



**BUILDING INSPECTION COMMISSION (BIC)
Department of Building Inspection (DBI)**

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, June 18, 2025 at 10:30 a.m.

City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 416

Watch SF Cable Channel 78/Watch www.sfgovtv.org

WATCH: <https://bit.ly/4mEfy18>

PUBLIC COMMENT CALL-IN: 1-415-655-0001 / Access Code: 2663 786 4375

ADOPTED JULY 16, 2025

MINUTES

1. Call to Order and Roll Call.

The regular meeting of the Building Inspection Commission was called to order at 9:33 a.m., and a quorum was certified.

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

Alysabeth Alexander-Tut, **President**

Catherine Meng, **Vice President**

Dan Calamuci, **Commissioner**

Evita Chavez, **Commissioner**

Bianca Neumann, **Commissioner**

Kavin Williams, **Commissioner**

Sonya Harris, **Secretary**

Monique Mustapha, **Assistant Secretary**

D.B.I. REPRESENTATIVES:

Patrick O’Riordan, **Director**

Christine Gasparac, **Assistant Director**

Matthew Greene, **Deputy Director, Inspection Services**

Alex Koskinen, **Deputy Director, Administrative Services**

Tate Hanna, **Legislative & Public Affairs Manager**

CITY ATTORNEY REPRESENTATIVE:

Peter Miljanich, **Deputy City Attorney**

2. President’s opening remarks.

President Alexander-Tut said congratulations to DBI staff for all of their accomplishments the past year and announced some of the agenda items would be called out of order. Item #5 would be heard at 10:30 a.m. and items 3, 4, 6, 8 & 9 would be heard first until 10:25 a.m. and the Board would possibly take a break to avoid any interruptions during an item and to give item #7 the attention it deserved. She thanked the members of the public for attending and said although the budget was not being heard the fees were before the board today. The budget and fees were statements of mandates of the department and our values and the Commission was proud of the work the Department did to stabilize funding and the work would continue to reflect the Department and the values of San Francisco. Also, an update on PermitSF would be heard from a member of the Mayor’s office at item #5.

3. Election of Vice-President of the Building Inspection Commission.

Commissioner Williams nominated Commissioner Meng for Vice President of the Building Inspection Commission, seconded by President Alexander-Tut.

There was no public comment.

Roll Call Vote by Commission Secretary Harris:

President Alexander-Tut	Yes
Commissioner Calamuci	Yes
Commissioner Chavez	Yes
Commissioner Meng	Yes
Commissioner Neumann	Yes
Commissioner Williams	Yes

The motion carried unanimously.

RESOLUTION NO. 055-25

4. General Public Comment: The BIC will take public comment on matters within the Commission’s jurisdiction that are not part of this agenda.

There was no general public comment.

5. Update on PermitSF.

Housing and Economic Development Chief of the Mayor’s Office Ned Segal presented and made the following points:

- The PermitSF team was working under the direction of Mayor Lurie from the executive direction that he published February 2025 to make it easier to build more housing in San Francisco and for small businesses to thrive.
- The group of leaders, which Director O’Riordan was an important part of, looked into how the state code was applied, where two departments were responsible for helping people and businesses create something as well as some of the antiquated rules and challenge if those codes were the best way to keep people safe, or make sure the city moves a bus when we should and balance all of the safety measures the government was responsible for. A series of legislative

proposals went to the Board of Supervisors with that in mind and was to mark the first one hundred days.

- The expectation was PermitSF would continue through the year and more legislation would be proposed at the two and three hundred day markers. These take more time due to the involvement of multiple departments.
- PermitSF was carefully balancing safety and other measures along with making it easier for people to get what they need from the City.
- There were ministerial changes Mayor Lurie had enacted.
- There were structural and technology changes that PermitSF would continue to consider.
- The Request for Information (RFI) was submitted for a common platform for permitting to benefit the people inside City Hall and the people who would apply for permits. People would be able to apply for permits online and track the process with transparency as well as dashboards to understand whether goals were being executed or not and figure what can be done to better serve the residents of the city.
- The RFI had a return of more than one hundred applications and the office was in the down selection process.
- The Fire Department and Public Works was added to PermitSF leadership because it was recognized that having those departments have a seat at the table would help small businesses and housing as well as a collaborative effort where those departments may need assistance from DBI or the Planning departments.
- PermitSF was a challenging undertaking because sometimes leadership gets stuck because their authority only goes so far and by bringing the team together along with the City Attorney Office and other important stakeholders they were making good progress but there was a lot more to do.
- More important work was on the horizon in conjunction with Director O' Riordan and other leaders around the permitting process as well as more broadly DBI's work.

There was no public comment.

Commissioner Comments and Questions.

Commissioner Williams asked was part of the focus of PermitSF to better assist people to navigate between DBI and Planning Departments to have permits issued, because it comes up during the Abatement Appeals Board (AAB) where people are having trouble and as a Commission they are bound by the Building Code.

Mr. Segal said PermitSF was finding ways for stakeholders to coordinate closer and figure what needed to be sequenced and what should happen in parallel as well as who would be last, then clear goals when responding and publish timelines relative to those goals. These steps were important to PermitSF, but not exclusive to DBI and the Planning Department. The goal was to be transparent, predictable, and principled in how we show up to the applicants so they know the timeline to get to the other side.

President Alexander-Tut said over the years the concern was about ethics, being able to track information, and the ability to make changes in reports. She said how would PermitSF address those ethical concerns.

Mr. Segal said ethics was tremendously important in PermitSF although it was its charge it was critical to ensure the work PermitSF does would not make it harder to report any ethical matters and make sure people comply with rules. PermitSF was a critical partner to ethics and the people who were enforcing

the rules but not the party who executes those rules however, in the RFI process Mr. Segal said he would be sure the technology would be a friend to an ethics investigation, or the hope was the transparency in the technology would keep an ethics investigation from happening.

President Alexander-Tut said sometimes from a user perspective from department to department the logic would be different, and one would believe they are doing the same thing across the board but it is not. She said she would like PermitSF to address the uniformity of the system.

Mr. Segal said the dashboard of PermitSF that was available shows the common goals of the stakeholders and some were using different but similar verbiage to describe the same things. There were now common goals and targets while some projects take more than thirty days to respond and others may take a few minutes, the goal was to have commonality across departments. The idea was to make permitting simpler.

6. Director's Report.

a. Director's Update [Director O'Riordan]

Assistant Director Christine Gasparac filled in for the director and made the following points:

- Thank you to the Commissioners who were able to join the All-Hands Staff meeting. Mayor Lurie also attended and said a few words regarding the work DBI was doing and that he had the departments back as changes were being made to improve the permitting system and he had confidence in the department's ability. Staff appreciated the visit and those comments from Mayor Lurie.
- Mayor Lurie had set some high standards to be met but it was more meaningful to the staff when the Commissioners and Mayor's office engaged with them.

b. Update on major projects.

Major projects are those with valuation of \$5 million or greater filed, issued, or completed for the month of March 2025.

- Major projects with permits filed.
 - 3 projects filed
 - 27.9 combined valuation
 - 48 net housing units
- Major projects Issued
 - 5 permits issued
 - \$48.3 million combined valuation
 - 2 net housing units
- Major projects with Certificate of Occupancy
 - 1 completed
 - \$68 million in valuation
 - 0 net units

c. Update on proposed or recently enacted State or local legislation.

Legislative & Public Affairs Manager Tate Hanna gave a presentation and made the following points:

The first three files were on today's agenda.

File No. 250539: Expansion of the existing awning amnesty program.

File No. 250630: Related to existing reporting requirements

File No. 250191: To adjust the fees of the Department of Building Inspection

Next were files moving through the legislative process.

File No. 250259: Waiver of first-year permit, license, and business registration fees for specified small businesses and would be heard next at the Budget and Finance Committee of the Board of Supervisors.

File No. 250284: Amending the Building Code to exempt accessory structures up to one hundred twenty square feet from building permits. Previously the requirement was one hundred square feet and this Ordinance aligns with the State Code. The BIC heard this on May 21, 2025 and recommended unanimous approval.

File No. 250191: Related to DBI's internal quality control audit to establish amnesty program for people subjected to the internal quality audit and received a Notice of Violation as a result, the Ordinance would provide a fee waiver and a streamlined pathway to come into compliance as well as offer a 'certificate of existing conditions' to waive the Planning Code violation. The BIC heard this on April 16, 2025 and recommended unanimous approval.

File No. 241069: To allow accessory dwelling units and associated primary dwelling units to be sold separately as condominiums. The BIC heard this on October 29, 2024 and recommended approval, it was on hold at the Land Use & Transportation Committee.

Assembly Bill 306 to freeze the Building Code until 2031, DBI had worked with the Mayor's office as it was a top priority and had worked closely with the authors office to implement some amendments. A few of those amendments were successfully added and would allow the Department to make changes to the code related to administrative practices such as increasing fees and expansion or creation of programs related to enforcements of Notices of Violations, changes to technology or tracking system.

Assembly Bill 253 to allow residential buildings to seek a private plan check service if the department was not able to provide those services within thirty days or the estimated time frame of those plans. This bill passed through the assembly and was referred to Senate Housing and Senate Local Government Committees.

Assembly Bill 1206 would require a city by January 2026 to create a preapproval program for single and multi-family buildings. This would expand the preapproved accessory dwelling unit to single family program. It was pending at the Senate Local Government.

Assembly Bill 282 would create an online automated permitting system for residential heat pump water heaters and HVAC systems. The bill was held in Appropriations and was no longer active.

Commissioner's Questions and Comments:

Commissioner Calamuci questioned if there was a unit threshold on the multi-family buildings on Assembly Bill 1206.

Mr. Hanna said he would circle back with that information.

President Alexander-Tut asked were there any standards the private plan check would be held to and how would that effect a city like San Francisco.

Mr. Hanna said the private plan checkers would be required to review plans under the San Francisco Building Code although an affidavit would be submitted as well stating the plans were reviewed under the proper code there was concern the private review would lead to double reviews and extra costs.

President Alexander-Tut said she was concerned the private plan review would open doors to ethics concerns and the department did a lot of clean-up work to create a culture of transparency and ethical standards, and introducing plan check into the private sector was concerning. She said possibly bring the Ethics Commission to the table and possibly have those plan checkers file with the them and go through trainings.

Mr. Hanna said the applicant could find their own plan checker those would not be contracted by the city and the affidavit had a clause allowing the department to add necessary items such as conflicts of interest, etc.

Commissioner Neumann said although San Francisco was unique it was not unusual for third party plan checkers to be involved in the plan check process, and this would push the city to have to meet those thresholds for the reasons President Alexander-Tut stated to maintain that control of the process.

Mr. Hanna said the third party plan checkers had to be licensed contractors and that if the Commission wanted an overview on any of the upcoming legislative items he would coordinate to meet or schedule the update.

d. Update on Inspection Services.

Deputy Director of Inspection Services Matthew Greene submitted the following Building Inspection Division Performance Measures for May 1, 2025 to May 31, 2025:

• Building Inspections Performed	5,077
• Complaints Received	413
• Complaint Response within 24-72 hours	409
• Complaints with 1st Notice of Violation sent	62
• Complaints Received & Abated without NOV	230
• Abated Complaints with Notice of Violations	44
• 2nd Notice of Violations Referred to Code Enforcement	27

Deputy Director of Inspection Services Matthew Greene submitted the following Housing Inspection Division Performance Measures May 1, 2025 to May 31, 2025:

• Housing Inspections Performed	860
• Complaints Received	479
• Complaint Response within 24-72 hours	444
• Complaints with Notice of Violations issued	149
• Abated Complaints with NOVs	450
• # of Cases Sent to Director's Hearing	38
• Routine Inspections	88

Deputy Director of Inspection Services Matthew Greene submitted the following Code Enforcement Services Performance Measures for May 1, 2025 to May 31, 2025:

• # Housing of Cases Sent to Director’s Hearing	156
• # Complaints of Order of Abatements Issues	39
• # Complaint of Cases Under Advisement	2
• # Complaints of Cases Abated	174
• Code Enforcement Inspections Performed	944
• # of Cases Referred to BIC-LC	1
• # of Case Referred to City Attorney	0

Deputy Director of Inspection Services Matthew Greene said Code Enforcement Outreach Programs are updated on a quarterly as follows for the 4th quarter:

• # Total people reached out to	38,634
• # Counseling cases	512
• # Community Program Participants	4,669
• # Cases Resolved	255

e. Update on DBI’s finances.

Deputy Director of Administrative Services Alex Koskinen submitted update on the Department’s May 2025 finances as follows:

Revenues:

- 92% of the year had elapsed
- DBI had collected 109% of FY25 budgeted Charges for Services revenue.

Expenditures:

- Total year-end expenditures were projected at \$89.5 million (\$1.5M/2% below budget)

Permits:

- Year to Date (YTD) permits were 1% higher than the same period last year
- YTD valuation was 4% higher than same period last year

There was no public comment.

7. Discussion and possible action regarding Board of Supervisors Ordinance (File #250592) amending the Building, Subdivision, and Administrative Codes to adjust fees charged by the Department Building Inspection and to establish Subfunds within the Building Inspection Fund, in addition to other requirements.

Deputy Director of Administration Alex Koskinen gave a presentation and made the following points:

- The budget process of what had happened and what was to come schedule of dates and events. DBI submitted its budget February 2025, all departments were then kicked out of the budget system and the Mayor develops their proposed budget and released it May 30, 2025. At the time, the city was in the Board of Supervisors (BOS) phase and there would be two budget committee meetings where priorities are explained.
- Part of DBI’s budget said the department’s budget assumed it generated additional revenue by increasing fees to pay for its services, which was introduced into legislation.

- The BOS would decide what to cut from the Mayor’s proposed budget and what to add back and it cannot increase beyond what the Mayor proposed and only add back what the Mayor cut. This would happen July 2025. The Mayor will sign the full budget and it would take effect thirty days after signature.
- The remaining action for the BIC was the fee legislation and the department was seeking a recommendation of approval to send to the BOS.
- Some of the changes the Mayor made to the Department’s budget were reduced proposed increase from \$98.1 million to \$88.1 million.
- The Mayor’s office reduced revenue because they reduced the expenditures, removed the General Fund transfer that supported the Community Based Organizations (CBO) and reduced the amount of the fund balance that the Department relied on to balance the budget until full cost recovery was reached in FY27.
- The vast majority of the departments spending was labor and non-discretionary cost. Labor and work orders with other departments was over ninety percent.
- Expenditure changed included mostly labor items, overhead was reduced to zero, the CBO grant was removed however there was an agreement between the Mayor’s office and the BOS to add \$1.7 million back and discussion regarding the remaining \$3.1 million, some work orders were changed or removed, instructed to remove the Technology reserve, and three vacant positions were deleted.
- Three positions were approved for two Data Analyst, Permit Technicians, and Concrete Building Program analyst.
- The fee study was conducted with a consultant and new fees would be effective September 1, 2025.
- The plan was the budget would be balanced and the structural deficit would end by FY27.
- The fee ordinance was amended to increase fees for apartment and hotel licenses to generate an ongoing \$1.7 million and planned to use that amount in FY26 to fund existing CEOP. The remaining SRO grant of \$3.1 million was being discussed.

Deputy City Attorney Peter Miljanich said the discussion was the BIC would discuss the amendment and consider it adequately today such that it would not require referral back to the BIC after recommendation to the BOS thereby slowing down the process and depriving the department of additional revenue. Re-referral would be by BOS general counsel but ultimately the purpose of the discussion of the amendment was to avoid the budget returning to the BIC.

Mr. Koskinen said the department was seeking a motion of recommendation of approval of the Ordinance with the amendment and any additional recommendations the BIC may have.

Public Comment:

Please note: Apologies for any misspelling of public commenter’s names.

Following are the members of public and various agencies who provided public comment:

Greg Johnson
Yeana Medina
Cheng Ho Chi
Molly Goldberg, SF Anti-Displacement Coalition
Charlie Goss, SF Apartment Association

Cathy Wong, Code Enforcement Outreach Program (CEOP) Representative
Maria Casena
Suzy Valcone
Anthony
Dennis Williams, Jr., Housing & Urban Development (HUD) Alliance
Anona
Pat Cochran
Yee Fung Lee, SRO Collaborative
Ms. Aguilar
Member of Chinatown Community Development Center (CCDC)
Consuelo & Mario Gutierrez
Cha Ha Wu
Joanna Ramirez
Christina, SRO Collaborative Mission Action
Amy
Yen Fan Yu
Representative of Tenderloin Housing Clinic (THC)
Monique – 35-year resident of Hunter’s Point/Bayview, works with Human Rights Coalition (HRC)
Eli, Chair at Association

Multiple Families came to speak, but there was not enough time for everyone to speak that day. The members said their names for the record. Following the meeting Lisa Yu of the Chinatown Community Development Center (CCDC) submitted an email with the following names:

Ziyi Ye
Yanxiao Tan
Mei Rong Liu
Yanhong Yu
Juanhua Chen
Junpeng Wu
Dan Liao
Cuiping Tan
Chunping Huang
Xiaoling Zheng
Kelly

Members of the public and various agencies made the following comments:

- Asked the Commission to restore full funding to the Code Enforcement Outreach Program (CEOP). Their organization helps members with disaster preparedness, Go bags. If there was a natural disaster, members of the Tenderloin would get hit hard in an earthquake. He looks out for the neighborhood and did not want to see his program go down the drain.
- Lived in the Bayview for 63 years. Described issue of a rain storm and there was a leak in the bedroom. She told the landlord, but they did not check out the problem in a timely manner so the ceiling collapsed. She sought help from the Housing Rights Committee (HRC) and a counselor who spoke her language helped her to write a letter to the landlord to correct the repairs. She supported the ordinance to raise fees.

- The Code Enforcement Outreach Program is needed, and depends on the fee legislation being approved. Referenced incident of mold and peeling paint while living in a Single Room Occupancy (SRO) building and she would not have received help without the CEOP program.
- Trained PEER advocates and counselors help tenants. Materials produced in 7 different languages.
- He works with landlords and owners. They came before the BIC on 2/12 to talk about the CEOP program, and the letter worked as it seems they're on the way to receive funding for the program.
- Tenants came to talk to CEOP representative for fear of eviction from the landlord in the Tenderloin.
- She was hospitalized and her daughter signed a lease on a new apartment, but there were multiple issues with gas leaks and other items. They sought support from the SRO Collaborative and HRC helped resolve the situation
- They safeguard the health and safety of tenants and give information on their rights. Important to fund the SRO Collaborative.
- There are gaps in what the City Inspectors and CEOP organizers can do. Gave example of sewage problem in a building and CEOP organizers were able to get the landlord to restore electricity and water.
- Represented District 5, Alyce Griffith, Bayview, housing development. Mentioned unfair treatment of bilingual tenants. Lenard of HRC & CEOP helped him to organize and assist residents. As a result, 29 units were abated and fines were levied.
- Thomas Square Apartments – Issues of mold, infestation and workers scraped paint when they were not supposed to.
- She helps with legal representation. Mentioned lead paint causes learning disabilities. Concern regarding public safety and residents could die due to this. Grateful Inspector Grady came and gave a stop work order. Any cuts could cost lives.
- SRO organizer helped to resolve issues with the landlord that a family of 5 had with their stove, plumbing, and other issues.
- Plaza East representative referenced heater issues, pest infestation and said they needed HRC to help them.
- She lived in the Excelsior District and CCDC helped resolve rat and rodent infestation and mold issue.
- Couple referenced issues they had with their apartment and did not have access to keep their trash can outside, so had to keep it in the kitchen. Landlord did not help until HRC came to building to inspect and then he resolved the issues.
- Family of 5 lived in Chinatown and had a bad problem with rats and showed photo on overhead.
- Community Leader of Tenderloin Housing Clinic said it is crucial to establish funding for the organization. They support a vulnerable population and help support the community.
- She lived on Powell Street for 30 years. Tenants need CEOP program to help resolve issues and they held landlord accountable during pandemic when things were even worse.
- Multiple Chinese speaking families came to the podium and said their names into the record as there was not enough time for everyone to speak. There were approximately 30 people and Lisa Yu of CCDC said everyone urged the BIC to support the fee legislation.
- She said it is good that the CEOP program would have funding, but stated that the SRO Collaborative funding still hangs in the balance.
- 35-year resident of Hunter's Point/Bayview said she worked with Human Rights Coalition (HRC). Also is an Executive Director in Bayview Hunters Point. Mentioned All Hollows, and said apartments were under AIMCO property management. There was a lawsuit on behalf of the

community because there were ongoing issues. If it were not for DBI and HRC the community would have faced more problems.

- He referenced 25 Bush and 608 Bush Streets. There were Mandarin and Cantonese speaking tenants, as well as disabled persons. Building owners forced to comply with doing work on apartments. Supporting CEOP supports dignity and safety in San Francisco.

Commissioner Questions and Comments:

Commissioner Calamuci asked to clarify which table the Commissioners were reviewing was table 1AP, Residential Code Enforcement and Licensing Fees and were most of the increases aimed at the hotel license rather than the apartment license and were the tourist and residential hotels included.

Mr. Koskinen said there would be increases to both the tourist and residential hotel and apartment license fees, and what table 1AP showed was the amounts prior to adding the expenditures. An updated table could be provided with those amendments added once the final version was available.

Commissioner Calamuci said he supported the legislation and thanked the organizations for taking the time out of their work day to speak at the public hearing. He said one comment struck him most was that someone did not know the Department of Building Inspection (DBI) existed and it was not to make DBI look bad, it was just the reality of how government resources were allocated. He thanked the other commissioners for their work on the budget as well.

Commissioner Chavez said thank you to the public and those who shared their powerful stories, and to hear them was really impactful. She said for clarification the SRO portion of the budget was still in negotiations.

Mr. Koskinen said the CEOP program was taken care of by the proposed amendment and the SRO was to be determined as discussions with the Mayor's Office were ongoing.

DCA Peter Miljanich said the very broadest recommendation would be to approve the fee ordinance with modifications to fully fund the CBO programs, and to be clear that was beyond the amendment Mr. Koskinen discussed which was just the increase of \$1.7 million for part of the program.

Commissioner Chavez questioned what would the potential change be in the draft that was being put together the day of the meeting?

Mr. Koskinen said fees based on hourly rates, code enforcement, and license fees would increase from an average of 5.3% to 10% and the goal was to generate an additional \$1.7 million of revenue.

Commissioner Chavez said she supported the legislation and wanted to be sure there was a plan going forward to support those programs, because shifting to and from the General Fund was not a secure bet for them.

Commissioner Williams asked was the increase a special assessment since earlier in the winter an across the board increase was discussed.

Mr. Koskinen said the increase was to hotel and apartment license fees which were collected as special property tax assessments, and there would not be a new assessment as that process was long and involved only those fees that would fund the program.

Commissioner Meng said what were the details of the ongoing discussions regarding the SRO funding.

Mr. Koskinen said those were ongoing discussions between the Mayor’s Office and the BOS and one option may be to add the funds back through funds that were cut from other programs, but that was up to the BOS and the department was suspecting that was the primary mechanism for funding to be restored.

Commissioner Neumann said she supported the ordinance and shared in the gratitude with the other Commissioners of the people who attended the meeting and shared their stories.

President Alexander-Tut said it was heartbreaking to know that some San Franciscans lived that way and we continued to allow it and these were our children and grandparents and friends and neighbors who it continues to happen to, and those cuts were unconscionable. She said this work was the core mission of DBI and its Housing Division. When the letter was written the commissioners did not foresee the funding being cut fully from the budget. The letter stated the programs were the core fundamentals of DBI.

President Alexander-Tut said if she speeds in her car she gets a ticket, but if we walk into a building full of mold it is not an automatic fine, but that was the reality we all lived in. That was the legislation.

President Alexander-Tut made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Chavez, to recommend the fee legislation with the amendments presented by DBI to cover fee increases for the CEOP program, and to cover any future amendments made by the BOS that would cover additional services related to the programs.

Roll Call Vote by Commission Secretary Harris:

President Alexander-Tut	Yes
Vice President Meng	Yes
Commissioner Calamuci	Yes
Commissioner Chavez	Yes
Commissioner Neumann	Yes
Commissioner Williams	Yes

The motion carried unanimously.

RESOLUTION NO. 056-25

- 8. Discussion and possible action regarding Board of Supervisors Ordinance (File #250539) amending the Building and Planning Codes to extend the Awning Amnesty Program to apply to existing unpermitted Signs and Gates; amending the Planning Code to remove design standards for gates, railings, and grillwork on ground floor street frontages of non-historic buildings in Neighborhood Commercial, Residential-Commercial, Commercial, and Mixed-Use Districts, in addition to other requirements.**

Legislative Affairs Manager Tate Hanna gave a presentation and made the following points:

- In 2023 DBI instituted an awning amnesty program in response to a swell of complaints throughout Chinatown.

- The program allowed for existing unpermitted awnings installed on or before August 20, 2023 to pursue a permit to comply with the Code. The program only applied to those seeking to comply with the Code, if there was corrective action the program did not apply.
- The program reduced the need for professional plan, the submittal requirements had been significantly reduced and the streamlined pathway to compliance was opened.
- The program instituted a fee waiver applicable to any fees in pursuant to that permit legalizing the existing awning.
- The fee waiver was expanded outside of the program to those who had received corrective actions, the waiver would sunset July 1, 2025.
- The Ordinance today was to expand the Awning Amnesty Program to applicable signs and security gates, to be eligible they must be non-illuminated, under 250 pounds, and 25 square feet or less.
- The program was specific to B, S, and M occupancy, vehicular gates were explicitly excluded.
- Additional submittal requirements applied to top and roll down gates.
- The Administrative and General Design and Disability Access Subcommittee met June 11, 2025 and recommended approval with the Departments amendments, the Code Advisory Committee (CAC) met the same day and recommended approval as well.
-

There was no public comment.

Commissioner's Questions and Comments:

Commissioner Williams said what was the life safety risk for the gates.

Mr. Hanna said the California Building Code did not categorize the gates as appropriately needed for San Francisco and the city would apply a different standard, as the horizontal gates were attached at the side of the building, posing less risk to falling onto someone. Whereas, the roll down gates attached to the top of the building due to the mechanism at the top being significantly heavier, posed the life safety risk. An example was from an instance where the top roll down gate fell unfortunately landing on a child.

Commissioner Williams said was the roll down mechanism for those gates specific to San Francisco.

Mr. Hanna said there was not a specific standard for San Francisco, however, the state Building Code did not differentiate between the two gates. The department would establish how the gates were treated internally.

President Alexander-Tut said would there be explicit instructions for what securely attached meant.

Mr. Hanna said there was a memo with detailed descriptions of what would be needed, and what the department would look for.

President Alexander-Tut made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Neumann, to recommend approval of File #250539 with DBI amendments.

Roll Call Vote by Commission Secretary Harris:

President Alexander-Tut Yes

Commissioner Calamuci	Yes
Commissioner Chavez	Yes
Commissioner Meng	Yes
Commissioner Neumann	Yes
Commissioner Williams	Yes

The motion carried unanimously.

RESOLUTION NO. 057-25

9. Discussion and possible action regarding Board of Supervisors Ordinance (File #250630) amending the Administrative, Environment, Health, Labor and Employment, Park, Planning, Police, Public Works, Subdivision, Transportation, and Building Inspection Commission Codes to change departments reporting requirements.

Legislative Affairs Manager Tate Hanna gave a presentation and made the following points:

- Ordinance on the requirements of reports to be submitted to the Board of Supervisors or other oversight bodies.
- Legislation required updated status reports on progress of those Ordinances.
- The requirement to report were sometimes decades old or no longer useful.
- This Ordinance was introduced by the Mayor and City Attorney Offices to remove outdated and unnecessary reporting requirements specifically File No. 250630 was to remove seven outdated reporting requirements for DBI, three were no longer relevant and four were outdated.
- The following reports were the no longer used or outdated: Code Enforcements Activities (p.11-12), Residential Hotels (p.259), Technology Projects (p.263), Drink Tap Stations (p.293), ADU Authorization (p.316), ADU Fee Waiver (p.349-350), and Water Conservation Measures (p.350).
- The CAC and Administrative and General Design and Disability Access Subcommittee unanimously recommended approval.

There was no public comment.

Commissioner's Questions and Comments:

Vice President Meng asked what information did the Residential Hotel report provide?

Mr. Hanna said the main point of the data was to look for any conversions and DBI tracked that data separately, and would produce a report as needed; to the department's understanding the report was not read consistently.

Commissioner Chavez asked if he could speak to the other ways Code Enforcement activities were reported?

Mr. Hanna said there was monthly summarization of the data of Code Enforcement activities and the quarterly added to the monthly was a big lift for staff. Those were submitted to the Mayor's office and BOS and there was not often follow up to the reported data to propose policy decisions. This Ordinance wiped away the reporting requirement for all Code Enforcement departments, because it may have been an overwhelming quantity of data and the department does have the data if needed to produce a report.

Commissioner Neumann clarified to clear the Ordinance was not to stop collecting data, but it was to remove the requirement to produce reports on the data collected on those set timelines.

Mr. Hanna said yes the data could be produced when requested.

President Alexander-Tut said where did the data live on the city website.

Assistant Director Christine Gasparac said there was a department that collected data called DataSF, it may have a new name, however there were reams of data collected.

President Alexander-Tut made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Chavez, to recommend approval of File No. 250630.

Roll Call Vote by Commission Secretary Harris:

President Alexander-Tut	Yes
Commissioner Calamuci	Yes
Commissioner Chavez	Yes
Commissioner Meng	Yes
Commissioner Neumann	Yes
Commissioner Williams	Yes

The motion carried unanimously.

RESOLUTION NO. 058-25

10. Commissioner’s Questions and Matters.

- a. Inquiries to Staff. At this time, Commissioners may make inquiries to staff regarding various documents, policies, practices, and procedures, which are of interest to the Commission.
- b. Future Meetings/Agendas. At this time, the Commission may discuss and take action to set the date of a Special Meeting and/or determine those items that could be placed on the agenda of the next meeting and other future meetings of the Building Inspection Commission.

Commission Secretary Harris said the next Regular meeting would be July 16, 2025.

There was no public comment.

11. Review and approval of the minutes of the Regular Meeting Minutes of May 21, 2025.

Commissioner Williams made a motion, seconded by President Alexander-Tut, to approve the Regular Meeting minutes of May 21, 2025.

There was no public comment.

The motion carried unanimously.

RESOLUTION NO. 059-25

12. Adjournment.

Commissioner Neumann made a motion, seconded by Vice President Meng, to adjourn the meeting.

The motion carried unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:44 p.m.

RESOLUTION NO. 060-25

SUMMARY OF REQUESTS BY COMMISSIONERS OR FOLLOW UP ITEMS	
<i>Commissioner Calamuci said was there a unit threshold on the multi-family buildings on Assembly Bill 1206.</i>	<i>Page 5</i>

Respectfully submitted,

Monique Mustapha

Monique Mustapha, Assistant BIC Secretary

Sonya Harris

Edited By: Sonya Harris, BIC Secretary