



ETHICS COMMISSION

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

PAUL A. RENNE
CHAIRPERSON

PETER KEANE
VICE-CHAIRPERSON

BEVERLY HAYON
COMMISSIONER

DAINA CHIU
COMMISSIONER

QUENTIN L. KOPP
COMMISSIONER

LEEANN PELHAM
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Date: November 10, 2016

To: Members of the Ethics Commission

Copy: Joel Warne, Nancy Sarieh, Victor Young

From: Jessica Blome, Deputy Director, Enforcement & Legal Affairs

Subject: **Agenda Item 6: Staff's Report and Recommendation**
for handling Ethics Commission Complaint Nos. 1516-23 & 1516-24
Joel Warne v. Nancy Sarieh & the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force

Summary This memorandum serves as Staff's Report and Recommendation for how the Ethics Commission should handle a complaint alleging violations of the Sunshine Ordinance.

Action Requested Staff recommends that the Commission send warning letters to Nancy Sarieh and the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force.

Introduction

On November 18, 2015, Joel Warne filed a complaint with the Ethics Commission alleging that Nancy Sarieh, Public Information Officer for the Department of Public Health (DPH), willfully violated the Sunshine Ordinance by failing to disclose public records or cite legally applicable exemptions justifying the withholding of certain records. On November 19, 2015, Mr. Warne filed a second complaint with the Ethics Commission alleging that the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force (SOTF) had mishandled Mr. Warne's complaint against Ms. Sarieh.

The Ethics Commission has jurisdiction to handle complaints alleging willful violations of the Sunshine Ordinance by a department head under section 67.34 of the Sunshine Ordinance. Neither Ms. Sarieh nor the SOTF are department heads or elected officials, so the Ethics Commission is not required to handle Mr. Warne's complaint. Staff, may, however initiate its own investigation of Mr. Warne's complaint under under Chapter Three(I)(A)(3) of the Enforcement Commissions Regulations for Handling Violations of the Sunshine Ordinance (Sunshine Regulations). In the future, Staff will refer this type of complaint to the SOTF for its review; however this matter is unusual because Mr. Warne is alleging that the SOTF itself violated the Sunshine Ordinance by mishandling his complaint against Ms. Sarieh. Therefore, Staff initiated its own complaint and investigation into Mr. Warne's allegations against Ms. Sarieh and the SOTF under Chapter Three(I)(A)(3) of the Sunshine Regulations. Because both

complaints involve the same set of underlying facts, Staff combined them and analyze them both below.

Background

A. Original Records Request to DPH

On September 8, 2015, Joel Warne made a 10-page public records request to San Francisco General Hospital (SFGH), the Sheriff, and the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors for 52 categories of documents related to the events of August 8 and 9, 2015, when Mr. Warne stated he voluntarily admitted himself to SFGH (hereafter "Original Records Request"). The following record requests are at issue here:

- "Item 8: A copy of any security camera footage, audio recordings, or any other electronic media captured at SFGH on or between August 8 and 9, 2015 from any corridor, room or other space at or in which my person was located or relocated during the course of treatment, e.g. security camera footage that shows me being restrained, bound and forcibly sedated and the events preceding the succeeding that activity..."
- Item 14: Copies of any and all documents, electronic or physical, that serve as justification for assessing patients with expenses at a rate of \$1,807 for [Drug A]. This may be satisfied by providing a copy of a wholesale pharmaceutical acquisition receipt or invoice by the SFGH Pharmacy Dept.
- Item 15: Copies of any and all documents, electronic or physical, that serve as justification for assessing patients with expenses at a rate of \$1,807 for [Drug B]. This item may be satisfied by providing a copy of a wholesale pharmaceutical acquisition receipt or invoice received or paid by the SFGH Pharmacy Dept.
- Item 16: Copies of any and all documents, electronic or physical, that serve as justification for assessing patients with expenses at a rate of \$134 for every available dosage of [Drug C] by method or route administered to me between August 8 and 9, 2015. This may be satisfied by providing a copy of a wholesale pharmaceutical acquisition receipt or invoice.
- Item 17: Copies of any and documents, electronic or physical, that serve, or may serve, as justification for assessing patients with expenses at a rate of \$134 for every available dosage of [Drug D] by method or route administered to me between August 8 and 9, 2015 at SFGH. This may be satisfied by providing a copy of a wholesale pharmaceutical acquisition receipt or invoice by the SFGH Pharmacy Dept.
- Item 18: Copies of any and documents, electronic or physical, that serve, or may serve, as justification for assessing patients with an expense at a rate of \$134 for every available dosage of [Drug E] by method or route administered to me between August 8 and 9, 2015 at SFGH. This may be satisfied by providing a copy of a wholesale pharmaceutical acquisition receipt or invoice by SFGH Pharmacy Dept."

On September 23, 2015, Public Information Officer Nancy Sarieh, on behalf of SFGH, informed Mr. Warne that DPH was working to fulfill his public records request, but the request was voluminous. According to Ms. Sarieh, DPH could only provide responsive information on a rolling basis.

That same day, on September 23, 2015, Mr. Warne filed a complaint with the SOTF against DPH for allegedly violating Sunshine Ordinance sections 67.21 (10-day response deadline) and 67.25 (immediate disclosure response deadline).

On October 13, 2015, DPH, on behalf of SFGH, provided its response to Mr. Warne's Original Records Request. The response included the following exemption language:

"8. The security camera videos are for security and law enforcement purposes and are not public records...

14 - 18. SFGH purchases pharmaceuticals through a group purchasing organization called the University Health System Consortium or "UHC." All pricing information for pharmaceuticals is proprietary to the UHC."

On November 17, 2015, Mr. Warne appeared before the SOTF Complaint Committee for a hearing regarding his complaint against Nancy Sarieh and DPH. No representative from DPH attended the SOTF Complaint Committee meeting.

The SOTF Complaint Committee, on November 17, 2015, referred consideration of the merits of Mr. Warne's complaint to the full SOTF with no recommendation. However, the SOTF Complaint Committee deemed DPH in violation of Sunshine Ordinance section 67.21(e) for failing to attend the meeting.

The full SOTF never heard evidence supporting Mr. Warne's Original Complaint because Mr. Warne requested a continuance of his January 6, 2016, hearing before the full SOTF and then withdrew his complaint in February 2016.

B. Mr. Warne's Complaints to the Ethics Commission

On November 18, 2015, Mr. Warne filed a complaint with the Ethics Commission alleging that Nancy Sarieh, Public Information Officer at the Department of Public Health, committed a willful violation of the Sunshine Ordinance by failing to disclose public records or cite legally applicable exemptions justifying the withholding of certain records in her response to Mr. Warne's public records requests.

On November 19, 2016, Mr. Warne filed a complaint with the Ethics Commission alleging that the SOTF violated its own internal rules and timelines for handling complaints as follows:

1. "SOTF violated Sunshine Ordinance section 67.21(e) for failing to render an Order of Determination on File No. 15129 by November 2, 2015;
2. SOTF violated Sunshine Ordinance section 67.21(e) for failing to render an Order of Determination on File No. 15134 by November 7, 2015;
3. SOTF violated Sunshine Ordinance section 67.21(e) when the SOTF's Complaint Committee authorized a continuance for File No. 15129 on November 17, 2015;
4. SOTF violated Sunshine Ordinance section 67.21(e) when the SOTF's Complaint Committee authorized a continuance for File No. 15134 on November 17, 2015;

5. SOTF violated Sunshine Ordinance sections 67.14, 67.15, 67.21, 67.30, and 67.31 during its November 17, 2015 Complaint Committee meeting when Mr. Young ‘was permitted to provide substantive ‘advisements’ on actions the members of the Committee should or not should not [sic] take;’
6. SOTF violated Sunshine Ordinance section 67.30 ‘because a representative of the City Attorney was not present at its November 17, 2015 [Complaint Committee] meeting.’”

C. Records Requested after filing Ethics Commission Complaints

After making his complaints to the Ethics Commission, Mr. Warne continued to make a series of public records requests to DPH, copying the Ethics Commission on each request while indicating that the responses from the agencies were not responsive. Although unclear, it appears that Mr. Warne wished to include responses to each subsequent request as part of his original November 18, 2015, complaint. Staff reviewed the records requests and responses referenced and provides summary below:

- On November 18, 2015, Mr. Warne made a records request to DPH. DPH requested an extension for its response and responded on February 29, 2016.
- On February 5, 2016, Mr. Warne made an Immediate Disclosure Request (IDR) to DPH. DPH responded on February 8, 2016, in a timely manner.
- On March 12, 2016, Mr. Warne made three IDRs to DPH. After requesting extensions for its responses, DPH responded to one IDR on March 30, another one on April 7, and the third on April 8.
- On March 21, 2016, Mr. Warne made an IDR to DPH. DPH responded on March 23, 2016 in a timely manner.
- On April 28, 2016, Mr. Warne made an IDR to DPH. DPH requested an extension to provide a response and responded on May 3, 2016, in a timely manner.
- On June 21, 2016, Mr. Warne made two IDRs to DPH and one IDR to the Board of Supervisors. Both the Board and DPH responded in a timely manner on the same date.
- On June 22, 2016, Mr. Warne made four IDRs to DPH. DPH requested an extension to provide a response and did not respond in a timely manner.

Analysis

A. Public Information Officer Nancy Sarieh and the Department of Public Health violated section 67.21(b) of the Sunshine Ordinance.

Sunshine Ordinance section 67.21(b) provides:

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...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.

Sunshine Ordinance § 67.21(b) (emphasis provided) (see generally Sunshine Ordinance § 67.27 for a list of categorical exemptions from disclosure). Ethics Commission Staff reviewed hundreds

of pages of correspondence and public records between Mr. Warne and Ms. Sarieh. In response to Mr. Warne's Original Records Request, on October 13, 2015, Ms. Sarieh offered the following language to justify the withholding of certain records that would have otherwise been responsive to Mr. Warne's request:

"8. The security camera videos are for security and law enforcement purposes and are not public records..."

14 - 18. SFGH purchases pharmaceuticals through a group purchasing organization called the University Health System Consortium or "UHC." All pricing information for pharmaceuticals is proprietary to the UHC."

Neither of these justifications comply with the requirements of section 67.21(b) because Ms. Sarieh failed to identify the express provisions of the ordinance justifying disclosure. Mr. Warne raised this issue with Ms. Sarieh via email, and Ms. Sarieh responded by providing the applicable exemption citations. Staff concludes that Ms. Sarieh failed to provide express citations to categorical exemptions invoked to justify the withholding of certain records, as required by section 67.21(b). However, Staff also concludes that Ms. Sarieh immediately corrected this violation upon request from Mr. Warne.

In addition to her failure to immediately include citations for exemption justifications, Ms. Sarieh failed to respond to Mr. Warne's November 18, 2015, records request to DPH until February 29, 2016, more than three months after Mr. Warne's records request. Three months exceeds the ten-day maximum deadline under section 67.21(b).

B. Public Information Officer Nancy Sarieh and the Department of Public Health violated section 67.25 of the Sunshine Ordinance.

Section 67.25 of the Sunshine Ordinance requires city agencies to respond to Immediate Disclosure Requests (IDRs) "no later than the close of business on the day following the day of the request." Sunshine Ordinance § 67.25. If the voluminous nature of information requested in an IDR, its location in a remote storage facility, or the need to consult with another interested department warrants an extension of 10 days, the agency must notify the requester by the close of business on the following business day. *Id.* at § 67.25(b).

Ms. Sarieh failed to timely respond to two of Mr. Warne's records requests within the maximum deadline of ten days, as required by section 67.25. On March 12, 2016, Mr. Warne made IDRs to DPH for three categories of information. After requesting extensions for its responses, DPH responded with responsive records on March 30, April 7, and April 8. All three response dates exceed the 10-day maximum extension for responses to IDRs under § 67.25. Similarly, on June 22, 2016, Mr. Warne made IDRs to DPH for four categories of information. DPH timely requested an extension to provide a response but did not meet the ten-day deadline when it provided responsive records to Mr. Warne in violation of § 67.25.

C. The Sunshine Ordinance Task Force violated section 67.21(e) of the Sunshine Ordinance.

Mr. Warne alleges that the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force itself violated myriad provisions of the Sunshine Ordinance as well as its own internal rules and policies for the handling of complaints. The Ethics Commission does not have authority to enforce the SOTF's internal rules and policies, so Staff

addresses each of Mr. Warne's allegations of the Sunshine Ordinance only and ultimately concludes that the SOTF committed one violation of section 67.21(e).

1. Alleged violation of Sunshine Ordinance section 67.21(e)

Section 67.21(e) requires the SOTF to "inform the petitioner, as soon as possible...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. Mr. Warne filed one complaint with the SOTF on September 16, 2015, and another on September 23, 2015. The complainant asserts therefore that his complaints should have been heard by SOTF no later than November 2, 2015, and November 9, 2015, respectively. The SOTF did not hold its first hearing on Mr. Warne's complaints until November 17, 2015, at which point the SOTF continued Mr. Warne's hearing until January 2016. In January, the SOTF continued Mr. Warne's hearing again. Mr. Warne then withdrew his complaint before the SOTF and filed it with the Ethics Commission.

Per the SOTF Administrator and Staff's review of SOTF's agendas from June 1, 2014, to March 31, 2016, SOTF rarely complies with the 45-day rule for hearing complaints as required by Sunshine Ordinance section 67.21(e). As a result, complaints take approximately 2-3 months to be resolved. The SOTF acknowledges these "wait times" are a problem.¹ In its Annual Report covering the same period, the SOTF handled 325 complaints. *Id.* at p. 4. The SOTF responded by setting up a Complaint Committee to hear backlogged complaints "in an effort to reduce . . . wait times." *Id.* at p. 8. The SOTF also called upon the Board of Supervisors to fill two vacant seats on the SOTF to improve efficiencies. *Id.* Staff concludes that the SOTF violated section 67.21(e) of the Sunshine Ordinance by failing to make a determination regarding Mr. Warne's complaints within 45 days, but Staff also concludes that the SOTF did not intentionally disregard its deadline. Indeed, the SOTF appears to recognize the delays and is taking steps to deal with them.

2. Alleged violation of Sunshine Ordinance section 67.14

Section 67.14(a) permits any person attending an open and public meeting to record the proceedings with an audio or video recorder or a still or motion picture camera. Sunshine Ordinance section 67.14(b) relates to the audio recording requirements of certain boards and commissions. Sunshine Ordinance section 67.14(c) requires every policy body to audio or video record every noticed regular or special meeting or hearing held in a City Hall hearing room that is equipped with those facilities. None of these provisions appear to have been violated by SOTF or Mr. Young on November 17, 2015. Mr. Warne has not asserted that he was prohibited from recording the November 17, 2015, meeting or that SOTF or its committees do not record their open and public meetings. Staff confirmed that SOTF records its open and public meetings. Therefore, staff found no evidence indicating a violation of section 67.14.

3. Alleged violation of Sunshine Ordinance section 67.15

Section 67.15(a) requires an opportunity for members of the public to address the policy body during its regular meetings. Sunshine Ordinance section 67.15(b) provides for public testimony requirements at a special meeting. Sunshine Ordinance section 67.15(c) allows a policy body to adopt regulations to

¹ See SOTF 2014/2016 Annual Report, p. 8, available at <http://sfgov.org/sunshine/sites/default/files/FileCenter/Documents/56321-SOTF%20Annual%20Report%2020142016%20%20Final%2006.30.2016.pdf>.

ensure the intent of subdivisions (a) and (b) are carried out. Sunshine Ordinance section 67.15(d) prohibits a policy body from abridging or prohibiting public criticism of the policy, procedures, programs or services of the City, or various other things. Sunshine Ordinance section 67.15(e) requires an opportunity for members of the public to address the policy body.

Mr. Warne has not provided any information or evidence that any subdivision of Sunshine Ordinance section 67.15 was violated. Staff found no evidence indicating that SOTF or Mr. Young violated section 67.15 during the November 17, 2015 Complaint Committee meeting.

4. Alleged violation of Sunshine Ordinance section 67.30

Section 67.30 outlines the establishment and membership of the SOTF. It also states that the City Attorney "shall serve as legal advisor" to SOTF and that the SOTF shall have an attorney assigned to it to serve solely as a legal advisor and advocate to the Task Force. Mr. Warne alleges that the SOTF requested advice from its administrator on a matter and that the SOTF relied "heavily" on advice from the City Attorney assigned to advise the SOTF. In addition, the complainant stated that SOTF had violated section 67.30 as a "representative of the City Attorney as not present at its November 17, 2015 meeting." Staff confirmed with the City Attorney's Office that SOTF has an attorney assigned to it from within the City Attorney's Office. Staff also confirmed that the Deputy assigned to the SOTF is not required to attend the entirety of SOTF or its committees' meetings. Staff listened to the portions of the November 17, 2015 Complaint Committee meeting where the complainant's SOTF complaints were considered. On November 17, 2015, Mr. Young provided information to the members of the Complaint Committee regarding a continuance and other administrative matters, which are part of his duties as Administrator. Therefore, staff has found no evidence that SOTF or Mr. Young violated Sunshine Ordinance section 67.30.

5. Alleged violation of Sunshine Ordinance section 67.31

Section 67.31 requires the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors to provide a full-time staff person to perform administrative duties for the SOTF and to assist any person in gaining access to public meetings and information. Victor Young is the current SOTF Administrator, serving pursuant to Section 67.31. Mr. Warne alleges that Mr. Young advocated for Mr. Sarieh during his November 17, 2015 hearing before the SOTF Complaint Committee. Staff reviewed the recording of Mr. Warne's complaint during the subject meeting and found no evidence that Mr. Young acted outside the scope of his duties during the meeting. Mr. Young did not violate section 67.31.

Staff's Recommendation

If the Commission determines that a respondent has committed a violation of the Sunshine Ordinance, whether under Chapter Two or Chapter Three, the Commission may issue an order requiring any or all of the following:

- A. The respondent to cease and desist the violation and/or produce the public records;
- B. The Executive Director to post on the Commission's website the Commission's finding that the Respondent violated the Sunshine Ordinance;
- C. The Executive Director to issue a warning letter to the respondent and inform the respondent's appointment authority of the violation.

The Commission should issue a warning letter to Nancy Sarieh and the Department of Public Health for minor violations of the Sunshine Ordinance. As outlined above, Staff concludes that Nancy Sarieh, Public Information Officer for the Department of Public Health, violated Sunshine Ordinance sections 67.21(b) and 67.25 by failing to provide express justification for the withholding of documents from public disclosure and by failing to timely respond to three public records requests. Staff also concludes that Ms. Sarieh remedied her violations prior to Mr. Warne filing his complaint with the Ethics Commission. Accordingly, relief under (A) above does not apply.

Staff also Staff observes that Ms. Sarieh was dealing with several records requests, received on multiple days throughout 2015 and 2016. Staff has no evidence that Ms. Sarieh intended to violate the Sunshine Ordinance but rather appeared to have trouble keeping up with the voluminous and comprehensive nature of Mr. Warne's requests. Accordingly, relief under (B) is in appropriate. Staff, therefore, recommends that the Commission issue a warning letter to Ms. Sarieh and the Department of Public Health, pursuant to (C), advising them to put protocols in place that would assist Ms. Sarieh with Sunshine Ordinance compliance for future voluminous records requests.

The Commission should issue a warning letter to the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force. As outlined above, Staff concludes that the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force violated Sunshine Ordinance section 67.21(e) by failing to issue a determination within forty-five days of Mr. Warne filing his complaint against Nancy Sarieh and the Department of Public Health. Staff recommends that the Commission issue a warning letter to the SOTF encouraging its members to continue working on solutions for its complaint backlog and wait time issues.

Response from Respondent SOTF, received December 8, 2016

SUNSHINE ORDINANCE TASK FORCE



City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place Room 244
San Francisco CA 94102-4689
Tel. No. (415) 554-7724
Fax No. (415) 554-7854
TDD/TTY No. (415) 554-5227

MEMORANDUM

TO: Chair Paul Renne and the Ethics Commission
25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 220
San Francisco, CA 94102

FROM: Bruce Wolfe, Chair
Sunshine Ordinance Task Force

DATE: December 8, 2016

RE: Response to Ethics Commission Complaint Nos. 1516-23 & 1516-24

Sunshine Ordinance Task Force (herein, SOTF) thanks you for the consideration of continuance to the upcoming meeting to provide opportunity to review this issue being a new iteration of membership appointed just this past June 2016 and having no knowledge or experience of this case except through minutes and audio recording.

On December 7, 2016, the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force (Task Force) conducted a hearing to review the allegations listed in Ethics Commission Complaint Nos. 1516-23 & 1516-24.

Upon review of the allegations it appears that the only potential violation is in regards to Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Section 67.21(e) for failing to provide a determination as to whether the records requested is public. The Task Force acknowledges that a determination was not provided within 45 day in regards to Joel Warne's complaints filed with SOTF (File No. 15134 Joel Warne V Public Health). However, the Complaint Committee of SOTF conducted a hearing on the matter within 2 days of the 45-day determination requirement and was prepared to conduct additional hearings to resolve the complaint until Mr. Warne *withdrew his complaint*. Nonetheless, Mr. Warne's action to bring a complaint before the Ethics Commission strikes curious to SOTF.

In addition to the actions taken by SOTF listed in your staff report, SOTF has recently taken additional steps to comply with Administrative Code, Section 67.21(e). On November 2, 2016, SOTF adopted a new complaint hearing procedure to schedule all incoming complaints at the next available Complaint Committee or other authorized Committee to review the merits of the complaints, determine if SOTF has jurisdiction, and determine if the requested records are public prior to referring the complaints to SOTF for hearing. It should be noted that Administrative Code, Section 67.21(e) only requires that SOTF "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."

In regards to the complaint filed by Mr. Warne against Nancy Sariah, Department of Public Health, SOTF is concerned that the Ethics Commission has decided to hear Sunshine Ordinance complaints against city departments and would appreciate discussions regarding procedures in the future.

c: LeeAnn Pelham, Executive Director, Ethics Commission
Jessica, Blome, Deputy Director, Enforcement and Legal Affairs, Ethics Commission
Members, Sunshine Ordinance Task Force
Nicholas Colla, Deputy City Attorney

Response from Complainant Joel Warne, received January 19, 2017

The complaints, as they were iterated and presented to the Ethics Commission on December 19, 2016, were incorrect. I want to clarify.

On August 8, 2015, I self-admitted to San Francisco General Hospital due to an adverse reaction to long-prescribed medication. What would occur thereafter defies human conscience. During my admission, I was physically assaulted. I was verbally insulted and demoralized. The toxicology reports that I requested were denied to me. When I began experiencing severe cardiac symptoms, I kept calling out for a nurse and no one would respond. When someone finally responded, I asked her to show me my heart rate. She pointed to my systolic blood pressure. I got agitated and demanded her to show me my heart rate. She then pointed to my pulmonary vascular resistance.

I demanded to speak to my mother. Medical staff demanded to know why I wanted to make the call. I disclosed that she was a registered nurse and that I wanted to give her some of the information from the cardiac monitor. Tenner finally came and said I could use the phone. There was a wall-mounted phone just across the hall from my bed. I walked to it flanked on the right by Tenner and on the left by the mail nurse. I picked up the phone and began dialing. Tenner grabbed the phone out of my hand. She did this twice more before telling me to "sit the fuck back down."

When I demanded to be discharged, Tenner picked up the phone and called in a "code 415," combative patient. I was held down by several sheriff's deputies while medical staff placed me in restraints. I simultaneously received an injection to my right thigh. Medical staff then went through my shorts below the gurney and pulled out my cellphone. They confiscated it to another room. I demanded an attorney, and upon making that request, I was wheeled into a darkened, adjacent room, the door locked behind me.

I was still bound.

I ultimately lapsed in consciousness.

I was awakened the next morning while still under the influence of psychotropic drugs. I received no explanation for what happened and/or why it happened.

I moved to San Francisco on February 1, 2015, pursuant to a job offer as a labor representative for the mental health clinicians of Contra Costa County. While I worked in Contra Costa County, I lived in the City and County of San Francisco. In representing the mental health clinicians of Contra Costa County, I took up a lot of very controversial political issues.

I learned that Contra Costa County was defrauding MediCal by misrepresenting work performed on reimbursement vouchers by claiming work that was not performed, that the employees were not paid to perform, and in some cases the employees were not licensed to perform the work.

Contra Costa County at the time was implementing “AOT” (assistive outpatient treatment, otherwise known as Laura’s Law; codified at Welfare & Institutions Code (“WIC”) Sec. 5345, et seq.). Their intent was to contract out the work to non-bargaining unit employees of a not-for-profit organization. Their implementation was tied both in terms of deadlines for implementation and modality to San Francisco’s implementation of the same—November 1, 2015. I threw a wrench in the gears by threatening to have Contra Costa County’s contract nullified by the Public Employment Relations Board for failing or refusing to negotiate over the subject of contracting out unit-specific work.

I made no friends.

Three times between March 31 and May 15, 2015, my car was vandalized in my contract parking spot located just adjacent to my building at the corner of Brady St. and Stephenson St. Each time, my car was the only one targeted.

On May 21, 2015, I received a letter from the Department of Motor Vehicles (“DMV”) stating that my driver license was being revoked for having a condition “characterized by lapses of consciousness.” Though I’m diagnosed with a seizure disorder, I’ve been seizure free for six years now. When I went to the hearing on June 1, 2015, after receiving no response to my multiple discovery requests, I was led into an office, not a hearing chamber, by the deputy director of public safety. He apologized and told me that my “revocation folder had disappeared.”

I would later learn that the doctor who made the referral, whom I had met once in April 2015, destroyed her copies of the referral form. She argued destroying the forms was legal because they were “confidential.” I studied the law and learned that the form is the “morbidity” report, which may be filed pursuant to Health & Safety Code Sec. 103900. Contrary to what I was being told, the form does not go to the DMV. It goes to the “local health officer,” whom, in this case, is Dir. of Public Health Barbara Garcia. As it would have it, Garcia was also the one responsible for implementing AOT for the City and County of San Francisco.

Twenty-five or so days after my driver license was restored, my car was vandalized for a fourth time. This time \$18,000 was done, totaling the vehicle. Again, it was the only car targeted. On or around June 30, 2015, my first night in my rental car, it was vandalized, the window broken out and my work bag stolen.

On July 18, 2015, I submitted my resignation because what I now knew was political retribution led me to fear for my personal, physical safety. On August 7, 2015, my resignation was accepted and I separated from my employer.

Then the events at SFGH occurred.

On August 25 and 26, 2015, I filed three public records requests—with the Sheriff’s Department, the San Francisco District Attorney’s Office, and the San Francisco Police Department. Included in the request was “video,” and specific to the Sheriff’s Department, video

referred to the video surveillance footage captured at SFGH. All three either denied having any responsive records or in the case of the Sheriff's Department, refused to provide them. I also requested my medical records by fax to SFGH.

When I hadn't received my medical records by September 4, 2015, I presented in person to demand them. I received 14 pages of documents, which were incomplete. The documents included a number of incorrect assertions—including claims that I had Hepatitis C, when I don't; that my race was "Eskimo," when I'm a white male who recognizes that "Eskimo" is an ethnic slur; the medical record even cited a current medication of "Adaril [by intramuscular injection]." Adaril is hydroxyzine, which I was prescribed—but not by intramuscular injection and not until four days after it was entered into the medical record.

On September 8, 2015, I filed a massive request for fifty-two (52) categories of records. The majority of them were medical records and requested on the basis that I believed that I had been placed on a "5150 hold." I wanted to see the application and other documents related to that hold.

Included in the list, specifically at issue here, were:

- (1) the video surveillance footage from SFGH during my admission.
- (2) pricing documents for benztropine mesylate and haloperidol.

The SFDPH did not respond until October 13, 2015. The records were denied, generally, because they affirmed that I was not placed on a "5150 hold."

With respect to the two items at issue, the video surveillance footage was denied on the basis that it was a "law enforcement record." This is not a valid exemption for the SFGH. They later clarified that it was HIPAA protected on October 19, 2015.

In the interim period, on September 18, 2015, ten days after filing the request with no response from the SFDPH and a denial to provide the video surveillance footage by the Sheriff's Department, I filed a petition with the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force to order its release. I subsequently filed a second petition, when I was told the first could not be attributed to both the Sheriff's Department and Nancy Sariah (SFDPH).

A hearing was not scheduled until November 17, 2015—sixty days after the original petition was filed. I do not know where Mr. Wolfe got the information that the hearing was only two days late; nonetheless, he's wrong. Prior to the hearing, I submitted a copy of the medical record to Administrator Victor Young via e-mail. I specifically asked him by phone whether it would be kept confidential. I was told that it would be.

I appeared for the hearing on November 17, 2015, and not only did the SFDPH not show up to defend Nancy Sarieh but the City Attorney's designee failed to show up. That is where my complaints began.

I complained, and continue to complain, as follows:

(1) The Sunshine Ordinance specifically provides that a determination will be provided within forty-five days of the date of petition. It had been sixty. There was no legal grounds to continue the issue. Ordinances are not suggestions—they're laws.

(2) The nonchalant-ness of the chair person in saying, "Yea, that ordinance... we violate it all the time. No big whoop." Obviously, that's exaggerated paraphrase, but what I am referring to occurs at or around 33:20 in the published audio.

(3) I didn't argue that the City Attorney's designee must be present for every meeting, as the complaint was articulated to the Ethics Commission—but someone must be present who can make a damn decision. I understand the value in having journalists on the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force. I also understand that journalists aren't attorneys. I wouldn't even argue that you need an attorney on the complaints committee or the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force more generally. But if the people appointed to the complaints committee, in the collective and not individually, are so deficient in the law that they cannot stand on their own two feet and make a decision, then yes, a designee from the City Attorney's Office must be present.

There is no usefulness in even holding a meeting if those presiding over it can't make a decision without someone holding their hands.

(4) On four separate occasions, the Complaints Committee deferred to Victor Young for advice OR Victor Young asserted advice that he is not entitled to provide. The duties of the Administrator are written out in ordinance:

"The Clerk of the Board of Supervisors shall provide a full-time staff person to perform administrative duties for the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force and to assist any person in gaining access to public meetings or public information. The Clerk of the Board of Supervisors shall provide that staff person with whatever facilities and equipment are necessary to perform said duties." (Sec. 67.31.)

The administrator is not an advisor to the committee; yet, at 32:05, Young advises the committee without being asked; 32:50, Young advises the committee without being asked; 34:50, Young advises the committee without being asked; at 36:50, he wants to "interject."

The administrator cannot advise the committee on substantive matters. The administrator is not an appointed member of the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, nor is he a representative from the City Attorney's Office.

(5) The petitions were not continued to January 6, 2016, they were continued to February 6, 2016. I was conveniently assigned jury duty on that date. Young responded by proposing March 2016, but then wrote again continuing the issue to April 6, 2016—that's 201 days after the petition was filed.

(6) The Sunshine Ordinance Task Force published my medical records on the City's public website—entirely unredacted and entirely incorrect.

(7) Freya Horne said that I would receive a letter at the conclusion of the investigation into my internal affairs complaint and that when it was complete I would get the video surveillance footage. I never received a letter and Freya then refused to provide it once I discovered the case had been closed.

Below are my short hand notes. The timestamps are what are important.

Plaintiff ends speaking at 10:10 as to sheriff's department.

Plaintiff sits at 10:40.

13:00 Horne stops talking.

Chair questions Horne.

16:05, can he have the record after the investigation?

Horne: only if discipline is complete.

17:05, no discipline: Horne: He's sent a letter.

18:13, Elton – letter sent, no misconduct, request.

18:15 – once no misconduct, request would be made.

18:50 – no misconduct, video sooner; misconduct, sometime after that. Never indefinite no. In this case he would get the video.

20:15 – sunshine issue if an investigation agency has a rule that goes against mandate, Elton. That appears to be a sunshine issue before us.

21:49 – "We'll get to you." Joel intercedes.

22:12 returns to speak.

September 15, they said, "we'll request it." Sat for 12 days, not requesting it. Must look at what it was used for at the time that it was originally requested.

23:34: Elton, you basically need it now. Joel, It's been two months, no notification.

Joel, THIS INVESTIGATION DIDN'T OCCUR YET; CANNOT HOLD IN PERPETUITY.

26:45 – GOES ALL THE WAY TO AUGUST 29, 2015, ORIGINAL REQUEST (ERROR). Look at original motive.

26:06 – no perpetuity, elton

27:43 – first public records request, not internal affairs.

28:30 – Move to full body.

28:50 – nothing you're going to get from the three of us.

29:10 – only purpose for requesting the video surveillance footage.

30:00 – Horne, original request... nothing under his name. Video only was requested because of his complaint.

31:15, Eldon would like to know from the city attorney—what exactly do they believe is the law. Is the fact that they asked for a public record first keep it from being exempted.

32:05 – Victor Young advising the committee. “It’s my understanding...”

32:30 – Fluffer for Freya.

32:50 – Victor young, “May I suggest ... that it be continued to January.”

33:10 – we’ll let you speak. (Joel, raising objections from gally.)

33:20: Joel, Sunshine ordinance is in violation of its own rules. Chair responds: “Yea, that happens.” No CORRESPONDENCE FROM SFDPH, NO PRESENCE. ARE YOU WILLING TO ACCEPT THAT THE SUNSHINE ORDINANCE TASK FORCE IS PUTTING ITSELF IN THE POSITION OF VIOLATING ITS OWN ORDINANCE.

34:48: AGREE THAT’S WILLFUL MISCONDUCT.

34:50 “We rarely comply.”

34:50: Young: May I make a suggestion.... [to continue].

36:00 – requested a continuance from SFDPH denied – “Joel”)

36:50 – Joel. The Department of Health has not requested a continuance. If they didn’t request a continuance one did not exist. Been denied copy of request for continuance from dgfph.

36:50 – Young, “I want to refute that. SFDPH made oral request.”

37:19 –“they don’t have to give a reason.”

38:00 Joel – Backward interpretation, sets a poor standard for agencies, that they can hold documents on the basis that they may get around to investigate.

39:20 – not talking about stealing petty cash, talking about emotional abuse; sheriff’s that are still badged, doctor’s that are still badged and tending to patients.

42:30 – TO sfdph, may I suggest – Young.

44:40 – Congentin violation of human rights violations.

45:00 – Alameda County pticing.

46:00—

47:50 – to be here they would have to perjure themselves.

48:20 – Young, “

Joel Warne

Warne, Exhibit 1

From: **Blome, Jessica (ETH)** jessica.blome@sfgov.org
Subject: RE: Letter of Warning in re: Complaint No. 1516-24 & 24, Joel Warne v. Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, et al.
Date: January 9, 2017 at 3:35 PM
To: JOEL WARNE joeljwarne@icloud.com, Pelham, LeeAnn (ETH) leeann.pelham@sfgov.org
Cc: soft@brucewolfe.net, Garcia, Barbara (DPH) barbara.garcia@sfdph.org



Mr. Warne,

Our response to your request for rehearing is attached to this email.

Sincerely,

Jessica L. Blome
Deputy Director, Enforcement & Legal Affairs
San Francisco Ethics Commission
(415) 252-3100
sfethics.org | jessica.blome@sfgov.org

From: JOEL WARNE [<mailto:joeljwarne@icloud.com>]
Sent: Saturday, December 31, 2016 1:01 PM
To: Pelham, LeeAnn (ETH) <leeann.pelham@sfgov.org>
Cc: Blome, Jessica (ETH) <jessica.blome@sfgov.org>; soft@brucewolfe.net; Garcia, Barbara (DPH) <barbara.garcia@sfdph.org>
Subject: Letter of Warning in re: Complaint No. 1516-24 & 24, Joel Warne v. Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, et al.

Dear Ms. Pelham:

I, Complainant in the above-referenced matters, Joel Warne, am in receipt of your Ethics Commission hearing notice, dated December 23, 2016, and referring to a hearing held on December 19, 2016.

I am writing to state that I have very serious concerns about the manner in which this case was heard. First, a hearing was held on December 19, 2016, in my absence, without notice, and without an opportunity to attend and provide testimony. I am relatively certain that is a violation of the Brown Act. Had I been afforded an opportunity to appear, either by teleconference or in person, I would have clarified. There appears to be multiple misunderstandings between the Ethics Commission and the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force.

For instance, Mr. Wolfe states on page 1 of his response: "The Task Force acknowledges that a response was not provided within 45 days [in regards to Warne's complaint ...]. However, the Complaint Committee of the SOTF conducted a hearing on the matter within 2 days of the 45-day determination requirement and was prepared to conduct additional hearings to resolve the complaint until Mr. Warne withdrew his complaint."

That is patently false. The initial set of requests made to Ms. Sarih and the San Francisco Sheriff's Department were made on September 8, 2015. When I did not receive a response by COB on September 18, 2015, I filed a complaint on that day, as acknowledged by the SOTF on or around September 23, 2015, and quickly thereafter, filed a second complaint with the SOTF. That's 60 days, not 45 + 2. I don't know where Mr. Wolfe got his math.

nonetheless, it's wrong. Further, the complaint was withdrawn because I was conveniently selected for jury duty the date a full hearing was scheduled. I could not attend. When I brought this up to Victor Young, he told me they couldn't schedule a new hearing until APRIL 6, 2016...**that's 201 days after the petition was filed.** That's a willful violation of the Sunshine Ordinance. It was more time efficient to file in civil court, which I did. The Court ruled that many of the records withheld by Nancy Sarieh **were public records** and that they were wrongfully withheld—with or without a legal citation for non-disclosure. It only cost me \$2,500 to receive the records which, under the Sunshine Ordinance, should have been free (with an exception for duplication fees) had Nancy Sarieh done her damn job. (See attached.)

The Task Force is not in a position to continue an issue for 201 days—and if the DPH did not show up so as to defend non-disclosure, the Task Force should have entered a default judgment in my favor.

Additionally, the Ethics Commission decided that the Sunshine Ordinance does not require the City Attorney, or his or her designee, to be in attendance for the entirety of every meeting. That may or may not be true. The issue, as expressed in my complaint, was that during the course of the hearing, in the absence of a representative of the DPH and the City Attorney, the Complaints Committee gave me exactly 5:00 minutes of speaking time until I stood up in protest. Freya Horne for the Sheriff was given 17 minutes of speaking time, and the chair of the Committee deferred to Horne for judgment as to the merits of the case—all the while, telling me that I “was not to speak” and that “it wasn't my time.” Finally, as the complaint wrongly reflects, in Sarieh's absence and in the absence of the City Attorney's designee, the Committee deferred to Victor Young for how to proceed. Victor Young advised the chair of the Committee to continue the hearing rather than enter a default judgment in my favor. **THAT** was the issue raised. The Sunshine Ordinance does not permit the administrator, a member of staff and not a designee of the City Attorney, to advise the Task Force. The Task Force must be a self-sufficient body who, notwithstanding advisement by the City Attorney, has the knowledge, intellectual capacity, and reasoning ability to stand on its own without 1) deferring for judgment to the defendant (Horne); and with regard to the DPH, 2) deferring judgment as to courses of action to the administrator. The administrator is a member of the City's civil service system and is not publicly accountable as an elected or appointed person.

As I stated in my complaint, the Sunshine Ordinance is specific to the role of the administrator: "The Clerk of the Board of Supervisors shall provide a full-time staff person to perform administrative duties for the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force and to assist any person in gaining access to public meetings or public information. The Clerk of the Board of Supervisors shall provide that staff person with whatever facilities and equipment are necessary to perform said duties." (Sec. 67.31.) Nowhere in that section does it give the administrator authorization to advise the Task Force or contribute to their deliberations. Young's job is to set up the video and audio equipment, take roll call, and shut up.

Here's why: To my knowledge you can't hear Victor Young advising the Committee. You can tell where in the audio, based on pauses, where the chair person is being advised. The reason you can't hear him is because **HE WASN'T MIC'ED.** That's a violation of the Brown Act and Sec. 67.14(b) of the Sunshine Ordinance.

Lastly, the Ethics Commission failed to address the most important issue: the fact that, in response to my demands for the video surveillance footage from SFGH, the CCSF responded by publishing my entire medical record and confidential information relating thereto on the City's public website. That medical record includes fictitious information, such as that I have Hepatitis C (I don't, and can prove that I don't); that I had been bingeing on illicit drugs for "five days" (I hadn't); that my race is "Eskimo" (it isn't); that I had been injecting "adaril" (I haven't). In the above-referenced litigation, the CCSF conceded that the medical record contains "several inaccuracies":

27 22. Answering paragraph 22 above its lettered subparagraphs, respondents admit that on
28 about September 4, 2015, petitioner received a copy of his emergency record from SFGH, which is 1

EXHIBIT C-8

1 pages in length, and whose contents speak for themselves. Respondents admit that the record contain
2 several inaccuracies. Respondents deny that petitioner's record contains "contrived information" or

3 that it reflects any "hurried attempt to cover up the abuse," and further deny that any "abuse" occurred
4 Respondents lack information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations
5 contained therein, and deny the same on that basis.

6 a. Answering subparagraph 22.a, respondents admit that the medical record
7 that petitioner's "past medical history" included Hepatitis C. Respondents also admit that petiti
8 subsequently reported that he does not have Hepatitis C and requested that his protected health
9 information be amended accordingly, and that a correction was appended to petitioner's protecte
10 health information. Respondents lack information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of th
11 subparagraph's remaining allegations, and deny the same on that basis.

12 b. Answering subparagraph 22.b, respondents admit that the ECG listed
13 petitioner's race as "Eskimo," although the rest of petitioner's medical record did not. Respondent

14 admit that petitioner is a white male. Respondents lack information sufficient to form a belief as to
15 truth of that subparagraph's remaining allegations, and deny the same on that basis.

21 d. Answering subparagraph 22.d, respondents admit that the medical record states
22 under "current medications," that petitioner reported taking Adderall by muscular injection.
23 Respondents deny that Adderall is hydroxyzine. Respondents lack information sufficient to form
24 belief as to the truth of that subparagraph's remaining allegations, and deny the same on that basis.

(With regard to the last, the medical record does not say "Adderall," it says "Adaril," which is hydroxyzine and in either case, not only am I not an injection drug user, I don't believe injecting Adderall is even possible.)

The medical record and related information were provided, under Victor Young's assurances that they would be handled confidentially, for the SOTF's private deliberative processes. The SOTF responded by publishing the medical record, entirely unredacted, on its public website—clear as day, for up to six months, with sufficient SEO so that it was the second result when you googled my name.

THAT was the issue I wanted the Ethics Commission to address. Because not only did Victor Young provide his assurances that the information would be kept confidential, but medical records have to be kept confidential under the Brown Act (Govt Code Sec. 64597.5 & 6254(c)). However, I couldn't clarify these issues because no one bothered to notify me that a hearing was occurring on my complaints.

THAT is why I'm so damn angry, and I can't even get the Ethics Commission to properly articulate the issues and confirm them with me, let alone send me an invitation to be heard at the hearing.

Joel Warne
415-815-8512

110 010 0011

PDF



2017-01-09,
Warne...ne.pdf

Warne Response, Exhibit 2

From: SOTF, (BOS) sotf@sfgov.org
Subject: SOTF - Cancellation/Withdrawal of Complaint Nos. 15129 and 15134
Date: February 8, 2016 at 1:43 PM
To: Joel Warne joeljwarne@gmail.com
Cc: Horne, Freya (SHF) freya.horne@sfgov.org, Sarieh, Nancy (DPH) nancy.sarieh@sfdph.org, Calvillo, Angela (BOS) angela.calvillo@sfgov.org

S

Dear Mr. Warne:

I am in receipt of your request to cancel/withdraw your complaints listed below pending before the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force and will process your request. Thank you.

File No. 15129: Complaint filed by Joel Warne against Freya Horne and the Sheriff's Department for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.21 and 67.25, by failing to respond to a request for public records in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 15134: Complaint filed by Joel Warne against the Department of Public Health for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.21 and 67.25, by failing to respond to a request for public records in a timely and/or complete manner and failing to send a knowledge representative to the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force – Complaint Committee hearing on November 17, 2015.

Victor Young 415-554-7724
Administrator, Sunshine Ordinance Task Force

From: Joel Warne [<mailto:joeljwarne@gmail.com>]
Sent: Saturday, February 06, 2016 2:39 AM
To: SOTF, (BOS) <sotf@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: SOTF - Complaint Nos. 15129 and 15134 - Updated rescheduling Information

Please cancel my complaints 15134 and 15129. I decided instead to file a civil claim in superior court. Please delete my complaints and all content from the public folders.

Sent from my iPhone

On Dec 30, 2015, at 4:10 PM, SOTF, (BOS) <sotf@sfgov.org> wrote:

Dear Mr. Warne:

I would like to provide a correction to the possible rescheduling hearing date for your complaints. Please note that your complaints will be tentatively rescheduled for hearing on April 6, 2016. Notice of hearing will be provided approximately 2 weeks prior to the hearing.

Thank you.

Victor Young 415-554-7724
Administrator, Sunshine Ordinance Task Force

From: SOTF, (BOS)
Sent: Wednesday, December 30, 2015 11:58 AM
To: 'Joel Warne' <joeljwarne@gmail.com>
Cc: Horne, Freya (SHF) <freya.horne@sfgov.org>; Nicco, Mark (SHF) <mark.nicco@sfgov.org>; Mirkarimi, Ross (SHF) <ross.mirkarimi@sfgov.org>; Sarieh, Nancy (DPH) <nancy.sarieh@sfdph.org>; DPH, PublicRecords (DPH) <publicrecords.dph@sfdph.org>; Ausberry, Andrea <andrea.ausberry@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>
Subject: SOTF - Continuance Granted - Complaint Nos. 15129 and 15134 - January 6, 2016

Dear Mr. Warne:

Your request for continuance of your complaints scheduled before the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force (SOTF) on January 6, 2016, has been granted pursuant to the SOTF's Complaint Procedures(attached).

Please note that your complaints have been tentatively rescheduled for hearing on March 2, 2016, at 4:00 p.m. Notice of hearing will be provided approximately 2 weeks prior to the hearing.

File No. 15129: Complaint filed by Joel Warne against Freya Horne and the Sheriff's Department for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.21 and 67.25, by failing to respond to a request for public records in a timely and/or complete manner.

(The Complaint Committee referred the complaint to the SOTF without recommendation for hearing on the merits of the complaint)

File No. 15134: Complaint filed by Joel Warne against the Department of Public Health for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.21 and 67.25, by failing to respond to a request for public records in a timely and/or complete manner and failing to send a knowledge representative to the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force – Complaint Committee hearing on November 17, 2015. *(attachment)*

(The Complaint Committee referred the complaint to the SOTF without recommendation for hearing on the merits of the complaint)

Please contact me if you have any questions.

Please contact me if you have any questions.

Victor Young 415-554-7724
Administrator, Sunshine Ordinance Task Force

From: Joel Warne [<mailto:joeljwarne@gmail.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, December 29, 2015 4:26 PM
To: SOTF, (BOS) <sotf@sfgov.org>
Cc: Michael Anderer <michael_anderer@demarillac.org>; Gavin, John (ECN) <john.gavin@sfgov.org>; Joel Warne <joeljwarne@gmail.com>; Horne, Freya (SHF) <freya.horne@sfgov.org>; Nicco, Mark (SHF) <mark.nicco@sfgov.org>; Mirkarimi, Ross (SHF) <ross.mirkarimi@sfgov.org>; Sarieh, Nancy (DPH) <nancy.sarieh@sfdph.org>; DPH, PublicRecords (DPH) <PublicRecords.DPH@sfdph.org>; Tom Borden <tom@intrinsicdevices.com>; Pawlowsky, Eric (REC) <eric.pawlowsky@sfgov.org>; Ginsburg, Phil (REC) <phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: SOTF - Agenda and Packet for January 6, 2016 meeting - online

Hello:

I've encountered an issue where I am scheduled to be in jury duty, for jury selection, on that date and am unable to attend. I must request a continuance. Please let me know if you need confirmation from the Hall of Justice or the presiding judge.

Joel

On Dec 29, 2015, at 1:31 PM, SOTF, (BOS) <sotf@sfgov.org> wrote:

Good Afternoon:

The agenda packet for the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force January 6, 2016, meeting is available online at the following link:

<http://www.sfbos.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=54595>

The packet material is linked to each item listed on the agenda. Click anywhere on the title of the item to open the link to the pdf of the packet material in question.

Please note that additional material may have been added to the file and is available as part of the packet at the above listed link.

Victor Young

Administrator

Sunshine Ordinance Task Force

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall., Room 244

San Francisco CA 94102

phone 415-554-7724 | fax 415-554-5163

victor.young@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

[<image001.png>](#) Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The [Legislative Research Center](#) provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation, and archived matters since August 1998.

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

<SOTF - Complaint Procedure 2014-11-05.pdf>