

**From:** [CivilService, Civil \(CSC\)](#)  
**To:** [Eng, Sandra \(CSC\)](#); [Holmes, Lavena \(CSC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Fw: PermitSF/OpenGov - DHRPSC0006176-  
**Date:** Friday, May 15, 2026 10:40:20 AM

---

Hello,

Please see the public comment that was just submitted.

Thanks,  
Mika

Civil Service Commission Representative  
25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 720  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Office (628) 652-1110  
Main (628) 652-1100  
Fax (628) 652-1109

---

**From:** receipt.left-65@icloud.com <receipt.left-65@icloud.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, May 15, 2026 10:17 AM  
**To:** CivilService, Civil (CSC) <civilservice@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** PermitSF/OpenGov - DHRPSC0006176-

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

I am a senior planner in the Planning Department.  
There are two topics in play here.

First, whether the existing permit system needs upgrades and/or replacement. The answer is unequivocally yes. It's old, outdated, and functionally stuck in the past.

The second topic is OpenGov/PermitSF. The existing permit system needing an overhaul or replacement does not automatically make the OpenGov/PermitSF system better. The PermitSF introduced was built by managers and leadership who do not review permits. You will hear from managers and leadership who say that the system was built to address things that journeyman level planners and inspectors find burdensome – interesting statements, considering there was no surveying or data collection on what we find burdensome to begin with.

Additionally, you will hear that the new system has improved our processes. What you will not hear is any definitive statements as to how things have improved. Speed? Rate filed permits being approved? Unclear. No data has been shared to back these statements up in public or to staff.

It's expected that a new system will have hiccups. However, given that this system has been bulldozed into the City's ecosystem, bypassing the bid process, ignoring staff feedback since introduction, and continual delays, it is fair to stop this before it becomes too far gone.

Additionally, I support Local 21's position that this is work that should be undertaken by City staff, not a third-party contractor. I find that issue to be completely valid and separate from the simple fact that the OpenGov system is not viable for the City's needs.

I urge the Commission to follow their own instincts and make the choice they deem correct.