

***Regular Meeting of the Building
Inspection Commission***

August 19, 2026

Public Comment #1

From: [Jeremy Beal](#)
To: [Harris, Sonya \(DBI\)](#)
Subject: For distribution to the Commission: oversight questions arising from the Department's own records concerning 248 Valley Street (Block 6614, Lot 015)
Date: Tuesday, August 4, 2026 11:28:15 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Ms. Harris, I ask that the attached letter be distributed to the President and Members of the Building Inspection Commission, and included in the correspondence for the Commission's August 19, 2026 meeting. Thank you.

President and Members of the Building Inspection Commission:

I am the tenant of 246 Valley Street, the occupied home immediately adjacent to, and now in physical contact with, the construction project at 248 Valley Street (Block 6614, Lot 015; alteration Permit No. 202212239051). I write not to ask the Commission to referee my complaints, but to bring to its attention a set of facts drawn from the Department's own records, each of which I can document, and three questions now pending before the Department in writing. I will attend public comment on August 19, and I will provide any source document to the Commission on request.

The record, in brief, with dates:

1. Thirteen complaints have been filed concerning this project since January 2026. Not one Notice of Violation has issued. The complaint records show closures based on the contractor's own statements, including a dust complaint closed on the contractor's representation that cutting was complete, with no contact with the complainant.
2. Complaint No. 202653093, which concerned an inspector's conduct, was assigned to and closed by that same inspector on March 25, 2026. Its closure cites a "site visit on 12/30/2025," a date roughly five weeks before demolition began at the site.
3. On April 5, 2026, the permit activity log contained no entry for an inspection said to have occurred March 20. On April 9, Department staff wrote that the inspection had occurred. On April 13, a note bearing the March 20 date was entered into the log. Whether that is ordinary late entry or something else can only be determined from creation timestamps and revision history, which is one subject of the preservation demand described below.
4. Ninety five of ninety six inspection dispositions on this project were recorded against the wrong records and later corrected. The pre-correction state now exists only in audit history.
5. Shoring Permit No. 202510227848 shows a single field entry, dated April 13, 2026. Excavation reached eight feet per Cal/OSHA Permit No. 719670. The permit expired June 5, 2026. The Special Inspections ledger for the project showed no completed special inspections as of late July.
6. The new building is in documented contact with the occupied home I live in. I reported the contact on June 23, 2026; a complaint of June 25 stated the buildings "are leaning against each other"; on July 22 the Department's own record confirmed "observed

building contact." As of today no separation has been performed, no follow-up inspection has occurred, and the assigned inspector is out of the office until August 17. The complaint remains open, "pending follow up on providing building separation."

7. On or about July 24 and 25, 2026, following an inspector's written site findings, Department staff were directed not to issue a Notice of Violation. I am aware of no written record of that direction, which is why call and calendar records for that period are within the preservation demand described below.
8. On the permit form: on November 6, 2023, DBI Technical Services stated in writing, in response to a Planning Department inquiry about this very project, that Form 6 demolition permits "are only used when demolishing an entire building," and that the alteration form applies when "a portion of the existing building is to remain." The Department's own complaint closure describes the work performed as "demo and new construction," and a Planning Department memorandum of April 22, 2026, produced under the Sunshine Ordinance, states: "It appears that DBI did not require demo and new construction permits." On August 4, 2026, I asked the Interim Director in writing which permit form the Department requires for the work as performed, with a response requested by August 14.
9. On valuation: the permit's estimated cost of construction is \$660,000, a figure identical to the same architect's contemporaneous project at 56 Conrad Street, a modest vertical addition. Records produced under the Sunshine Ordinance show that Department and Planning staff questioned the figure the day before the project's Commission hearing in November 2023, and that the sponsor then produced an amended cost schedule totaling \$2,219,842, prepared using the Department's own cost schedule. DBI Information Sheet G-13 provides that valuation is set at issuance by the cost schedule or actual cost, "whichever is greater." The permit issued November 26, 2025 at \$660,000, with the form's Revised Cost field blank. I ask the Commission to inquire what valuation verification occurred at issuance, because permit fees scale with valuation, and the answer affects every project.
10. On records process: on August 3, 2026, the Department's Sunshine Team stated in writing that text messages "are not maintained by the Department," that when requested, "we contact the staff member directly to retrieve them," and that because the former assigned inspector "is no longer with the department, we are unable to obtain the text messages you requested." It also disclosed that the search supporting prior productions used eight spellings of the street address and no other terms. I do not raise this to fault the staff, whose candor is what makes the gap visible. But a process in which fulfillment means asking rather than obtaining, in which separation defeats retrieval, and in which searches run on address strings alone, cannot reliably comply with the Sunshine Ordinance. Closing that gap is within the Department's power: retention of business communications on Department systems, central retrieval rather than custodian self-collection, and device and account recovery at separation.

Three matters are now pending before the Department in writing: a preservation demand delivered to the Interim Director on August 3, with confirmation requested by August 7; the permit-form question of August 4, with a response requested by August 14; and a custodian-based records search specification provided to the Department's records staff at their request on August 4.

I ask the Commission to do three things: first, request that the Department report to the Commission on its complaint-handling and Notice of Violation practices as applied to this property, including the basis for closing complaints on contractor representations; second,

request that the Department answer the three pending matters above in writing by the dates already requested; and third, inquire into the valuation verification and records process questions in items 9 and 10, which reach beyond this one project.

Every statement above is drawn from Department records, City records, or my own dated correspondence, and I will provide the underlying documents to the Commission or its staff on request. I appreciate the Commission's time, and the professionalism of the Department staff who have dealt with me straightforwardly through a difficult seven months.

Respectfully,

Jeremy Beal 246 Valley Street, San Francisco, CA 94131 [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [Jeremy Beal](#)
To: [Harris, Sonya \(DBI\)](#)
Subject: Correction to my letter of August 4, 2026 concerning 248 Valley Street (Block 6614, Lot 015)
Date: Thursday, August 6, 2026 1:59:02 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Ms. Harris,

I ask that this correction be distributed to the President and Members of the Building Inspection Commission alongside my letter of August 4, 2026 concerning 248 Valley Street, and included in the correspondence for the Commission's August 19, 2026 meeting. Thank you.

President and Members of the Building Inspection Commission:

I am writing to correct an error in my letter of August 4, 2026. In item 9 I wrote that Permit No. 202212239051 issued on November 26, 2025 at \$660,000, "with the form's Revised Cost field blank," and I asked the Commission to inquire what valuation verification occurred at issuance. That was wrong, and the error was mine. The Revised Cost field on the issued permit is not blank. It reads \$2,778,870, entered by the plan checker on December 11, 2024, and the same figure appears in the permit's Characteristics record and in the Department's permit tracking history. The blank field I described is on an earlier copy of the same application form held in the Planning Department's file, last modified November 15, 2023, two years before the permit issued. I read the earlier copy and wrote about the issued permit. In doing so I asked the Commission to look into a verification the Department's own record shows it performed: the figure the plan checker entered is more than four times the applicant's estimate, and a Department engineer reviewed it later that month against the Department's own 2022 Cost Schedule and left it in place. I withdraw the last two sentences of item 9, and the part of my third request that asks the Commission to inquire into valuation verification. With those two sentences removed, item 9 reports what the record shows about the estimated cost figure and about the Department's valuation standard, and asks the Commission for nothing. The remainder of the letter stands as written.

Respectfully,

Jeremy Beal 246 Valley Street, San Francisco, CA 94131 [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]