Director

Action: Adopted the report. Approved the request for proposed Personal Services Contract #DHRPSC0006234 v0.01, notify the Office of the Controller and the Office of Contract Administration subject to: 1. Six-month intervals reporting back to the Commission, with the first report due in January 2027. The reporting back will include knowledge transfer, staffing plan including the transfer of work back to the city where appropriate, 2. Continuing discussions with the affected employee organizations, consideration by the appointing officer of embedding within the organizational structure a permanent labor/management communication team (e.g. – joint labor/management) and 3. As part the report back every six-months indicate the status of the ongoing discussions with the employee organizations.
(Vote of 4 to 1; Commissioner Wood dissents)

Public Comment:

Jeff Speirs, I've worked with the Planning Department for twelve years and I'm also a delegate and steward with Local 21. I want to start off with just thank you for allowing us to have this second chance to meet with you. I know that, you know, it's really important that this commission exists for this specific reason, everything has been so fast with Permit SF, so fast with OpenGov, for you to force the two sides to meet, was massively beneficial and I want to thank you for that. Having the department and our department leadership and Permit SF leadership slow down to think things through has not only helped us understand a lot of things, but it shows much is lacking in protecting public work and exposing a lot of the issues that still exist. A lot of planners are working on these things, but they're not technical staff. The real issue with this scope of work that is being contracted out is back-of-house related. It's not front-of-house related. Working through different permits and how each planner working with the software is going to approve things. That's not the issue at all. What terminology is used, how items are classified in the system as we use the software and the different permit types allowed; these are back-of-house issues. I really would like more time for my colleagues, the actual experts, to inform you more about why OpenGov and the process were selected. It has been just way too fast and OpenGov, as it exists right now, there's nothing in the contract that we've been able to see that would secure a transfer of knowledge back to our IT staff. It's a one-way door at this point. I would like to recommend that, and I think you all have the facts to back yourselves up with a denial of this vote, but we don't know what's actually going to be promised until it's in the contract, so we would like you to, if you can't deny it today postpone it four weeks until the contract is done so we all have an accurate read on what's been included in that contract. There shouldn't be rushed. We are stewards of this long-term investment and the future of this work. So please either deny or continue for four weeks so that we can actually see what's in this contract and continue to work with the department on what we can include in that contract to protect city jobs and union work. Thank you. I really appreciate you taking the time.

Jessica Nuti, IFPTE Local 21, I'm one of the union organizers. Today I'm here to stand in solidarity with our members that are trying to protect their work from being descaled and privatized. Ahead of any department submitting to the Civil Service Commission on a contract, they must provide specific things. 1. they must identify the scope of work, 2. they have to demonstrate that the work cannot be reasonably performed by civil service employees, 3. they have to notify unions and show that they've notified unions, and 4. justify the contract duration. We stand here today with what we know through the meetings that we had, I was there on the Tuesday meeting that was 2 hours long. I really think that it did start getting juices flowing, which is great. But the things that we know coming out of that is 1. the department agrees that it's Local 21's work, 2. management has not been able to demonstrate that the work cannot be done in house, but rather has shown us that a contractor will be doing Local 21 work and also have no commitment or solid reassurance that there is a proper knowledge transfer back to our members and having this contract move forward has a risk of indefinitely descaling our members profession, 3. management has not provided any reassurances that are actually trackable and enforceable, nor would they demonstrate that the descaling or elimination of our city employees could potentially happen, 4. management has not confirmed

in writing, its plans to minimize or descale their dependence on the contractor, but rather see that this is going to be an ongoing dependence with this specific contractor that has created roadblocks for our members to do their work. This commission has the responsibility to ensure that contracting out does not circumvent the civil service system. Before moving forward, the city should demonstrate that this contract will not displace our bargaining unit work; nor the erosion of professional skills or the transfer of expertise from public servants to private consultants. IPTE Local 21 is not in opposition to modernization. In fact, our members acknowledge they are excited to do so, and they want to be able to serve San Francisco residents to their best capability. Local 21 supports technical tools that help city employees do their jobs more effectively, but technology should support the workforce, not replace it. City staff should be trained and empowered to perform the work internally rather than creating long-term dependence on a private contractor. Nothing we're asking today is out of the scope. And the department themselves have said that they could commit to some of these things, but we need more than just verbal assurance. We need something written, enforceable, and we respectfully ask you to vote this down. Thank you.

Teddy Sherbin, Planning Department and Local 21. As I think you've heard, there currently is no plan for this contract and something I find ironic for the planning department. They confirmed today they are making up the roadmap as they go. As they've said, they don't know what permits are going into the system from which department. As they know, because I've told them, the system as it stands today fundamentally cannot onboard public works permits without degrading the existing service. There is no staffing plan. You saw a bunch of boxes with colors. This last staffing plan they shared, including many people I know, aren't involved in the project, including the team member they removed from the project and another data expert that they fired. It's funny they mentioned Raymond Yip will be joining the project now. This week I found out I'm being removed from Raymond Yip's team. The timing is suspect based on my involvement in this OpenGov conversation. If you request periodic staffing plans, you better review them in detail because their definition of part of the project is very loose and they will put disagreeable staff in a corner as they've done with a large number of my peers in the past, and as I'm worried they're doing with me right now, there frankly is no scope of work for you to review here today. Please reject this PSC and let our leaders take the time that they should take to build a plan and get this right. Thank you.

V. ADJOURNMENT

5:19 p.m.