

		Critical Risk	High Risk	Medium Risk	
Policy Milestone	Tools and Enforcement	Year "0"	Year "0"	Year "0"	Notes
Assessment	<p>City provides standardized assessment protocol and provides reference for the City's roster of engineers.</p> <p>Tools to encourage for compliance: City Liaison to serve as single point of contact Financial incentive options</p> <p>Enforcement for non-compliance: <i>Notice of violation to Owner</i> Fine: \$500/quarter * Public posting: City database posted online Block on any new permits City conducts assessment</p> <p><i>* NOV and fines to follow DPD's standard enforcement process</i></p>	+ 1 year	+2 years	+ 3 years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessment is the crucial step to obtaining an accurate picture of high/medium/low risks – this is the gauge of potential impacts on public safety, and feeds into total cost estimation. Assessment must be a priority, with incentives for all projects that conduct assessment within one year of Notice. Consider job-order contract (JOC) program to control costs (“standard process for standard cost”) If assessment is conducted by the City, the City would contract with a 3rd party inspector to conduct assessment at market-rate cost and bill property owner for assessment and administrative costs. City roster: would it be useful to have 3 rosters developed by the city (assessment, design and construction)? Lessons learned from energy disclosure programs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public posting of non-compliance is proven to be effective Fines are difficult to assess and marginally effective -- \$500/quarter covers admin costs. Don't try to pay for the program with fines or it will fail.
Permit Application	<p>Tools to encourage for compliance: City Liaison to serve as single point of contact 2 free hours of permit pre-submittal coaching Permit fees waived Interdepartmental and inter agency permit facilitator</p> <p>Enforcement for non-compliance: <i>Notice of violation to Owner</i> Fine: \$1,000/quarter* Public posting: City database posted online</p>	+ 1 year	+2 years	+ 2 years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase fine – still not severe, but does place lien on property which affects re-sale and insurance. For extensions at each stage, do we need to create financial hardship criteria? How do we assess good faith effort?
Permit Approval	<p>Tools to encourage for compliance: Interdepartmental and inter agency permit facilitator</p> <p>Enforcement for non-compliance: <i>Notice of violation to Owner</i> Fine: \$1,000/quarter * Public posting: City database posted online Sunsetting of incentives (permit fees are reinstated)</p>	+ 1 year	+ 1 year	+ 1 year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> “Enforcement incentives” – depends on how fines are collected and held by City – would free consulting be possible? Consider job-order contract (JOC) program to control costs
Work Completion = Compliance	<p>Tools to encourage for compliance: Public disclosure of “retrofitted buildings” Available funding sources for retrofits</p> <p>Enforcement for non-compliance: <i>Notice of violation to Owner with copy to Tenants</i> Lien on property based on outstanding fines Block on any new permits Abatement Fine: \$500/day civil penalty</p>	+ 4 years	+ 5 years	+ 7 years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At this point, fines no longer effective – if permit is in hand, \$\$ are hurdle; if no permit, no intent of compliance and fines are pointless Block on any new permits could create unintended consequences. Owner may need tenant revenue to fund retrofit. Perhaps limit any new permits to minor TI. For example, could we not accept permit applications for voluntary energy upgrades or structural work not associated with seismic retrofit? This approach could cause unintended consequences for existing buildings that want to do energy retrofits – substantially increase the cost for the upgrade.
Time to Compliance		7 years	10 years	13 years	