



# TO: SAN FRANCISCO ETHICS COMMISSION

FROM: LISA HERRICK Sr. Deputy City Attorney

# SUBJECT: Referral from Sunshine Ordinance Task Force re Ethics Complaint No. 09-110816

DATE: September 6, 2012

# INTRODUCTION

The San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance Task Force ("Sunshine Task Force") referred Ethics Complaint No. 09-110816 to the Ethics Commission finding violations of the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance and California Public Records Act against the Ethics Commission. The referral from the Sunshine Task Force also provided notification of willful failure and official misconduct findings against the Executive Director of the Commission. Since this matter involves the Executive Director of the Ethics Commission, I have been asked to review and investigate the Complaint consistent with the Ethics Commission Regulations for Investigations and Enforcement Proceedings.<sup>1</sup>

# SUMMARY OF COMPLAINT

On March 6, 2011, Patrick Monette-Shaw filed a complaint with the Sunshine Task Force alleging that the Ethics Commission violated Sections 67.24<sup>2</sup>, 67.26<sup>3</sup> and 67.34<sup>4</sup> of the Sunshine Ordinance by failing to provide records in response to an Immediate Disclosure Request for:

1. Any and all written communication(s) between the Ethics Commission and the City Controller's Office (including the City Controller, the City Services Auditor, and/or the Controller's Whistleblower Program) regarding this complaint.

2. The Ethics Commission investigative file(s) regarding the patient gift fund complaint.

3. Any closing memo(s) authored by the Ethics Commission staff regarding this LHH patient gift fund complaint.

# PROCEEDINGS BEFORE SUNSHINE ORDINANCE TASK FORCE

The Sunshine Task Force heard this matter on April 26, 2011.

In an Order of Determination dated June 7, 2011, the Task Force found that the Ethics Commission violated Section 67.26 of the Sunshine Ordinance and Government Code Memo to San Francisco Ethics Commission Re: Complaint No. 09-110816 September 6, 2012 Page 2 of 14

Section 6253 of the California Public Records Act by not disclosing the records requested. The Task Force ordered the Ethics Commission to release the records requested within 5 business days and appear before the Compliance and Amendments Committee on June 14, 2011.

On June 14, 2011, not enough members of the Compliance and Amendments Committee were present to reach a quorum and the Committee could not meet.

At the next meeting of the Compliance and Amendments Committee on July 12, 2011, the Committee recommended that the Task Force find that Ethics Commission staff violated Sunshine Ordinance Section 67.34 for willful failure to disclose the records requested.

On July 26, 2011, the Task Force adopted the recommendation of the Compliance and Amendments Committee to find Ethics Commission staff in willful violation of the Order of Determination pursuant to Section 67.34 of the Sunshine Ordinance and San Francisco City Charter Section 15.105(e).<sup>5</sup> The Task Force also voted to forward the matter to the District Attorney and the Ethics Commission for enforcement and forward a copy of the referral letter to Mayor Ed Lee and the San Francisco Civil Grand Jury.

On August 15, 2011, the Task Force referred its Order of Determination issued June 7, 2011 to the Ethics Commission pursuant to Sunshine Ordinance Sections 67.21<sup>6</sup> and 67.30.<sup>7</sup> The Task Force's August 15 letter also provided notification of willful failure and official misconduct findings against Ethics Commission staff for failure to comply with the June 7 Order of Determination.

# **REFERRALS TO OTHER AGENCIES**

On August 25, 2011, Garrett Chatfield, Investigator with the Ethics Commission, referred the Task Force's Order of Determination to Andrew Shen, Deputy City Attorney, San Francisco City Attorney's Office and Marc Katz, Assistant District Attorney, San Francisco District Attorney's Office.

On August 31, 2011, Marc Katz informed Mr. Chatfield:

At this time, our office is not pursuing a criminal investigation concerning this complaint. Your letter notes that the Ethics Commission is "in discussions with various outside agencies to determine if the matter ... can be referred to another agency." Please provide us with the contact information for the person/agency that will handle the investigation. We will ask that agency to inform us if they uncover evidence of criminal conduct.

On September 8, 2011, Mr. Shen wrote to John St. Croix, Executive Director of the Ethics Commission, to inform him that the City Attorney's Office would not investigate Complaint No. 09-110816.

Memo to San Francisco Ethics Commission Re: Complaint No. 09-110816 September 6, 2012 Page 3 of 14

## **REVIEW OF THE RECORD**

I reviewed the entire file in this matter, including the Complaint and all memoranda and correspondence related to the proceedings before the Sunshine Task Force. I determined that it was not necessary for me to conduct additional interviews.

## LEGAL ANALYSIS

Appendix C3.699-13(a) of the San Francisco City Charter provides in part:

If the commission, upon the sworn complaint or on its own initiative, determines that there is sufficient cause to conduct an investigation, it shall investigate alleged violations of this charter or City ordinances relating to campaign finance, lobbying, conflicts of interest and governmental ethics.... <u>The investigation shall be conducted in a confidential manner.</u> Records of any investigation shall be considered confidential information to the extent permitted by state law. Any member or employee of the commission or other person who, prior to a determination concerning probable cause, discloses information about any preliminary investigation, except as necessary to conduct the investigation, shall be deemed guilty of official misconduct. The unauthorized release of confidential information shall be sufficient grounds for the termination of the employee or removal of the commissioner responsible for such release.

Sections 6276<sup>8</sup> and 6276.32<sup>9</sup> of the California Public Records Act exempt from disclosure "official information." California Evidence Code 1040 defines "official information" as follows:

(a) As used in this section, "official information" means information acquired in confidence by a public employee in the course of his or her duty and not open, or officially disclosed, to the public prior to the time the claim of privilege is made.

(b) A public entity has a privilege to refuse to disclose official information, and to prevent another from disclosing official information, if the privilege is claimed by a person authorized by the public entity to do so and:

(1) Disclosure is forbidden by an act of the Congress of the United States or a statute of this state; or

(2) Disclosure of the information is against the public interest because there is a necessity for preserving the confidentiality of the information that outweighs the necessity for disclosure in the interest of justice; but no privilege may be claimed under this paragraph if any person authorized to do so has consented that the information be disclosed in the proceeding. In determining whether disclosure of the information is against the public interest, the interest of the public entity as a party in the outcome of the proceeding may not be considered. Memo to San Francisco Ethics Commission Re: Complaint No. 09-110816 September 6, 2012 Page 4 of 14

The City may refuse to disclose information acquired in confidence by a public employee. Although Drs. Kerr and Rivero apparently submitted a "Waiver of Confidentiality Request for our LHH Gift Fund Whistleblower Complaints", the conduct of investigative audits is governed by the City's Charter and state law and so neither physician is authorized to waive the privilege.

The City's Charter deems confidential records of investigations by the Ethics Commission to the extent provided by state law. Since state law protects "official information" and the Sunshine Ordinance is preempted by the City's Charter, the information requested by Mr. Monette-Shaw cannot be disclosed.

## RECOMMENDATION

For the reasons explained above, the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force did not apply the law correctly. I recommend that the Commission dismiss Complaint 09-110816, in which the Sunshine Task Force found violations of Sections 67.25 67.26, 67.27 and 67.34 of the Sunshine Ordinance.

Please note that one member of the Commission may cause this Complaint to be calendared for consideration by the full Commission in an open session at the next Commission meeting, which is scheduled for September 24, 2012.<sup>10</sup> A request for consideration by the full Commission must be received by staff to the Ethics Commission by Wednesday, September 19, 2012 (no fewer than five days before the date of the Commission meeting) so that staff may comply with the applicable notice and agenda requirements.<sup>11</sup>

RICHARD DOYLE City Attorney

LISA HERRICK Sr. Deputy City Attorney

For questions, please contact Lisa Herrick, Sr. Deputy City Attorney, at 408-535-1900.

<sup>1</sup> I am a Senior Deputy City Attorney for the San Jose Office of the City Attorney. One of my first assignments when I joined the City Attorney's Office in August 2006 was to staff the Sunshine Reform Task Force, which met for two years. Over that period, the Task Force made a number of recommendations about increasing transparency in meetings and access to documents in San Jose.

I also advise City officials and employees on the Brown Act, California Public Records Act, Political Reform Act and the City's ethics ordinances.

896118

Memo to San Francisco Ethics Commission Re: Complaint No. 09-110816 September 6, 2012 Page 5 of 14

l advise the City Clerk on all matters related to the Clerk's Office, including elections. I also staff the Elections Commission. I have handled litigation matters involving the City's Campaign Finance and Lobbying ordinances.

Before joining the City Attorney's Office, I worked for the County of Santa Clara for nearly 5 years; one of my assignments was to advise the Registrar of Voters. I started my law career in a private law firm where I handled general litigation matters for ten years.

#### <sup>2</sup> Sec. 67.24. Public Information That Must Be Disclosed.

Notwithstanding a department's legal discretion to withhold certain information under the California Public Records Act, the following policies shall govern specific types of documents and information and shall provide enhanced rights of public access to information and records:

(a) Drafts and Memoranda.

(1) Except as provided in subparagraph (2), no preliminary draft or department memorandum, whether in printed or electronic form, shall be exempt from disclosure under Government Code Section 6254, subdivision (a) or any other provision. If such a document is not normally kept on file and would otherwise be disposed of, its factual content is not exempt under subdivision (a). Only the recommendation of the author may, in such circumstances, be withheld as exempt.

(2) Draft versions of an agreement being negotiated by representatives of the City with some other party need not be disclosed immediately upon creation but must be preserved and made available for public review for 10 days prior to the presentation of the agreement for approval by a policy body, unless the body finds that and articulates how the public interest would be unavoidably and substantially harmed by compliance with this 10 day rule, provided that policy body as used in this subdivision does not include committees. In the case of negotiations for a contract, lease or other business agreement in which an agency of the City is offering to provide facilities or services in direct competition with other public or private entities that are not required by law to make their competing proposals public or do not in fact make their proposals public, the policy body may postpone public access to the final draft agreement until it is presented to it for approval.

(b) Litigation Material.

(1) Notwithstanding any exemptions otherwise provided by law, the following are public records subject to disclosure under this Ordinance:

(i) A pre-litigation claim against the City;

(ii) A record previously received or created by a department in the ordinary course of business that was not attorney/client privileged when it was previously received or created;

(iii) Advice on compliance with, analysis of, an opinion concerning liability under, or any communication otherwise concerning the California Public Records Act, the Ralph M. Brown Act, the Political Reform Act, any San Francisco governmental ethics code, or this Ordinance.

(2) Unless otherwise privileged under California law, when litigation is finally adjudicated or otherwise settled, records of all communications between the department and the adverse party shall be subject to disclosure, including the text and terms of any settlement.

(c) Personnel Information. None of the following shall be exempt from disclosure under Government Code Section 6254, subdivision (c), or any other provision of California Law where disclosure is not forbidden:

(1) The job pool characteristics and employment and education histories of all successful job applicants, including at a minimum the following information as to each successful job applicant:

(i) Sex, age and ethnic group;

(ii) Years of graduate and undergraduate study, degree(s) and major or discipline;

(iii) Years of employment in the private and/or public sector;

(iv) Whether currently employed in the same position for another public agency.

(v) Other non-identifying particulars as to experience, credentials, aptitudes, training or education entered in or attached to a standard employment application form used for the position in question.

(2) The professional biography or curriculum vitae of any employee, provided that the home address, home telephone number, social security number, age, and marital status of the employee shall be redacted.

(3) The job description of every employment classification.

(4) The exact gross salary and City-paid benefits available to every employee.

(5) Any memorandum of understanding between the City or department and a recognized employee organization.

(6) The amount, basis, and recipient of any performance-based increase in compensation, benefits, or both, or any other bonus, awarded to any employee, which shall be announced during the open session of a policy body at which the award is approved.

(7) The record of any confirmed misconduct of a public employee involving personal dishonesty, misappropriation of public funds, resources or benefits, unlawful discrimination against another on the basis of status, abuse of authority, or violence, and of any discipline imposed for such misconduct.

(d) Law Enforcement Information.

The District Attorney, Chief of Police, and Sheriff are encouraged to cooperate with the press and other members of the public in allowing access to local records pertaining to investigations, arrests, and other law enforcement activity. However, no provision of this ordinance is intended to abrogate or interfere with the constitutional and statutory power and duties of the District Attorney and Sheriff as interpreted under Government Code section 25303, or other applicable state law or judicial decision. Records pertaining to any investigation, arrest or other law enforcement activity shall be disclosed to the public once the District Attorney or court determines that a prosecution will not be sought against the subject involved, or once the statute of limitations for filing charges has expired, whichever occurs first. Notwithstanding the occurrence of any such event, individual items of information in the following categories may be segregated and withheld if, on the particular facts, the public interest in nondisclosure clearly and substantially outweighs the public interest in disclosure:

(1) The names of juvenile witnesses (whose identities may nevertheless be indicated by substituting a number or alphabetical letter for each individual interviewed);

(2) Personal or otherwise private information related to or unrelated to the investigation if disclosure would constitute an unwarranted invasion of privacy;

Memo to San Francisco Ethics Commission Re: Complaint No. 09-110816 September 6, 2012 Page 7 of 14

(3) The identity of a confidential source;

(4) Secret investigative techniques or procedures;

(5) Information whose disclosure would endanger law enforcement personnel; or

(6) Information whose disclosure would endanger the successful completion of an investigation where the prospect of enforcement proceedings is concrete and definite.

This subdivision shall not exempt from disclosure any portion of any record of a concluded inspection or enforcement action by an officer or department responsible for regulatory protection of the public health, safety, or welfare.

(e) Contracts, Bids and Proposals

(1) Contracts, contractors" bids, responses to requests for proposals and all other records of communications between the department and persons or firms seeking contracts shall be open to inspection immediately after a contract has been awarded. Nothing in this provision requires the disclosure of a private person's or organization's net worth or other proprietary financial data submitted for qualification for a contract or other benefit until and unless that person or organization is awarded the contract or benefit. All bidders and contractors shall be advised that information provided which is covered by this subdivision will be made available to the public upon request. Immediately after any review or evaluation or rating of responses to a Request for Proposal ("RFP") has been completed, evaluation forms and score sheets and any other documents used by persons in the RFP evaluation or contractor selection process shall be available for public inspection. The names of scorers, graders or evaluators, along with their individual ratings, comments, and score sheets or comments on related documents, shall be made immediately available after the review or evaluation of a RFP has been completed.

(2) Notwithstanding the provisions of this subdivision or any other provision of this ordinance, the Director of Public Health may withhold from disclosure proposed and final rates of payment for managed health care contracts if the Director determines that public disclosure would adversely affect the ability of the City to engage in effective negotiations for managed health care contracts. The authority to withhold this information applies only to contracts pursuant to which the City (through the Department of Public Health) either pays for health care services or receives compensation for providing such services, including mental health and substance abuse services, to covered beneficiaries through a pre-arranged rate of payment. This provision also applies to rates for managed health care contracts for the University of California, San Francisco, if the contract involves beneficiaries who receive services provided jointly by the City and University. This provision shall not authorize the Director to withhold rate information from disclosure for more than three years.

(3) During the course of negotiations for:

(i) personal, professional, or other contractual services not subject to a competitive process or where such a process has arrived at a stage where there is only one qualified or responsive bidder;

(ii) leases or permits having total anticipated revenue or expense to the City and County of five hundred thousand dollars (\$500,000) or more or having a term of ten years or more; or

(iii) any franchise agreements, all documents exchanged and related to the position of the parties, including draft contracts, shall be made available for public inspection and copying upon request. In the event that no records are prepared or exchanged during negotiations in the above-mentioned categories, or the records exchanged do not provide a meaningful representation of the respective positions, the city

Memo to San Francisco Ethics Commission Re: Complaint No. 09-110816 September 6, 2012 Page 8 of 14

attorney or city representative familiar with the negotiations shall, upon a written request by a member of the public, prepare written summaries of the respective positions within five working days following the final day of negotiation of any given week. The summaries will be available for public inspection and copying. Upon completion of negotiations, the executed contract, including the dollar amount of said contract, shall be made available for inspection and copying. At the end of each fiscal year, each City department shall provide to the Board of Supervisors a list of all sole source contracts entered into during the past fiscal year. This list shall be made available for inspection and copying as provided for elsewhere in this Article.

(f) Budgets and Other Financial Information. Budgets, whether tentative, proposed or adopted, for the City or any of its departments, programs, projects or other categories, and all bills, claims, invoices, vouchers or other records of payment obligations as well as records of actual disbursements showing the amount paid, the payee and the purpose for which payment is made, other than payments for social or other services whose records are confidential by law, shall not be exempt from disclosure under any circumstances.

(g) Neither the City nor any office, employee, or agent thereof may assert California Public Records Act Section 6255 or any similar provision as the basis for withholding any documents or information requested under this ordinance.

(h) Neither the City nor any office, employee, or agent thereof may assert an exemption for withholding for any document or information based on a "deliberative process" exemption, either as provided by California Public Records Act Section 6255 or any other provision of law that does not prohibit disclosure.

(i) Neither the City, nor any office, employee, or agent thereof, may assert an exemption for withholding for any document or information based on a finding or showing that the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosure. All withholdings of documents or information must be based on an express provision of this ordinance providing for withholding of the specific type of information in question or on an express and specific exemption provided by California Public Records Act that is not forbidden by this ordinance.

#### <sup>3</sup> Sec. 67.26. Withholding Kept to a Minimum.

No record shall be withheld from disclosure in its entirety unless all information contained in it is exempt from disclosure under express provisions of the California Public Records Act or of some other statute. Information that is exempt from disclosure shall be masked, deleted or otherwise segregated in order that the nonexempt portion of a requested record may be released, and keyed by footnote or other clear reference to the appropriate justification for withholding required by section 67.27 of this article. This work shall be done personally by the attorney or other staff member conducting the exemption review. The work of responding to a public-records request and preparing documents for disclosure shall be considered part of the regular work duties of any city employee, and no fee shall be charged to the requester to cover the personnel costs of responding to a records request.

### <sup>4</sup> Sec. 67.34. Willful Failure Shall Be Official Misconduct.

The willful failure of any elected official, department head, or other managerial city employee to discharge any duties imposed by the Sunshine Ordinance, the Brown Act or the Public Records Act shall be deemed official misconduct. Complaints involving allegations of willful violations of this ordinance, the Brown Act or the Public Records Act by elected officials or department heads of the City and County of San Francisco shall be handled by the Ethics Commission.

Memo to San Francisco Ethics Commission Re: Complaint No. 09-110816 September 6, 2012 Page 9 of 14

#### <sup>5</sup> SEC. 15.105. SUSPENSION AND REMOVAL.

ELECTIVE AND CERTAIN APPOINTED OFFICERS. Any elective officer, and any member of the (a) Airport Commission, Asian Art Commission, Civil Service Commission, Commission on the Status of Women, Golden Gate Concourse Authority Board of Directors, Health Commission, Human Services Commission, Juvenile Probation Commission, Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors, Port Commission, Public Utilities Commission, Recreation and Park Com-mission, Fine Arts Museums Board of Trustees, Taxi Commission, War Memorial and Performing Art Center Board of Trustees, Board of Education or Community College Board is subject to suspension and removal for official misconduct as provided in this section. Such officer may be suspended by the Mayor and the Mayor shall appoint a qualified person to discharge the duties of the office during the period of suspension. Upon such suspension, the Mayor shall immediately notify the Ethics Commission and Board of Supervisors thereof in writing and the cause thereof, and shall present written charges against such suspended officer to the Ethics Commission and Board of Supervisors at or prior to their next regular meetings following such suspension, and shall immediately furnish a copy of the same to such officer, who shall have the right to appear with counsel before the Ethics Commission in his or her defense. The Ethics Commission shall hold a hearing not less than five days after the filing of written charges. After the hearing, the Ethics Commission shall transmit the full record of the hearing to the Board of Supervisors with a recommendation as to whether the charges should be sustained. If, after reviewing the complete record, the charges are sustained by not less than a three-fourths vote of all members of the Board of Supervisors, the suspended officer shall be removed from office; if not so sustained, or if not acted on by the Board of Supervisors within 30 days after the receipt of the record from the Ethics Commission, the suspended officer shall thereby be reinstated.

(b) BUILDING INSPECTION COMMISSION, PLANNING COMMISSION, BOARD OF APPEALS, ELECTIONS COMMISSION, ETHICS COMMISSION, AND ENTERTAINMENT COMMISSION. Members of the Building Inspection Commission, the Planning Commission, the Board of Appeals, the Elections Commission, the Ethics Commission, and the Entertainment Commission may be suspended and removed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) of this section except that the Mayor may initiate removal only of the Mayor's appointees and the appointing authority shall act in place of the Mayor for all other appointees.

(c) REMOVAL FOR CONVICTION OF A FELONY CRIME INVOLVING MORAL TURPITUDE.

(1) Officers Enumerated in Subsections (a) and (b).

(A) An appointing authority must immediately remove from office any official enumerated in subsections (a) or (b) upon:

(i) a court's final conviction of that official of a felony crime involving moral turpitude; and

(ii) a determination made by the Ethics Commission, after a hearing, that the crime for which the official was convicted warrants removal.

(B) For the purposes of this subsection, the Mayor shall act as the appointing authority for any elective official.

(C) Removal under this subsection is not subject to the procedures in subsections (a) and (b) of this section.

(2) Other Officers and Employees.

(A) At will appointees. Officers and employees who hold their positions at the pleasure of their appointing authority must be removed upon:

(i) a final conviction of a felony crime involving moral turpitude; and

(ii) a determination made by the Ethics Commission, after a hearing, that the crime for which the appointee was convicted warrants removal.

(B) For cause appointees. Officers and employees who by law may be removed only for cause must be removed upon:

(i) a final conviction of a felony crime involving moral turpitude; and

(ii) a determination made by the Ethics Commission, after a hearing, that the crime for which the appointee was convicted warrants removal.

(3) Penalty for Failure to Remove. Failure to remove an appointee as required under this subsection shall be official misconduct.

## (d) DISQUALIFICATION.

(1) (A) Any person who has been removed from any federal, state, County or City office or employment upon a final conviction of a felony crime involving moral turpitude shall be ineligible for election or appointment to City office or employment for a period of ten years after removal.

(B) Any person removed from any federal, state, County or City office or employment for official misconduct shall be ineligible for election or appointment to City office or employment for a period of five years after removal.

(2) (A) Any City department head, board, commission or other appointing authority that removes a City officer or employee from office or employment on the grounds of official misconduct must invoke the disqualification provision in subsection (d)(1)(B) and provide notice of such disqualification in writing to the City officer or employee.

(B) Upon the request of any former City officer or employee, the Ethics Commission may, after a public hearing, overturn the application of the disqualification provision of subsection (d)(1)(B) if: (i) the decision that the former officer or employee engaged in official misconduct was not made after a hearing by a court, the Board of Supervisors, the Ethics Commission, an administrative body, an administrative hearing officer, or a labor arbitrator; and (ii) if the officer or employee does not have the right to appeal his or her restriction on holding future office or employment to the San Francisco Civil Service Commission.

(e) OFFICIAL MISCONDUCT. Official misconduct means any wrongful behavior by a public officer in relation to the duties of his or her office, willful in its character, including any failure, refusal or neglect of an officer to perform any duty enjoined on him or her by law, or conduct that falls below the standard of decency, good faith and right action impliedly required of all public officers and including any violation of a specific conflict of interest or governmental ethics law. When any City law provides that a violation of the law constitutes or is deemed official misconduct, the conduct is covered by this definition and may subject the person to discipline and/or removal from office.

Memo to San Francisco Ethics Commission Re: Complaint No. 09-110816 September 6, 2012 Page 11 of 14

## <sup>6</sup> Sec. 67.21. Process for Gaining Access to Public Records; Administrative Appeals.

(a) Every person having custody of any public record or public information, as defined herein, (hereinafter referred to as a custodian of a public record) shall, at normal times and during normal and reasonable hours of operation, without unreasonable delay, and without requiring an appointment, permit the public record, or any segregable portion of a record, to be inspected and examined by any person and shall furnish one copy thereof upon payment of a reasonable copying charge, not to exceed the lesser of the actual cost or ten cents per page.

(b) A custodian of a public record shall, as soon as possible and within ten days following receipt of a request for inspection or copy of a public record, comply with such request. Such request may be delivered to the office of the custodian by the requester orally or in writing by fax, postal delivery, or e-mail. If the custodian believes the record or information requested is not a public record or is exempt, the custodian shall justify withholding any record by demonstrating, in writing as soon as possible and within ten days following receipt of a request, that the record in question is exempt under express provisions of this ordinance.

(c) A custodian of a public record shall assist a requester in identifying the existence, form, and nature of any records or information maintained by, available to, or in the custody of the custodian, whether or not the contents of those records are exempt from disclosure and shall, when requested to do so, provide in writing within seven days following receipt of a request, a statement as to the existence, quantity, form and nature of records relating to a particular subject or questions with enough specificity to enable a requester to identify records in order to make a request under (b). A custodian of any public record, when not in possession of the record requested, shall assist a requester in directing a request to the proper office or staff person.

(d) If the custodian refuses, fails to comply, or incompletely complies with a request described in (b), the person making the request may petition the supervisor of records for a determination whether the record requested is public. The supervisor of records shall inform the petitioner, as soon as possible and within 10 days, of its determination whether the record requested, or any part of the record requested, is public. Where requested by the petition, and where otherwise desirable, this determination shall be in writing. Upon the determination by the supervisor of records that the record is public, the supervisor of records shall immediately order the custodian of the public record to comply with the person's request. If the custodian refuses or fails to comply with any such order within 5 days, the supervisor of records shall notify the district attorney or the attorney general who shall take whatever measures she or he deems necessary and appropriate to insure compliance with the provisions of this ordinance.

(e) If the custodian refuses, fails to comply, or incompletely complies with a request described in (b) above or if a petition is denied or not acted on by the supervisor of public records, the person making the request may petition the Sunshine Task Force for a determination whether the record requested is public. The Sunshine Task Force shall inform the petitioner, as soon as possible and within 2 days after its next meeting but in no case later than 45 days from when a petition in writing is received, of its determination whether the record requested, or any part of the record requested, is public. Where requested by the petition, and where otherwise desirable, this determination shall be in writing. Upon the determination that the record is public, the Sunshine Task Force shall immediately order the custodian of the public record to comply with the person's request. If the custodian refuses or fails to comply with any such order within 5 days, the Sunshine Task Force shall notify the district attorney or the attorney general who may take whatever measures she or he deems necessary to insure compliance with the provisions of this ordinance. The Board of Supervisors and the City Attorney's office shall provide sufficient staff and resources to allow the Sunshine Task Force to fulfill its duties under this provision. Where requested by the petition, the Sunshine Task Force may conduct a public hearing concerning the records request denial. An authorized representative of the custodian of the public records requested shall attend any hearing and explain the basis for its decision to withhold the records requested.

Memo to San Francisco Ethics Commission Re: Complaint No. 09-110816 September 6, 2012 Page 12 of 14

(f) The administrative remedy provided under this article shall in no way limit the availability of other administrative remedies provided to any person with respect to any officer or employee of any agency, executive office, department or board; nor shall the administrative remedy provided by this section in any way limit the availability of judicial remedies otherwise available to any person requesting a public record. If a custodian of a public record refuses or fails to comply with the request of any person for inspection or copy of a public record or with an administrative order under this section, the superior court shall have jurisdiction to order compliance.

(g) In any court proceeding pursuant to this article there shall be a presumption that the record sought is public, and the burden shall be upon the custodian to prove with specificity the exemption which applies.

(h) On at least an annual basis, and as otherwise requested by the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, the supervisor of public records shall prepare a tally and report of every petition brought before it for access to records since the time of its last tally and report. The report shall at least identify for each petition the record or records sought, the custodian of those records, the ruling of the supervisor of public records, whether any ruling was overturned by a court and whether orders given to custodians of public records were followed. The report shall also summarize any court actions during that period regarding petitions the Supervisor has decided. At the request of the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, the report shall also include copies of all rulings made by the supervisor of public records and all opinions issued.

(i) The San Francisco City Attorney's office shall act to protect and secure the rights of the people of San Francisco to access public information and public meetings and shall not act as legal counsel for any city employee or any person having custody of any public record for purposes of denying access to the public. The City Attorney may publish legal opinions in response to a request from any person as to whether a record or information is public. All communications with the City Attorney's Office with regard to this ordinance, including petitions, requests for opinion, and opinions shall be public records.

(j) Notwithstanding the provisions of this section, the City Attorney may defend the City or a City Employee in litigation under this ordinance that is actually filed in court to any extent required by the City Charter or California Law.

(k) Release of documentary public information, whether for inspection of the original or by providing a copy, shall be governed by the California Public Records Act (Government Code Section 6250 et seq.) in particulars not addressed by this ordinance and in accordance with the enhanced disclosure requirements provided in this ordinance.

(I) Inspection and copying of documentary public information stored in electronic form shall be made available to the person requesting the information in any form requested which is available to or easily generated by the department, its officers or employees, including disk, tape, printout or monitor at a charge no greater than the cost of the media on which it is duplicated. Inspection of documentary public information on a computer monitor need not be allowed where the information sought is necessarily and inseparably intertwined with information not subject to disclosure under this ordinance. Nothing in this section shall require a department to program or reprogram a computer to respond to a request for information or to release information where the release of that information would violate a licensing agreement or copyright law.

# <sup>7</sup> Sec. 67.30. The Sunshine Ordinance Task Force.

(a) There is hereby established a task force to be known as the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force consisting of eleven voting members appointed by the Board of Supervisors. All members must have experience and/or demonstrated interest in the issues of citizen access and participation in local government. Two members shall be appointed from individuals whose names have been submitted by the local chapter of the Society of Professional Journalists, one of whom shall be an attorney and one of

Memo to San Francisco Ethics Commission Re: Complaint No. 09-110816 September 6, 2012 Page 13 of 14

whom shall be a local journalist. One member shall be appointed from the press or electronic media. One member shall be appointed from individuals whose names have been submitted by the local chapter of the League of Women Voters. Four members shall be members of the public who have demonstrated interest in or have experience in the issues of citizen access and participation in local government. Two members shall be members of the public experienced in consumer advocacy. One member shall be a journalist from a racial/ethnic-minority-owned news organization and shall be appointed from individuals whose names have been submitted by New California Media. At all times the task force shall include at least one member who shall be a member of the public who is physically handicapped and who has demonstrated interest in citizen access and participation in local government. The Mayor or his or her designee, and the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors or his or her designee, shall serve as non-voting members of the task force. The City Attorney shall serve as legal advisor to the task force. The Sunshine Ordinance Task Force shall, at its request, have assigned to in an attorney from within the City Attorney"s Office or other appropriate City Office, who is experienced in public-access law matters. This attorney shall serve solely as a legal advisor and advocate to the Task Force and an ethical wall will be maintained between the work of this attorney on behalf of the Task Force and any person or Office that the Task Force determines may have a conflict of interest with regard to the matters being handled by the attorney.

(b) The term of each appointive member shall be two years unless earlier removed by the Board of Supervisors. In the event of such removal or in the event a vacancy otherwise occurs during the term of office of any appointive member, a successor shall be appointed for the unexpired term of the office vacated in a manner similar to that described herein for the initial members. The task force shall elect a chair from among its appointive members. The term of office as chair shall be one year. Members of the task force shall serve without compensation.

(c) The task force shall advise the Board of Supervisors and provide information to other City departments on appropriate ways in which to implement this chapter. The task force shall develop appropriate goals to ensure practical and timely implementation of this chapter. The task force shall propose to the Board of Supervisors amendments to this chapter. The task force shall report to the Board of Supervisors at least once annually on any practical or policy problems encountered in the administration of this chapter. The Task Force shall receive and review the annual report of the Supervisor of Public Records and may request additional reports or information as it deems necessary. The Task Force shall make referrals to a municipal office with enforcement power under this ordinance or under the California Public Records Act and the Brown Act whenever it concludes that any person has violated any provisions of this ordinance or the Acts. The Task Force shall, from time to time as it sees fit, issue public reports evaluating compliance with this ordinance and related California laws by the City or any Department, Office, or Official thereof.

(d) In addition to the powers specified above, the Task Force shall possess such powers as the Board of Supervisors may confer upon it by ordinance or as the People of San Francisco shall confer upon it by initiative.

(e) The Task Force Commission shall approve by-laws specifying a general schedule for meetings, requirements for attendance by Task Force members, and procedures and criteria for removing members for non-attendance.

#### <sup>8</sup> California Government Code Section 6276.

Records or information not required to be disclosed pursuant to subdivision (k) of Section 6254 may include, but shall not be limited to, records or information identified in statutes listed in this article.

## <sup>9</sup> California Government Code Section 6276.32.

Narcotic addict outpatient revocation proceeding, confidentiality of reports, Section 3152.5, Welfare and Institutions Code.

Narcotic and drug abuse patients, confidentiality of records, Section 11845.5, Health and Safety Code. Native American graves, cemeteries and sacred places, records of, subdivision (r), Section 6254. Notary public, confidentiality of application for appointment and commission, Section 8201.5.

Nurse, alcohol or dangerous drug diversion and rehabilitation records, confidentiality of, Section 2770.12. Business and Professions Code.

Obscene matter, defense of scientific or other purpose, confidentiality of recipients, Section 311.8, Penal Code.

Occupational safety and health investigations, confidentiality of complaints and complainants, Section 6309, Labor Code.

Occupational safety and health investigations, confidentiality of trade secrets, Section 6322, Labor Code.

Official information acquired in confidence by public employee, disclosure of, Sections 1040 and 1041, Evidence Code.

Oil and gas, confidentiality of proposals for the drilling of a well, Section 3724.4, Public Resources Code.

Oil and gas, disclosure of onshore and offshore exploratory well records, Section 3234, Public Resources Code.

Oil and gas, disclosure of well records, Section 3752, Public Resources Code.

Oil and gas leases, surveys for permits, confidentiality of information, Section 6826, Public Resources Code.

Oil spill feepayer information, prohibition against disclosure, Section 46751, Revenue and Taxation Code.

Older adults receiving county services, providing information between county agencies, confidentiality of, Section 9401, Welfare and Institutions Code.

Organic food certification organization records, release of, Section 110845, Health and Safety Code. Osteopathic physician and surgeon, rehabilitation and diversion records, confidentiality of, Section 2369, Business and Professions Code.

<sup>10</sup> Ethics Commission Regulations for Investigations and Enforcement Proceedings § VI.A.

<sup>11</sup> Ethics Commission Regulations for Investigations and Enforcement Proceedings § VI.D.