MEMORANDUM

TO: Honorable Members
Sunshine Ordinance Task Force

FROM: Bradley Russi
Deputy City Attorney

DATE: November 8, 2022

RE: Twenty-Second Annual Report of the Supervisor of Records
January 1 to December 31, 2021

The City Attorney’s Office submits this report to the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force under Section 67.21(h) of the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance (S.F. Admin. Code §67.21(h)). That section requires the Supervisor of Records to prepare an annual tally and report for the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force on each petition brought before the Supervisor of Records for access to records. Section 67.21(h) includes the following requirements:

- 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.

- Reporting period: This report covers petitions brought before the Supervisor of Records between January 1 – December 31, 2021 (the “reporting period”). We also include petitions submitted in 2020 that have been resolved since the previous Annual Report of the Supervisor of Records dated October 28, 2021.

- Custodian of Records: For the custodian of records, the report generally gives the name of the employee who responded to the request.

- Court actions: No court decisions issued regarding determinations by the Supervisor of Records for the reporting period.

- Orders issued: No order from the Supervisor of Records issued to any City department whose records were the subject of a petition.

- Court Decisions Interpreting or Applying the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance: No court decisions interpreting or applying the Sunshine Ordinance for the reporting period.
DESCRIPTION OF PETITIONS AND THEIR DISPOSITION

1. Petitioner: Anonymous (this petition and those below from “Anonymous” are from the same individual)
   Department: Department of Public Works
   Records sought: Communications regarding a prior records request
   Custodian of Records: David Steinberg
   Determination: Department properly redacted email based on privacy. See Gov’t Code Secs. 6254(c), (k); Cal. Const. Art. I, Sec. 1.
   Date Petition Received: December 9, 2020
   Date of Determination: December 20, 2021
   A copy of the decision and petition are included on pages 1-16 of the Appendix.

2. Petitioner: Anonymous
   Department: Department of Police Accountability
   Records sought: Audio recordings of interviews department conducted in connection with three investigations
   Custodian of Records: Paul Henderson
   Determination: Department indicated it would produce recordings of interviews with police officers. Department properly withheld recordings of interviews with complainants and witnesses based on the official information privilege and privacy. See Gov’t Code Sec. 6254(c), (k); Penal Code Secs. 823.7(b)(5)(B)-(C), (b)(6); Cal. Const. Art. I, Sec. 1; Evid. Code Sec. 1040.
   Date Petition Received: December 22, 2020
   Date of Determination: November 18, 2021
   A copy of the decision and petition are included on pages 17-20 of the Appendix.

3. Petitioner: Anonymous
   Department: Mayor’s Office
   Records sought: Various calendar entries
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Custodian of Records: Hank Heckel
Determination: No determination needed; issues resolved at Task Force.

Date Petition Received: December 29, 2020
Date of Determination: Petition closed on August 5, 2022

A copy of the decision and petition are included on pages 21-50 of the Appendix.

4. Petitioner: Anonymous
   Department: Mayor’s Office
   Records sought: Various text messages and other communications
   Custodian of Records: Hank Heckel
   Determination: No determination needed; department confirmed it had no responsive records with respect to one request and produced records with regard to the second request.

   Date Petition Received: December 30, 2020
   Date of Determination: Petition closed on March 16, 2022

A copy of the decision and petition are included on pages 51-63 of the Appendix.

5. Petitioner: Anonymous
   Department: City Administrator’s Office
   Records sought: Communications between former City Administrator Naomi Kelly; documents regarding United States v. Harlan Kelly
   Custodian of Records: Tal Quetone
   Determination: No determination needed; department confirmed it had no responsive records regarding one request and produced records with regard to the second request.

   Date Petition Received: December 30, 2020
   Date of Determination: Petition closed on November 19, 2021

A copy of the decision and petition are included on pages 64-73 of the Appendix.
6. **Petitioner:** Anonymous  
**Department:** Department of Emergency Management  
**Records sought:** Communications between the department head and various individuals; communications between other department staff and various individuals  
**Custodian of Records:** Victor Lim  
**Determination:** No determination needed; department confirmed it had no responsive records.  
**Date Petition Received:** December 30, 2020  
**Date of Determination:** Petition closed on November 17, 2021  
A copy of the decision and petition are included on pages 74-81 of the Appendix.

7. **Petitioner:** Anonymous  
**Department:** Department of Public Health  
**Records sought:** Communications between the department head and the health officer and various individuals  
**Custodian of Records:** Veronica Vien  
**Determination:** No determination needed; department produced records with regard to one request and confirmed it had no responsive records regarding the second request  
**Date Petition Received:** January 4, 2021  
**Date of Determination:** Petition closed on March 21, 2022  
A copy of the decision and petition are included on pages 82-96 of the Appendix.

8. **Petitioner:** Anonymous  
**Department:** City Attorney’s Office  
**Records sought:** Two calendar entries  
**Custodian of Records:** Elizabeth Coolbrith  
**Determination:** Department properly redacted records under Government Code Secs. 6254.19 and 6254(k), and Evidence Code Sec. 1040.  
**Date Petition Received:** January 8, 2021
9. Petitioner: Anonymous  
Department: City Attorney’s Office  
Records sought: A record that the department previously provided to the requester  
Custodian of Records: Elizabeth Coolbrith  
Determination: No determination needed; department produced responsive record.  
Date Petition Received: January 8, 2021  
Date of Determination: Petition closed on March 16, 2022  
A copy of the decision and petition are included on pages 104-119 of the Appendix.

10. Petitioner: Anonymous  
Department: Mayor’s Office  
Records sought: All Government Code Section 6254.21 written demands issued by the Mayor or her agents in 2020  
Custodian of Records: Hank Heckel  
Determination: No determination needed; department did not withhold or redact records.  
Date Petition Received: January 11, 2021  
Date of Determination: Petition closed on April 14, 2022  
A copy of the decision and petition are included on pages 120-121 of the Appendix.

11. Petitioner: Ross Braden  
Department: Department of Public Health  
Records sought: Communications and other records regarding Color and Carbon Health and regarding PCR testing  
Custodian of Records: Veronica Vien  
Determination: No determination needed; department produced responsive records.
Date Petition Received: January 12, 2021
Date of Determination: Petition closed on June 4, 2021

A copy of the decision and petition are included on pages 122-127 of the Appendix.

12. Petitioner: Anonymous
Department: Mayor’s Office
Records sought: Communication with various individuals
Custodian of Records: Hank Heckel
Determination: No determination needed; department produced responsive records.

Date Petition Received: January 19, 2021
Date of Determination: Petition closed on August 4, 2022

A copy of the decision and petition are included on pages 128-141 of the Appendix.

13. Petitioner: Anonymous
Department: Mayor’s Office
Records sought: Communication with records custodians group
Custodian of Records: Hank Heckel
Determination: No determination needed; department produced responsive records.

Date Petition Received: January 19, 2021
Date of Determination: Petition closed on May 11 2022

A copy of the decision and petition are included on pages 142-155 of the Appendix.

14. Petitioner: Anonymous
Department: Board of Supervisors
Records sought: An email from Supervisor Sandra Fewer’s office regarding a code enforcement request
Custodian of Records: Wilson Ng
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Determination: Department properly redacted document based on Government Code Section 6254(k) and Evidence Code Section 1041.

Date Petition Received: January 25, 2021
Date of Determination: February 24, 2021

A copy of the decision and petition are included on pages 156-210 of the Appendix.

15. Petitioner: Harry Pariser
Department: Recreation and Parks Department
Records sought: Records regarding a specific person
Custodian of Records: Tiffany Lin-Wilson
Determination: No determination needed; department did not redact or withhold records and was continuing to respond to request.

Date Petition Received: February 5, 2021
Date of Determination: Petition closed on February 10, 2021

A copy of the decision and petition are included on pages 211-218 of the Appendix.

16. Petitioner: Anonymous
Department: Mayor’s Office
Records sought: Various calendar entries
Custodian of Records: Hank Heckel
Determination: Department properly redacted information reflecting draft recommendations of the author. See Administrative Code Section 67.24(a)(1), Government Code Section 6254(a).

Date Petition Received: February 10, 2021
Date of Determination: February 19, 2021

A copy of the decision and petition are included on pages 219-249 of the Appendix.

17. Petitioner: Jeremy Goodrich
Department: District Attorney’s Office
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Records sought: All records regarding a specific case
Custodian of Records: Robyn Burke
Determination: No determination needed; department produced responsive records.
Date Petition Received: February 10, 2021
Date of Determination: Petition closed on March 22, 2021
A copy of the decision and petition are included on pages 250-254 of the Appendix.

18. Petitioner: Anonymous
Department: Mayor’s Office
City Attorney’s Office
Police Department
Sheriff’s Department
Records sought: Prospective calendar entries
Custodian of Records: Various
Date Petition Received: February 12, 2021
Date of Determination: March 9, 2021
A copy of the decision and petition are included on pages 255-317 of the Appendix.

19. Petitioner: Anonymous
Department: Office of Economic and Workforce Development
Records sought: Communication with the Mayor’s Office
Custodian of Records: Marianne Thompson
Determination: Department properly redacted information reflecting draft recommendations of the author. See Administrative Code Section 67.24(a)(1), Government Code Section 6254(a).
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Date Petition Received: February 16, 2021
Date of Determination: February 19, 2021

A copy of the decision and petition are included on pages 318-321 of the Appendix.

20. Petitioner: Anonymous
Department: Board of Supervisors
Records sought: Communications between Supervisor Myrna Melgar’s office and various individuals
Custodian of Records: Wilson Ng
Determination: Department properly redacted information unrelated to City business.
Date Petition Received: February 17, 2021
Date of Determination: February 19, 2021

A copy of the decision and petition are included on pages 322-343 of the Appendix.

21. Petitioner: Anonymous
Department: Public Utilities Commission
Records sought: Communications between department staff and various individuals
Custodian of Records: Mayara Ruski Augusto Sa
Determination: No determination needed; department did not redact or withhold records.
Date Petition Received: February 18, 2021
Date of Determination: Petition closed on February 24, 2021

A copy of the decision and petition are included on pages 344-354 of the Appendix.

22. Petitioner: Anonymous
Department: Public Library
Records sought: Communications between commissioners and various individuals
Custodian of Records: Margot Shaub
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Determination: No determination needed; department produced responsive records.
Date Petition Received: February 22, 2021
Date of Determination: Petition closed on May 13, 2022

A copy of the decision and petition are included on pages 355-360 of the Appendix.

23. Petitioner: Anonymous
Department: Public Utilities Commission
Records sought: Electronic communications between Walter Wong and Harlan Kelly
Custodian of Records: Mayara Ruski Augusto Sa
Determination: Department appropriately redacted portions of the records that do not contain information relating to the conduct of the public’s business and therefore do not constitute public records. See Government Code Sec. 6252(e), City of San Jose v. Superior Court, 2 Cal.5th 608 (2017); would constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy, Cal. Const. Art. I, Sec. 1, Government Code Section 6254(c); or would disclose confidential personnel information, Government Code Section 6254(c).

Date Petition Received: February 23, 2021
Date of Determination: March 8, 2021

A copy of the decision and petition are included on pages 361-431 of the Appendix.

24. Petitioner: Anonymous
Department: Board of Supervisors
Records sought: An email from Supervisor Sandra Fewer’s office regarding a code enforcement request
Custodian of Records: Wilson Ng
Determination: Department properly redacted records based on the official information privilege and identity of informer privilege. See Government Code Section 6254(k), Evidence Code Sections 1040 and 1041.

Date Petition Received: February 25, 2021
Date of Determination: April 28, 2021
A copy of the decision and petition are included on pages 432-480 of the Appendix.

25. Petitioner: Anonymous
Department: Ethics Commission
Records sought: Log of complaints
Custodian of Records: Jeffrey Pierce
Determination: No determination needed; department further responded and petitioner filed another petition regarding that response.
Date Petition Received: February 25, 2021
Date of Determination: Petition closed on August 5, 2022
A copy of the decision and petition are included on pages 481-495 of the Appendix.

26. Petitioner: Anonymous
Department: Board of Supervisors
Records sought: Various calendar entries
Custodian of Records: Wilson Ng
Determination: No determination needed; department produced responsive records.
Date Petition Received: February 26, 2021
Date of Determination: Petition closed on August 5, 2022
A copy of the decision and petition are included on pages 496-508 of the Appendix.

27. Petitioner: anonymousrecordspublicca@gmail.com
Department: Municipal Transportation Agency
Records sought: Records regarding a residential parking permit
Custodian of Records: Caroline Celaya
Determination: Petition withdrawn after department produced records
Date Petition Received: March 1, 2021
Date of Determination: Petition withdrawn on March 5, 2021
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A copy of the decision and petition are included on pages 509-515 of the Appendix.

28. Petitioner: Anonymous
   Department: Public Utilities Commission
   Records sought: Communications between various individuals
   Custodian of Records: Mayara Ruski Augusto Sa
   Determination: Department properly redacted information reflecting attorney advice. See Government Code Section 6254(k), Evidence Code Section 954.
   Date Petition Received: March 9, 2021
   Date of Determination: August 5, 2022

A copy of the decision and petition are included on pages 516-528 of the Appendix.

29. Petitioner: Anonymous
   Department: Office of Economic and Workforce Development
   Records sought: Communications between various individuals
   Custodian of Records: Marianne Thompson
   Determination: Department properly redacted information based on privacy. See Government Code Sections 6254(c), (k); Cal. Const. Art. I, Sec. 1.
   Date Petition Received: March 10, 2021
   Date of Determination: May 10, 2022

A copy of the decision and petition are included on pages 529-547 of the Appendix.

30. Petitioner: Harold Christian
    Department: Controller’s Office
    Records sought: Record regarding uncashed checks
    Custodian of Records: Claire Stone
    Determination: No determination needed; department produced responsive records.
    Date Petition Received: March 16, 2021
Date of Determination: Petition closed on March 26, 2021
A copy of the decision and petition are included on pages 548-561 of the Appendix.

31. Petitioner: Zach Karnazes
   Department: Department of Disability and Aging Services
     Human Services Agency
   Records sought: Records regarding a proposed disability cultural center
   Custodian of Records: Ken Pang
   Determination: No determination needed; department produced responsive records.
   Date Petition Received: March 25, 2021
   Date of Determination: Petition closed on April 23, 2021
A copy of the decision and petition are included on pages 562-580 of the Appendix.

32. Petitioner: Anonymous
   Department: Department of Public Works
   Records sought: Various text messages
   Custodian of Records: David Steinberg
   Determination: Department properly redacted a personal cell phone number based on privacy. See Government Code Sections 6254(c) and (k), Cal. Const. Art I, Section 1.
   Date Petition Received: April 15, 2021
   Date of Determination: May 20, 2022
A copy of the decision and petition are included on pages 581-594 of the Appendix.

33. Petitioner: Charles Perkins
   Department: Board of Supervisors
   Records sought: Records from Supervisor Gordon Mar’s office concerning the closure of the Great Highway
   Custodian of Records: Wilson Ng
   Determination: No determination needed; department produced responsive records.
Date Petition Received: April 23, 2021
Date of Determination: Petition closed on May 11, 2021

A copy of the decision and petition are included on pages 595-601 of the Appendix.

34. Petitioner: Sam Wong
Department: Board of Supervisors
Records sought: Records from Supervisor Matt Haney’s office concerning the availability of vaccines
Custodian of Records: Wilson Ng
Determination: No determination necessary; department produced responsive records.
Date Petition Received: April 26, 2021
Date of Determination: Petition closed on April 29, 2021

A copy of the decision and petition are included on pages 602-604 of the Appendix.

35. Petitioner: Anonymous
Department: City Attorney’s Office
Records sought: Communications with various individuals
Custodian of Records: Elizabeth Coolbrith
Determination: No determination needed; department produced responsive records.
Date Petition Received: May 10, 2021
Date of Determination: Petition closed on August 12, 2022

A copy of the decision and petition are included on pages 605-656 of the Appendix.

36. Petitioner: Anonymous
Department: City Attorney’s Office
Records sought: Communications with journalists regarding a lawsuit
Custodian of Records: Elizabeth Coolbrith
Determination: Department properly redacted portions of emails reflecting information obtained in confidence based on
the official information privilege. See Government Code Section 6254(k); Evidence Code Section 1040.

Date Petition Received: May 28, 2021
Date of Determination: August 12, 2022
A copy of the decision and petition are included on pages 657-670 of the Appendix.

37. Petitioner: Jeremy Jessup, Dolan Law Firm
   Department: Police Department
   Records sought: Photographs of a traffic collision
   Custodian of Records: Lt. Arran Pera
   Determination: No determination necessary; department produced responsive records.
   Date Petition Received: June 1, 2021
   Date of Determination: Petition closed on June 16, 2021
   A copy of the decision and petition are included on pages 671-676 of the Appendix.

38. Petitioner: Anonymous
   Department: District Attorney’s Office
   Records sought: Communications with Megan Cassidy
   Custodian of Records: Robyn Burke
   Determination: Petition withdrawn
   Date Petition Received: June 25, 2021
   Date of Determination: Petition withdrawn on June 28, 2021
   A copy of the decision and petition are included on pages 677-684 of the Appendix.

39. Petitioner: Victoria Baranetsky
   Department: Police Department
   Records sought: Data for all arrests made by the Police Department from 2011 to present, including the name, race, gender, date of birth, and address of the arrestee
   Custodian of Records: Lt. Arran Pera
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40. Petitioner: Mark Sullivan  
Department: Recreation and Parks Department  
Records sought: Communications with the Parks Alliance regarding the Richmond Playground  
Custodian of Records: Tiffany Lin-Wilson  
Determination: Department properly withheld records under Government Code Sections 6254(f) and (k).  
Date Petition Received: July 2, 2021  
Date of Determination: July 30, 2021  
A copy of the decision and petition are included on pages 685-718 of the Appendix.

41. Petitioner: Mo Green  
Department: Public Utilities Commission  
Records sought: Records regarding the recruitment for a specific job announcement  
Custodian of Records: Mayara Ruski Augusto Sa  
Determination: Department properly redacted information under Government Code Section 6254(g) reflecting data related to the administration of an employment examination.  
Date Petition Received: July 15, 2021  
Date of Determination: August 20, 2021  
A copy of the decision and petition are included on pages 724-748 of the Appendix.

42. Petitioner: Michael Cawthon  
Department: Recreation and Parks Department
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Records sought: Records regarding improvements at the Great Highway
Custodian of Records: Tiffany Lin-Wilson
Determination: No determination needed; department produced responsive records.
Date Petition Received: July 27, 2021
Date of Determination: Petition closed on August 16, 2021
A copy of the decision and petition are included on pages 749-758 of the Appendix.

43. Petitioner: Nuala Bishari
Department: Department of Public Health
Records sought: Record regarding positive COVID-19 cases at certain shelters
Custodian of Records: Veronica Vien
Determination: Department properly withheld records based on privacy and as protected health information. See Government Code Sections 6254(c) and (k); Civil Code Section 56.05(j); 45 C.F.R. § 164.514(b).
Date Petition Received: August 10, 2021
Date of Determination: September 27, 2021
A copy of the decision and petition are included on pages 759-767 of the Appendix.

44. Petitioner: Anonymous
Department: City Attorney’s Office
Records sought: Communications with Recology regarding settlement of a lawsuit
Custodian of Records: Elizabeth Coolbrith
Determination: Department properly withheld records reflecting confidential settlement communications and/or records that were acquired in confidence. See Government Code Sections 6254(k), 6255; Evidence Code Section 1040.
Date Petition Received: August 27, 2021
Date of Determination: August 12, 2022
45. Petitioner: Darren Kelly  
   Department: Fire Department  
   Records sought: A verified complaint filed by the Fire Chief with the Fire Commission seeking discipline against a member of the department  
   Custodian of Records: Maureen Conefrey  
   Determination: Department properly withheld the record as a personnel record and based on privacy. See Government Code Sections 6254(c) and (k); Cal. Const. Art. I, Section 1.  
   Date Petition Received: September 30, 2021  
   Date of Determination: November 2, 2021  

46. Petitioner: independentm68@gmail.com  
   Department: Department of Public Works  
   Records sought: Communications between the former department head and various individuals  
   Custodian of Records: David Steinberg  
   Determination: Department produced some records, confirmed it did not possess other records, and properly redacted records based on privacy. See Government Code Sections 6254(c) and (k); Cal. Const. Art. I, Section 1.  
   Date Petition Received: November 22, 2021  
   Date of Determination: February 17, 2022  

47. Petitioner: Alison Heath  
   Department: Department of Public Health  
   Records sought: Communications regarding 300 DeHaro Street  
   Custodian of Records: Veronica Vien  

A copy of the decision and petition are included on pages 768-774 of the Appendix.
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Determination: No determination needed; department produced responsive records.

Date Petition Received: December 7, 2021

Date of Determination: Petition closed on December 10, 2021

A copy of the decision and petition are included on pages 843-847 of the Appendix.

48. Petitioner: Yuli Huang
Department: Department of Public Works
Records sought: Records regarding the Sunset and Parkside sewer and pavement replacement project

Custodian of Records: David Steinberg
Determination: No determination necessary; department produced a document responsive to request and confirmed it had no additional documents.

Date Petition Received: December 9, 2021

Date of Determination: Petition closed on February 16, 2022

A copy of the decision and petition are included on pages 848-853 of the Appendix.

Pending Petitions

On March 20, 2021, the Supervisor of Records sent a letter to the Anonymous petitioner who submitted 30 of the 48 petitions discussed above. At that time, the petitioner had submitted approximately 135 petitions to the Supervisor of Records in less than two years. Due to the burden placed on the City Attorney’s Office resulting from these petitions, we notified the petitioner that we would be limiting our review to six petitions for the remainder of 2021 and six petitions going forward each calendar year. A copy of our letter is included on page 855 of the Appendix.

The following are the outstanding petitions the Anonymous petitioner submitted in 2020 and 2021 that have not yet been resolved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Page Number in Appendix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 25, 2020</td>
<td>Fine Arts Museums</td>
<td>856-862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 15, 2020</td>
<td>Mayor’s Office</td>
<td>863-868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 5, 2020</td>
<td>Police Department</td>
<td>869-876</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 13, 2020</td>
<td>Police Department</td>
<td>877-891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 30, 2020</td>
<td>Sheriff’s Department</td>
<td>892-895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 18, 2021</td>
<td>Police Department</td>
<td>896-900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 18, 2021</td>
<td>District Attorney’s Office</td>
<td>901-916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 5, 2021</td>
<td>Mayor’s Office</td>
<td>917-920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 5, 2021</td>
<td>Department of Public Health</td>
<td>921-931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 12, 2021</td>
<td>Department of Police Accountability</td>
<td>932-957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 12, 2021</td>
<td>Department of Police Accountability</td>
<td>958-958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 18, 2021</td>
<td>Police Department</td>
<td>959-961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 23, 2021</td>
<td>Police Department</td>
<td>962-971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 24, 2021</td>
<td>Public Utilities Commission</td>
<td>972-976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 25, 2021</td>
<td>City Attorney’s Office</td>
<td>977-986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 26, 2021</td>
<td>Department of Police Accountability</td>
<td>987-987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 26, 2021</td>
<td>Police Department</td>
<td>988-1121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1, 2021</td>
<td>Mayor’s Office</td>
<td>1122-1128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1, 2021</td>
<td>Office of Economic and Workforce Development</td>
<td>1129-1135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1, 2021</td>
<td>Municipal Transportation Agency</td>
<td>1136-1141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1, 2021</td>
<td>Department of Emergency Management</td>
<td>1142-1152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1, 2021</td>
<td>Office of Contract Administration</td>
<td>1153-1155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1, 2021</td>
<td>Office of City Administrator</td>
<td>1156-1159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1, 2021</td>
<td>Department of Public Health</td>
<td>1160-1164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1, 2021</td>
<td>Department of Public Health</td>
<td>1165-1168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1, 2021</td>
<td>Department of Emergency Management</td>
<td>1169-1176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1, 2021</td>
<td>Sheriff’s Department</td>
<td>1177-1180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1, 2021</td>
<td>Office of City Administrator</td>
<td>1181-1189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1, 2021</td>
<td>Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector</td>
<td>1190-1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1, 2021</td>
<td>City Hall Building Management</td>
<td>1201-1211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1, 2021</td>
<td>Police Department</td>
<td>1212-1221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1, 2021</td>
<td>Office of City Administrator</td>
<td>1222-1227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2, 2021</td>
<td>Public Utilities Commission</td>
<td>1228-1254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2, 2021</td>
<td>Public Utilities Commission</td>
<td>1255-1257</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>March 2, 2021</th>
<th>Office of Economic and Workforce Development</th>
<th>1258-1269</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 4, 2021</td>
<td>Department of Police Accountability</td>
<td>1270-1270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 4, 2021</td>
<td>Department of Public Works</td>
<td>1271-1276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 5, 2021</td>
<td>Mayor’s Office</td>
<td>1277-1281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 5, 2021</td>
<td>Police Department</td>
<td>1282-1286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 9, 2021</td>
<td>City Administrator and the Mayor’s Office</td>
<td>1287-1288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 10, 2021</td>
<td>Mayor’s Office</td>
<td>1289-1318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 11, 2021</td>
<td>Public Utilities Commission</td>
<td>1319-1337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 12, 2021</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>1338-1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 15, 2021</td>
<td>Department of Police Accountability</td>
<td>1963-1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 18, 2021</td>
<td>Department of Public Works</td>
<td>1975-1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 18, 2021</td>
<td>Police Department</td>
<td>1976-1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 19, 2021</td>
<td>Mayor’s Office</td>
<td>1981-1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 25, 2021</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>1984-1985</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

TO: Honorable Members
Sunshine Ordinance Task Force
DATE: November 8, 2022
PAGE: 23
RE: Twenty-Second Annual Report of the Supervisor of Records
January 1 to December 31, 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 12, 2021</td>
<td>Multiple City Departments</td>
<td>1986-1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 30, 2021</td>
<td>District Attorney’s Office</td>
<td>2009-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 3, 2021</td>
<td>Public Utilities Commission</td>
<td>2018-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 7, 2021</td>
<td>Department of Public Health</td>
<td>2021-2031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 10, 2021</td>
<td>Public Utilities Commission</td>
<td>2032-2032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 12, 2021</td>
<td>San Francisco Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>2033-2036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 24, 2021</td>
<td>Police Commission</td>
<td>2037-2037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 26, 2021</td>
<td>Department of Police Accountability</td>
<td>2038-2039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 26, 2021</td>
<td>Mayor’s Office</td>
<td>2040-2047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 10, 2021</td>
<td>Office of Economic and Workforce Development</td>
<td>2048-2052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 14, 2021</td>
<td>Department of Elections</td>
<td>2053-2064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 15, 2021</td>
<td>Mayor’s Office</td>
<td>2065-2068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 18, 2021</td>
<td>Public Library</td>
<td>2069-2077</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**MEMORANDUM**

TO: Honorable Members  
Sunshine Ordinance Task Force  
DATE: November 8, 2022  
PAGE: 24  
RE: Twenty-Second Annual Report of the Supervisor of Records  
January 1 to December 31, 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 6, 2021</td>
<td>Recreation and Park Department</td>
<td>2078-2096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 19, 2021</td>
<td>District Attorney’s Office</td>
<td>2097-2184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 24, 2021</td>
<td>Multiple City Departments</td>
<td>2185-2188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 24, 2021</td>
<td>Police Department</td>
<td>2189-2193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 25, 2021</td>
<td>District Attorney’s Office</td>
<td>2194-2218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 27, 2021</td>
<td>City Attorney’s Office</td>
<td>2219-2227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 13, 2021</td>
<td>Mayor’s Office</td>
<td>2228-2256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 27, 2021</td>
<td>Mayor’s Office</td>
<td>2257-2266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1, 2021</td>
<td>Police Department</td>
<td>2267-2274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 6, 2021</td>
<td>Multiple City Departments</td>
<td>2275-2278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 9, 2021</td>
<td>Police Commission</td>
<td>2279-2280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 16, 2021</td>
<td>Multiple Departments</td>
<td>2281-2396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 20, 2021</td>
<td>Mayor’s Office</td>
<td>2397-2398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 21, 2021</td>
<td>Mayor’s Office</td>
<td>2399-2406</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

TO: Honorable Members
Sunshine Ordinance Task Force
DATE: November 8, 2022
PAGE: 25
RE: Twenty-Second Annual Report of the Supervisor of Records
   January 1 to December 31, 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 22, 2021</td>
<td>Department of Public Works</td>
<td>2407-2417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 23, 2021</td>
<td>Police Department</td>
<td>2418-2429</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX

TWENTY-SECOND ANNUAL REPORT OF THE SUPERVISOR OF RECORDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Petition Number</th>
<th>Petitioner</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>1-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>17-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>21-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>51-63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>64-73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>74-81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>82-96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>97-103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>104-119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>120-121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ross Braden</td>
<td>122-127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>128-141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>142-155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>156-210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Harry Pariser</td>
<td>211-218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petition Number</td>
<td>Petitioner</td>
<td>Page(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>219-249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Jeremy Goodrich</td>
<td>250-254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>255-317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>318-321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>322-343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>344-354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>355-360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>361-431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>432-480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>481-495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>496-508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td><a href="mailto:anonymousrecordspubliccca@gmail.com">anonymousrecordspubliccca@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>509-515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>516-528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>529-547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Harold Christian</td>
<td>548-561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Zach Kamazes</td>
<td>562-580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>581-594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petition Number</td>
<td>Petitioner</td>
<td>Page(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Charles Perkins</td>
<td>595-601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Sam Wong</td>
<td>602-604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>605-656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>657-670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Dolan Law Firm</td>
<td>671-676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>677-684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Alexandra M. Gutierrez</td>
<td>685-718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Mark Sullivan</td>
<td>719-723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Mo Green</td>
<td>724-748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Michael Cawthon</td>
<td>749-758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Nuala Bishari</td>
<td>759-767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>768-774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Darren Kelly</td>
<td>775-783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td><a href="mailto:independentm68@gmail.com">independentm68@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>784-842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Alison Heath</td>
<td>843-847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Yuli Huang</td>
<td>848-853</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
December 20, 2021

Sent via email (arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com)

Re: Petition to Supervisor of Records

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter responds to your petition to the Supervisor of Records dated December 9, 2020, concerning a request to the Department of Public Works (“DPW”). You requested from DPW text messages between former Public Utilities Commission (“PUC”) General Manager Harlan Kelly and DPW staff. DPW produced records responsive to that request, including a text dated June 5, 2019 from a DPW employee who had applied for a position at PUC. You later requested from DPW all emails and other communications concerning your prior request. The record at issue in this petition is an email from the employee who had applied for the job at PUC to DPW staff transmitting the text message. DPW redacted that email to protect the identity of the employee who had unsuccessfully sought a job with PUC. We conclude that DPW properly redacted the document based on personal privacy. See Gov’t Code Secs. 6254(c), (k); Cal. Const. Art. I, Sec. 1.

Very truly yours,

DAVID CHIU
City Attorney

Bradley A. Russi
Deputy City Attorney
To Whom It May Concern –

Please see the attached response to your petition.

Bradley Russi  
Deputy City Attorney  
Office of City Attorney David Chiu  
City Hall, Room 234  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., San Francisco, CA 94102  
www.sfcityattorney.org

From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>  
Sent: Wednesday, December 9, 2020 2:10 PM  
To: Supervisor Records (CAT) <supervisor.records@SFCITYATTY.ORG>; SOTF, (BOS) <sotf@sfgov.org>  
Cc: Steinberg, David (DPW) <david.steinberg@sfdpw.org>  
Subject: Re: New Petition and Complaint against DPW - Single record redactions

SOTF and Supervisor of Records:

Please amend the petition/complaint as follows:  
Replace the paragraph about 6254(f) (which was not cited), with this about 6254(c) (which was cited):  
> Information about a public records request is also not exempt under 6254(c): "Personnel, medical, or similar files, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy." It is unclear how an email about a records request is similar to personnel or medical files.

Thanks!

NOTE: Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the government all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

------ Original Message ------
On Wednesday, December 9th, 2020 at 1:39 PM, Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:
SUPERVISOR OF RECORDS DENNIS HERRERA:
Pursuant to SFAC 67.21(d), please determine in writing within 10 days that one or more redacted parts of the attached record are public and order them disclosed.

SOTF:
Please file a new complaint Anonymous (105571-26446823@requests.muckrock.com) v David Steinberg and DPW, conduct a hearing, and find DPW and Mr. Steinberg in violation of SFAC 67.26 for not minimizing withholding and SFAC 67.27 for not providing written justification, and order one or more of the redactions (or a smaller part of them) disclosed.

PETITION/COMPLAINT common to both processes:
This is a single document (attached) I allege is improperly redacted. All details of the request and response are available at https://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/requests/20-4829

The justification for these redactions is on the last page:
"Due to privacy concerns, personal information, such as personal phone numbers, cell numbers and email addresses, has been redacted from the documents that we are making available to you. We redacted this personal information pursuant to Section 6254(c) and Section 6254(k) of the California Public Records Act and Article 1, Section 1 of the California Constitution."

All redactions have that single common justification.

These redactions appear to be employee names, government email signature blocks identifying the department, name, title, work phone number, etc., and government - not personal - email addresses. The conversation is between Mr. Steinberg and someone else. They are discussing a response to a different public records request - which is by definition conduct of public business.

As decided in SOTF 19140 Stephen Malloy v. Dept of Human Resources, citing Gov Code 6254(k) is insufficient and a violation of SFAC 67.27. The City must also state which privilege or law (such as the section of the Evidence Code) they are relying on that is subsumed within Gov Code 6254(k). Otherwise it could be any unknown law or privilege and this is not specific enough. I have no idea what I'm fighting here - is it whistleblower privilege, attorney-client, etc.?

For 6254(f), it is unclear how an email between Steinberg and someone else about my records request could be a "Record[] of complaints to, or investigations conducted by, or records of intelligence information or security procedures of, the office of the Attorney General and the Department of Justice, the Office of Emergency Services and any state or local police agency, or any investigatory or security files compiled by any other state or local police agency, or any investigatory or security files compiled by any other state or local agency for correctional, law enforcement, or licensing purposes." This is a record of an email response to another records request... DPW isn't even one of those types of agencies.

Finally, public employee or contractor names are not protected by the constitutional right of privacy. The existence of an employment/contractor relationship is completely public. Note that the names of other employees who replied to this records request were not redacted - so it is unclear what's going on with this particular record - and makes finding out all the more important. If there is some other specific law (that they did not cite properly) preventing access to this employee's name, they'll need to find a different citation.

NOTE: Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other
damages whatsoever. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the government all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous
SOTF and Supervisor of Records:

Please amend the petition/complaint as follows:
Replace the paragraph about 6254(f) (which was not cited), with this about 6254(c) (which was cited):

> Information about a public records request is also not exempt under 6254(c): "Personnel, medical, or similar files, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy." It is unclear how an email about a records request is similar to personnel or medical files.

Thanks!

NOTE: Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the government all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,
Anonymous

-------- Original Message --------
On Wednesday, December 9th, 2020 at 1:39 PM, Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:

SUPERVISOR OF RECORDS DENNIS HERRERA:
Pursuant to SFAC 67.21(d), please determine in writing within 10 days that one or more redacted parts of the attached record are public and order them disclosed.

SOTF:
Please file a new complaint Anonymous (105571-26446823@requests.muckrock.com) v David Steinberg and DPW, conduct a hearing, and find DPW and Mr. Steinberg in violation of SFAC 67.26 for not minimizing withholding and SFAC 67.27 for not providing written justification, and order one or more of the redactions (or a smaller part of them) disclosed.

PETITION/COMPLAINT common to both processes:
This is a single document (attached) I allege is improperly redacted. All details of the request and response are available at https://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/requests/20-4829

The justification for these redactions is on the last page:
"Due to privacy concerns, personal information, such as personal phone numbers, cell numbers and email addresses, has been redacted from the documents that we are making available to you. We redacted this personal information pursuant to Section 6254(c) and Section 6254(k) of the California Public Records Act and Article 1, Section 1 of the California Constitution."

All redactions have that single common justification.

These redactions appear to be employee names, government email signature blocks identifying the department, name, title, work phone number, etc., and government - not personal - email addresses. The conversation is between Mr. Steinberg and someone else. They are discussing a response to a different public records request - which is by definition conduct of public business.

As decided in SOTF 19140 Stephen Malloy v. Dept of Human Resources, citing Gov Code 6254(k) is insufficient and a violation of SFAC 67.27. The City must also state which privilege or law (such as the section of the Evidence Code) they are relying on that is subsumed within Gov Code 6254(k). Otherwise it could be any unknown law or privilege and this is not specific enough. I have no idea what I'm fighting here - is it whistleblower privilege, attorney-client, etc.?

For 6254(f), it is unclear how an email between Steinberg and someone else about my records request could be a "Record[] of complaints to, or investigations conducted by, or records of intelligence information or security procedures of, the office of the Attorney General and the Department of Justice, the Office of Emergency Services and any state or local police agency, or any investigatory or security files compiled by any other state or local police agency, or any investigatory or security files compiled by any other state or local agency for correctional, law enforcement, or licensing purposes." This is a record of an email response to another records request... DPW isn't even one of those types of agencies.

Finally, public employee or contractor names are not protected by the constitutional right of privacy. The existence of an employment/contractor relationship is completely public.

Note that the names of other employees who replied to this records request were not redacted - so it is unclear what’s going on with this particular record - and makes finding out all the more important. If there is some other specific law (that they did not cite properly) preventing access to this employee's name, they'll need to find a different citation.

NOTE: Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the government all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous
SUPERVISOR OF RECORDS DENNIS HERRERA:
Pursuant to SFAC 67.21(d), please determine in writing within 10 days that one or more redacted parts of the attached record are public and order them disclosed.

SOTF:
Please file a new complaint Anonymous (105571-26446823@requests.muckrock.com) v David Steinberg and DPW, conduct a hearing, and find DPW and Mr. Steinberg in violation of SFAC 67.26 for not minimizing withholding and SFAC 67.27 for not providing written justification, and order one or more of the redactions (or a smaller part of them) disclosed.

PETITION/COMPLAINT common to both processes:
This is a single document (attached) I allege is improperly redacted. All details of the request and response are available at https://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/requests/20-4829

The justification for these redactions is on the last page:
"Due to privacy concerns, personal information, such as personal phone numbers, cell numbers and email addresses, has been redacted from the documents that we are making available to you. We redacted this personal information pursuant to Section 6254(c) and Section 6254(k) of the California Public Records Act and Article 1, Section 1 of the California Constitution."

All redactions have that single common justification.

These redactions appear to be employee names, government email signature blocks identifying the department, name, title, work phone number, etc., and government - not personal - email addresses. The conversation is between Mr. Steinberg and someone else. They are discussing a response to a different public records request - which is by definition conduct of public business.

As decided in SOTF 19140 Stephen Malloy v. Dept of Human Resources, citing Gov Code 6254(k) is insufficient and a violation of SFAC 67.27. The City must also state which privilege or law (such as the section of the Evidence Code) they are relying on that is subsumed within Gov Code 6254(k). Otherwise it could be any unknown law or privilege and this is not specific enough. I have no idea what I'm fighting here - is it whistleblower privilege, attorney-client, etc.?

For 6254(f), it is unclear how an email between Steinberg and someone else about my records request could be a "Record[] of complaints to, or investigations conducted by, or records of intelligence information or security procedures of, the office of the Attorney General and the Department of Justice, the Office of Emergency Services and any state or local police agency, or any investigatory or security files compiled by any other state or local police agency, or any investigatory or security files compiled by any other state or local agency for correctional, law enforcement, or licensing purposes." This is a record of an email response to another records request... DPW isn't even one of those types of agencies.
Finally, public employee or contractor names are not protected by the constitutional right of privacy. The existence of an employment/contractor relationship is completely public. Note that the names of other employees who replied to this records request were not redacted - so it is unclear what's going on with this particular record - and makes finding out all the more important. If there is some other specific law (that they did not cite properly) preventing access to this employee's name, they'll need to find a different citation.

NOTE: Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the government all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous
Request #20-4829

☑ CLOSED
As of December 9, 2020, 12:57pm

Details

Department of Public Works
PRA Office
Room 348
1 Doctor Carlton B Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

December 8 2020

This is a follow up to request number 20 4788:

Thank Mr Steinberg

Please add the following immediate disclosure request:

- all communication between Mr Steinberg and DPW per on requested or receiving record in #20 4788, including all attachments, and to/from/cc/bcc and sent dates produced directly
- an exact PDF copy (the remaining metadata is not relevant at this moment)

It seems that will be the easiest way for me to find out whose communications these are...

Anonymous

Received

December 8, 2020 via email

Departments

Public Works

Documents

FW_Mandatory_Notification.pdf-redacted.pdf
FW_MANDATORY_NOTIFICATION_Public_Records_Request_20-4788.pdf
MANDATORY_NOTIFICATION_Public_Records_Request_20-4788.pdf
Public_Records_Request_20-4788(1).pdf-redacted.pdf
Anonymous,  
In response to your email today, please note that we properly redacted specific information in the document you cited, and we included the appropriate footnote. We did this after consulting with the City Attorney's Office.  
Regards,

David A. Steinberg
Custodian of Records
San Francisco Public Works
December 9, 2020, 12:24pm by David A. Steinberg, Custodian of Records (Staff)

We have conducted a diligent search for records responsive to your request. We have located responsive records and are releasing them to you. As you know, because our redaction process eliminates links and attachments in PDF documents, we have released two versions of those documents: One is the redacted PDF (the format you requested) and the other splits the Outlook messages into component parts (text file, attachments, images). We did this to ensure that you were able to receive all of the records you requested.

If you have trouble accessing the files, we can burn the responsive records onto a CD at a rate of $1 per CD or load the responsive records onto a flash drive at a rate of $4 per flash.
drive. Fees for duplication are subject to change and postage is an additional cost.

If hard copies are needed, we can provide hard copies of any 8.5x11 documents that are made available to you at a cost of 10 cents per copy, as allowed by the San Francisco Administrative Code § 67.28(c). This section states "a fee not to exceed 10 cents per page may be charged." Postage is an additional cost.

Please note that the Public Records Act requires an agency to make available to any person a copy of an “identifiable record or records” in its possession, unless the record is specifically exempt from disclosure. (Please see California Government Code § 6253(b).) The City’s obligation under the Sunshine Ordinance, like the Public Records Act, is to produce public records in its custody. (See San Francisco Administration Code § 67.20(b).) There is no requirement that a department or officer construct a document to meet the specifications of the request.

Due to privacy concerns, personal information, such as personal phone numbers, cell numbers and email addresses, has been redacted from the documents that we are making available to you. We redacted this personal information pursuant to Section 6254(c) and Section 6254(k) of the California Public Records Act and Article 1, Section 1 of the California Constitution.

Please note that it is not necessary to create a NextRequest account to view responsive records. Once they have been released, a link, valid for 30 days, will be provided to view the records. Additionally, unless privacy concerns prevent it, Public Works makes all records requests visible to the public. You may search for requests at https://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/.

This concludes your public records request.

Regards,

David A. Steinberg
Custodian of Records
San Francisco Public Works
December 9, 2020, 10:35am

---

**Document(s) Released**

*December 9, 2020, 10:32am*

**Document(s) Released to Requester**

RE_ California Public Records Act Request #20-4788.pdf

*December 8, 2020, 1:02pm*

**External Message**
We received your public records request, dated Dec. 8. You have requested the following records:
all communication between Mr. Steinberg and DPW persons requesting or receiving records in #20 4788, including all attachments, and to/from/cc/bcc and sent dates produced directly as an exact PDF copy (the remaining metadata is not relevant at this moment).

Pursuant to Mayor London Breed's Proclamation dated March 13, Sections 67.25(a) and 67.25(b) of the Administrative Code are suspended for the duration of the local emergency. For this reason, we are treating your Immediate Disclosure Request as a standard public records request, subject to the normally applicable 10 day response time, with a possible extension. Our department will identify and compile the requested information. The Sunshine Ordinance requires departments to respond as soon as possible or within 10 calendar days from receipt of any records requests. Therefore, we will contact you on or before Dec. 18, as permitted by San Francisco Administrative Code § 67.21(b) and California Government Code § 6253(c). Please note that during the current public health emergency, the department is not required to provide copies of records by this deadline but must notify the requester whether the records exist.
It is not necessary to create a NextRequest account to view responsive records. Once they have been released, a link, valid for 30 days, will be provided to view the records. Additionally, unless privacy concerns prevent it, Public Works makes all records requests visible to the public. You may search for requests at https://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/.

December 8, 2020, 12:54pm by David A. Steinberg , Custodian of Records (Staff)

Department Assignment
Public Works
December 8, 2020, 12:52pm

Request Opened
Request received via email
December 8, 2020, 12:52pm
Hi Privacy

If it was work-related, then yes it qualifies and we need to produce it. The easiest way to send it to me is probably by taking a screenshot and put that into an email.

Thanks,

David A. Steinberg
Custodian of Records & Executive Assistant to the Director
San Francisco Public Works | City and County of San Francisco
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1647 | San Francisco, CA 94103 | (628) 271-2888
sfpivialworks.org · twitter.com/sfpivialworks

For public records requests, please go to sfpivialworks.org/records.
Sent: Monday, December 7, 2020 9:54 AM  
To: DPW-All-Employees <DPW-All-Employees@sfdpw.org>  
Subject: MANDATORY NOTIFICATION: Public Records Request #20-4788  
Importance: High

Dear Co-workers,

The department has received a records request for text and chat communications between our staff and specific individuals, who are listed below. Note that this does not apply to emails.

We are required to identify documents that may exist on work or personal accounts of Public Works employees, and every employee must review the following to ensure that the department fully complies with all applicable laws and obligations. With regards to personal electronic devices and personal accounts, courts have ruled that we must turn over responsive records if the communication relates to the City’s business. Purely personal messages do not need to be turned over. Please follow these instructions:

- If you have any messages, such as texts, Teams chats or IMs in any format for any time period, please let me know by Monday, Dec. 14. Again, if it’s related to City business, it must be turned over even if it’s on your personal mobile device. We were not asked about emails, just texts and other forms of instant messages. Depending on the type of message, IT may have to pull the files (for example in Teams).
- Do not reply to this message or email me if you do not have any responsive records. If you have records, please send your response to me and not as a reply-all. Please include “Public Records Request #20-4788” in the subject line. If the volume would make it difficult to send documents via email, I can create a folder for you to transfer files to me.

This records request covers communications with the following individuals whether they are one-on-one texts or as part of group messages:
- Sean Elsbernd
- Andrea Bruss
- London Breed
- Harlan Kelly Jr.
- Naomi Kelly
- Hank Heckel
- Walter Wong

Thank you for your cooperation. If you have any questions, feel free to email me.

Regards,

David A. Steinberg  
Custodian of Records & Executive Assistant to the Director  
San Francisco Public Works | City and County of San Francisco
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Page (# of occurrences)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>1 (4)</td>
<td>Due to privacy concerns, personal information, such as personal phone numbers, cell numbers and email addresses, has been redacted from the documents that we are making available to you. We redacted this personal information pursuant to Section 6254(c) and Section 6254(k) of the California Public Records Act and Article 1, Section 1 of the California Constitution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
November 18, 2021

Sent via email (arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com)

Re: Petition to Supervisor of Records

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter responds to your petition to the Supervisor of Records dated December 22, 2020, concerning a request to the Department of Police Accountability (“DPA”). You requested the audio recordings of interviews DPA conducted in connection with three investigations of alleged police officer misconduct. DPA initially declined to produce all the audio recordings but provided the written transcripts of the interviews.

On March 24, 2021, DPA provided a further response to your request. DPA indicated that it would produce the audio recordings of interviews with police officers, but it would continue to withhold audio recordings of interviews with the complainants and witnesses, because the recorded interviews were acquired by DPA staff in confidence, and the disclosure of the audio recordings would violate the privacy rights of the complainants and witnesses and undermine their anonymity. We concluded that DPA properly withheld the recordings on these bases. See Gov’t Code Sec. 6254(c), (k); Penal Code Secs. 823.7(b)(5)(B)-(C), (b)(6); Cal. Const. Art. I, Sec. 1; Evid. Code Sec. 1040. Additionally, to the extent you complain that DPA improperly sought reimbursement for the cost of applying redactions to the audio files, this issue is outside the scope of Supervisor of Records jurisdiction. But we note that DPA later rescinded its request for such costs.

Very truly yours,

DAVID CHIU
City Attorney

Bradley A. Russi
Deputy City Attorney
To Whom It May Concern –

Please see the attached response to your petition. Thank you.

Bradley Russi
Deputy City Attorney
Office of City Attorney David Chiu
City Hall, Room 234
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., San Francisco, CA 94102
www.sfcityattorney.org

From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 22, 2020 11:15 AM
To: Supervisor Records (CAT) <supervisor.records@SFCITYATTY.ORG>; Brad Russi (Deputy City Attorney, SF) <brad.russi@sfgov.org>
Cc: dpa.legalteam@sfgov.org; Henderson, Paul (DPA) <paul.henderson@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: 67.21(d) petition - An easy one - Police Audio files withheld - National Lawyers Guild v City of Hayward (2020)

Apologies - corrected below.

------- Original Message -------
On Tuesday, December 22nd, 2020 at 11:13 AM, Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:

Supervisor of Records,

This one should be easy. This is a petition under 67.21(d) to determine that one or more parts of the following records unlawfully withheld are public and to order a copy of each of them, redacted correctly, disclosed by DPA to 83876-31149286@requests.muckrock.com:
- audio recordings in SF DPA Case No. 0362-97
- audio recordings in SF DPA Case No. 0119-03
- audio recordings in SF DPA Case No. 0068-01

There are plenty more, but we'll start there.

They have withheld the audio records, and provided only a completely different record - a transcript - unless I pay to redact the audio recordings.
Pursuant to both SFAC 67.26 prohibiting personnel fees and requiring minimum redactions, and the Supreme Court ruling in *National Lawyers Guild v City of Hayward (2020)*, DPA cannot withhold these records unless I pay fees. I would owe only the fees for the physical medium of the copy - and I haven’t asked for a physical copy. DPA is free to upload, after redaction, with a key by footnote or other clear reference, an audio/video recording where the exempt portions are "masked" (by rectangle, or audio bleeping, etc.) the records to NextRequest. SFPD produces redacted audio/video - why would DPA be above the law?

Sincerely,
Anonymous

*NOTE: Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the government all be disclosable public records.*

Sincerely,
Anonymous
Apologies - corrected below.

-------- Original Message --------
On Tuesday, December 22nd, 2020 at 11:13 AM, Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:

Supervisor of Records,

This one should be easy. This is a petition under 67.21(d) to determine that one or more parts of the following records unlawfully withheld are public and to order a copy of each of them, redacted correctly, disclosed by DPA to 88376-31149286@requests.muckrock.com:
- audio recordings in SF DPA Case No. 0362-97
- audio recordings in SF DPA Case No. 0119-03
- audio recordings in SF DPA Case No. 0068-01

There are plenty more, but we'll start there.

They have withheld the audio records, and provided only a completely different record - a transcript - unless I pay to redact the audio recordings.

Pursuant to both SFAC 67.26 prohibiting personnel fees and requiring minimum redactions, and the Supreme Court ruling in *National Lawyers Guild v City of Hayward (2020)*, DPA cannot withhold these records unless I pay fees. I would owe only the fees for the physical medium of the copy - and I haven't asked for a physical copy. DPA is free to upload, after redaction, with a key by footnote or other clear reference, an audio/video recording where the exempt portions are "masked" (by rectangle, or audio beeping, etc.) the records to NextRequest. SFPD produces redacted audio/video - why would DPA be above the law?

Sincerely,
Anonymous

*NOTE: Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the government all be disclosable public records.*

Sincerely,
To Whom It May Concern –

We understand that the issues raised in the petition below have been addressed through further productions and discussions related to Sunshine Task Force complaints. Accordingly, we consider this petition closed.

Bradley Russi  
Deputy City Attorney  
Office of City Attorney David Chiu  
City Hall, Room 234  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
www.sfcityattorney.org

From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>  
Sent: Monday, December 28, 2020 5:58 PM  
To: Heckel, Hank (MYR) <hank.heckel@sfgov.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; SOTF, (BOS) <sotf@sfgov.org>; Supervisor Records (CAT) <supervisor.records@SFCITYATTY.ORG>  
Subject: New Calendar Violation

SOTF and Supervisor of Records,

On Feb 1, 2020, I requested from 87286-40239004@requests.muckrock.com "an electronic copy of all of London Breed's ("Named Custodians") government calendars (all of them, Prop G and non-Prop G, including but not limited to 'PropG, Mayor (MYR)', 'Calendar, Mayor (MYR)', 'Breed, London (MYR)' and all successors to or renames of these accounts), scheduling entries, appointments, and meeting invitations from the Requested Dates: October 15, 2019 to October 31, 2019 (inclusive.)" and certain other records. As of this filing, Respondents have been completely non-compliant with the Ordinance and your order in 19047.

SOTF please file complaint Anonymous (87286-40239004@requests.muckrock.com) v Hank Heckel, Mayor London Breed, and Office of the Mayor.

Allegations: SFAC 67.21, 67.26, 67.27, 67.34, Gov Code 6253(c)

(To the Supervisor of Records: this is a SFAC 67.21(d) petition to determine that some or all parts of 2, 3, and 4 below are public and to order their disclosure.)

1. Timeliness/completeness - SFAC 67.21(B), CPRA Gov Code 6253(c) (SOTF only)

On Feb 4, 2020 Heckel declared a regular 10-day deadline.

We followed up on Feb 20, Feb 21, Mar 9, June 5, and June 22.

Respondents violated the CPRA GC 6253(c) by failing to declare an up to 14 day deadline on Feb 14.

Respondents violated the CPRA further by failing to provide a notice of disclosable public records on Feb 28 by the latest.
(Un timeliness from Mar 21st through June 3rd were waived voluntarily by me for COVID reasons, but that has no bearing on this request because it was untimely prior to Mar 21 and after June 3.)

2. Non-Prop G calendars withheld, no justification - SFAC 67.26, 67.27, 67.21(B)
On July 1, 2020 Heckel provided solely the Prop G calendar entries and withheld the non-Prop G calendar entries. In SOTF 19047, Heckel previously lied to this Task Force indicating that no other information other than Prop G entries exist.
He then produced that information - that he never indicated existed or was withheld under any provision of law - a few weeks after the committee hearing.
The Task Force should not tolerate a city employee lying to it and should give no weight to Heckel's claims, if he makes any, that non-Prop G entries do not exist.
If needed, I will impeach Heckel's credibility based on his prior written responses and oral testimony.

3. Entry details withheld, no justification - SFAC 67.26, 67.27, 67.21(L)
Without justification, Heckel provided only the single combined summary of all of the events. This withholds information visible only on the per-event details view. No justification has been provided for the withholding of that information.

4. ICS withheld, bad justification - SFAC 67.26, 67.27, 67.21(L)
All parts of the ICS were withheld, including parts that do not constitute an information security threat. Contrary to what the Respondents argued in 19047, we now know that nearly every part of an ICS is not in any way exempt. See for example, DT's ICS production: https://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/documents/6211042 which has almost no redactions (DT has further agreed in writing that X-MICROSOFT-OLK-APPTSEQTIME and X-MICROSOFT-CDO-IMPORTANCE, while redacted in that link, will not be redacted going forward).

5. Willfulness - SFAC 67.34 (SOTF only)
All of these issues were already determined in my favor in SOTF 19047. Heckel and Breed choose to willfully violate the Ordinance and your orders and this Task Force should not tolerate that.
If Heckel is a managerial city employee, please find that he committed official misconduct by willfully violating the Sunshine Ordinance.
Please find that Breed willfully violated the Sunshine Ordinance, and refer her to the Ethics Commission for a hearing on official misconduct.

NOTE: Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the government all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous
SOTF and Supervisor of Records,

On Feb 1, 2020, I requested from 87286-40239004@requests.muckrock.com "an electronic copy of all of London Breed's ("Named Custodians") government calendars (all of them, Prop G and non-Prop G, including but not limited to 'PropG, Mayor (MYR)', 'Calendar, Mayor (MYR)', 'Breed, London (MYR)" and all successors to or renames of these accounts), scheduling entries, appointments, and meeting invitations from the Requested Dates: October 15, 2019 to October 31, 2019 (inclusive)." and certain other records. As of this filing, Respondents have been completely non-compliant with the Ordinance and your order in 19047.

SOTF please file complaint Anonymous (87286-40239004@requests.muckrock.com) v Hank Heckel, Mayor London Breed, and Office of the Mayor.
Allegations: SFAC 67.21, 67.26, 67.27, 67.34, Gov Code 6253(c)

(To the Supervisor of Records: this is a SFAC 67.21(d) petition to determine that some or all parts of 2, 3, and 4 below are public and to order their disclosure.)

1. Timeliness/completeness - SFAC 67.21(B), CPRA Gov Code 6253(c) (SOTF only)
On Feb 4, 2020 Heckel declared a regular 10-day deadline.
We followed up on Feb 20, Feb 21, Mar 9, June 5, and June 22.
Respondents violated the CPRA GC 6253(c) by failing to declare an up to 14 day deadline on Feb 14.
Respondents violated the CPRA further by failing to provide a notice of disclosable public records on Feb 28 by the latest.
(Untimeliness from Mar 21st through June 3rd were waived voluntarily by me for COVID reasons, but that has no bearing on this request because it was untimely prior to Mar 21 and after June 3.)

2. Non-Prop G calendars withheld, no justification - SFAC 67.26, 67.27, 67.21(B)
On July 1, 2020 Heckel provided solely the Prop G calendar entries and withheld the non-Prop G calendar entries.
In SOTF 19047, Heckel previously lied to this Task Force indicating that no other information other than Prop G entries exist.
He then produced that information - that he never indicated existed or was withheld under any provision of law - a few weeks after the committee hearing.
The Task Force should not tolerate a city employee lying to it and should give no weight to Heckel's claims, if he makes any, that non-Prop G entries do not exist.
If needed, I will impeach Heckel's credibility based on his prior written responses and oral testimony.

3. Entry details withheld, no justification - SFAC 67.26, 67.27, 67.21(L)
Without justification, Heckel provided only the single combined summary of all of the events. This withholds information visible only on the per-event details view. No justification has been provided for the withholding of that information.

4. ICS withheld, bad justification - SFAC 67.26, 67.27, 67.21(L)
All parts of the ICS were withheld, including parts that do not constitute an information security threat.
Contrary to what the Respondents argued in 19047, we now know that nearly every part of an ICS is not in any way exempt. See for example, DT's ICS production: https://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/documents/6211042 which has almost no redactions (DT has further agreed in writing that X-MICROSOFT-OLK-APPTSEQTIME and X-MICROSOFT-CDO-IMPORTANCE, while redacted in that link, will not be redacted going forward).

5. Willfulness - SFAC 67.34 (SOTF only)
All of these issues were already determined in my favor in SOTF 19047. Heckel and Breed choose to willfully violate the Ordinance and your orders and this Task Force should not tolerate that. If Heckel is a managerial city employee, please find that he committed official misconduct by willfully violating the Sunshine Ordinance. Please find that Breed willfully violated the Sunshine Ordinance, and refer her to the Ethics Commission for a hearing on official misconduct.

NOTE: Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the government all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous
From: Anonymous Person

Mayor Breed and the Office of the Mayor,

This is a new immediate disclosure request under the Sunshine Ordinance and under the CPRA for:

1) IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE: an electronic copy of all of London Breed's ("Named Custodians") government calendars (all of them, Prop G and non-Prop G, including but not limited to 'PropG, Mayor (MYR)', 'Calendar, Mayor (MYR)', 'Breed, London (MYR)' and all successors to or renames of these accounts), scheduling entries, appointments, and meeting invitations from the Requested Dates: October 15, 2019 to October 31, 2019 (inclusive). For calendars, you may provide this by directly exporting to PDF any Outlook view that shows for each and every event at least Subject, Location, Start, End, Recurrence, Meeting Status, Organizer, Show Time As, Required/Optional Attendees, Categories, Importance, Description/Body/Message, and preserving full color, formatting and text-searching. For meeting invitations, you should convert the invitations directly and individually to PDF. This includes declined or not-yet-accepted invitations, and those both sent and received for events on those days. Printing and scanning will be appealed. Use of PDF images as opposed to selectable text will be appealed. For examples of proper production, see DPW's PDF provision here: https://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/requests/19-4150 - they provide PDFs of each item, and a screenshot of all of the attendee status. I am explicitly asking for those same parts of these records. All Attachments should also be provided and in their original electronic format.

2) IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE: Furthermore, I request that a City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017) search be performed of each Named Custodian to provide: calendar items, scheduling entries, and meeting invitations for the Requested Dates that are present on their personal calendars/email or on personal accounts/devices/property (solely to the extent the record or portion thereof relates to the public's business). Any electronic format easily generated by the Named Custodian is acceptable here. Notwithstanding Gov Code 6253.3(b)(1), you may redact the Named Custodian's personal email addresses "used by the employee to conduct public business, or necessary to identify a person in an otherwise disclosable communication."

3a) regular disclosure: Furthermore, I request .ICS copies of each record identified in #1.

3b) regular disclosure: Finally, the following information, regardless of format, for each record identified in #1:
   i) creation timestamp,
   ii) modification timestamp,
   iii) creator identity,
   iv) timezone,
   v) name, email address, and acceptance status of each attendee
   vi) categories
   vii) importance
   viii) organizer name and email address
   ix) subject
   x) location
   xi) description/body
   If you provide all of (i)-(xi) in 3a, you may disregard this 3b. For 3b you may use whichever format you wish as long as this public information, which is not an information security record, is not withheld.
It is likely that you will refuse some portion, and I will appeal all withholdings, exemptions, delays, and refusals. Preserve originals of all records during my appeals.

All records must be provided in rolling fashion. Every withholding (including redactions) must be justified with clear reference to a statute or case law.

Provide only those records without fees.

My purpose is to maintain a permanent record of the Mayor's business, including through her top surrogates, regardless of how you wish to destroy records internally. Such requests will be made continually and periodically to retain this permanent record, both forward- and backward-looking. If you would like to suggest a change in the form of future periodic requests that would provide *all* of the same information I've requested, with less work, I may consider such suggestions – however that will not affect this request.

NOTE: Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. The email address sending this request is a publicly-viewable mailbox. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

From: Office of the Mayor 02/04/2020

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Older Mayoral Calendars - Immediate Disclosure Req...

Anonymous,

Your request is neither simple nor routine nor readily answerable and requires consultation with one or more other departments. Accordingly, we will respond within the full 10 day period for a regular request, barring the need for a further extension. See Cal. Gov. Code 6253 and Admin. Code 67.25(b).

Hank Heckel
Compliance Officer
Office of the Mayor
City and County of San Francisco

~WRD000

From: Muckrock Staff 02/20/2020

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Older Mayoral Calendars - Immediate Disclosure Req...
To Whom It May Concern:

I wanted to follow up on the following California Public Records Act request, copied below, and originally submitted on Feb. 1, 2020. Please let me know when I can expect to receive a response.

Thanks for your help, and let me know if further clarification is needed.

From: Anonymous Person  
02/21/2020
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Older Mayoral Calendars - Immediate Disclosure Req...

Why have we not received these calendars?

From: Muckrock Staff  
03/09/2020
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Older Mayoral Calendars - Immediate DisclosureReq...

To Whom It May Concern:

I wanted to follow up on the following California Public Records Act request, copied below, and originally submitted on Feb. 1, 2020. Please let me know when I can expect to receive a response.

Thanks for your help, and let me know if further clarification is needed.

From: Muckrock Staff  
06/05/2020
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Older Mayoral Calendars - Immediate Disclosure Req...

To Whom It May Concern:

I wanted to follow up on the following California Public Records Act request, copied below, and originally submitted on Feb. 1, 2020. Please let me know when I can expect to receive a response.

Thanks for your help, and let me know if further clarification is needed.

From: Muckrock Staff  
06/22/2020
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Older Mayoral Calendars - Immediate Disclosure Req...

To Whom It May Concern:

I wanted to follow up on the following California Public Records Act request, copied below, and originally submitted on Feb. 1, 2020. Please let me know when I can expect to receive a response.

Thanks for your help, and let me know if further clarification is needed.

From: Office of the Mayor  
07/01/2020
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Older Mayoral Calendars - Immediate Disclosure Req...
Anonymous,

Please see the responsive calendar entries of Mayor Breed.

The responsive information has been provided in a PDF format for its ease of transferability and accessibility, consistent with Cal. Gov. Code 6253.9(a)(1). Metadata from any native format has not been provided to avoid risks to the security and integrity of the original record as well as the city’s data and information technology systems and to avoid the release of exempt confidential or privileged information. See Cal. Gov. Code 6253.9 (f) and 6254.19. The PDF format ensures the security and integrity of the original record as well as the security and integrity of the city’s data and information technology systems.

Regards,

Hank Heckel
Compliance Officer
Office of the Mayor
City and County of San Francisco
### September 30, 2019 Continued

**Monday**

- **4:12 PM - 4:38 PM**  
  Meeting Re: Government Affairs -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office  
  Attendees:  
  - Mayor’s Office Staff

- **4:43 PM - 5:04 PM**  
  MTA Panel Meeting -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office  
  Attendees:  
  - Mayor’s Office Staff

### October 1, 2019

**Tuesday**

- **9:00 AM - 9:24 AM**  
  Senior Staff Check In -- Remote Conference Call  
  Attendees:  
  - Mayor’s Office Staff

- **11:02 AM - 11:35 AM**  
  Meeting Re: Budget -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office  
  Attendees:  
  - Mayor’s Office Staff

- **11:41 AM - 12:13 PM**  
  Courtesy Call with Honorable Apostolos Tzitzikostas, Governor of the State of Central Macedonia -- City Hall, Room 200, International Room

- **12:13 PM - 12:39 PM**  
  Office of Racial Equity Signing Ceremony -- City Hall, Mayor’s Balcony

- **12:51 PM - 1:15 PM**  
  Meeting Re: Human Rights Commission -- City Hall, Room 200 Mayor’s Office  
  Attendees:  
  - Sheryl Davis, Executive Director, Human Rights Commission  
  - Phelicia Jones, Chairperson, Service Employees International Union 1021 Wealth and Disparities in the Black Community

- **1:18 PM - 2:07 PM**  
  Meeting Re: Personnel -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office  
  Attendees:  
  - Interviewee  
  - Mayor’s Office Staff

- **2:22 PM - 3:07 PM**  
  Meeting Re: Personnel -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office  
  Attendees:  
  - Interviewee  
  - Mayor’s Office Staff

- **3:17 PM - 3:37 PM**  
  Meeting Re: Public Safety -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office  
  Attendees:  
  - Vicki Hennessy, Sheriff, San Francisco Sheriff's Department  
  - Mayor’s Office Staff
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 1, 2019 Continued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>5:15 PM - 5:45 PM</td>
<td>“Celebrate South Park” Community Event -- South Park; 64 South Park Street, San Francisco, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2, 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>7:25 AM - 8:15 AM</td>
<td>Walk and Roll to School Day -- SE corner of Visitacion Avenue &amp; Mansell Street, San Francisco, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9:00 AM - 9:30 AM</td>
<td>All Staff Visit to Laguna Honda Hospital -- Laguna Honda Hospital, San Francisco, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9:30 AM - 10:00 AM</td>
<td>Senior Staff Check In -- Remote Conference Call</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attendees:</td>
<td>Mayor’s Office Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10:00 AM - 10:30 AM</td>
<td>Bloomberg Harvard Check In -- Remote Conference Call</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:30 PM - 2:00 PM</td>
<td>Maxine Hall Health Center Groundbreaking Ceremony -- 1301 Pierce Street, San Francisco, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:33 PM - 3:38 PM</td>
<td>Meeting Re: Personnel -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attendees:</td>
<td>Interviewee, Mayor’s Office Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3:38 PM - 4:05 PM</td>
<td>Meeting Re: Loma Prieta -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attendees:</td>
<td>Mayor’s Office Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:07 PM - 4:28 PM</td>
<td>Meeting with USF President Father Paul Fitzgerald -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attendees:</td>
<td>Father Paul Fitzgerald, President, USF, Mayor’s Office Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:30 PM - 4:55 PM</td>
<td>Meeting Re: Public Safety -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attendees:</td>
<td>Police Chief William Scott, San Francisco Police Department, Mayor’s Office Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:30 PM - 6:10 PM</td>
<td>Meeting Re: Scheduling -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attendees:</td>
<td>Mayor’s Office Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6:00 PM - 6:30 PM</td>
<td>Domestic Violence Awareness Month Launch -- City Hall, Polk Street Steps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### October 3, 2019
**Thursday**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00 AM - 9:08 AM</td>
<td>Senior Staff Check In -- Remote Conference Call</td>
<td>Mayor’s Office Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 AM - 12:05 PM</td>
<td>Temporary Ferry Landing Debut -- Ferry Building; Peir 48, San Francisco, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:10 PM - 12:30 PM</td>
<td>Interview with New York Times Magazine -- Remote Conference Call</td>
<td>Elizabeth Weil, Writer, New York Times, Mayor’s Office Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:34 PM - 2:09 PM</td>
<td>Meeting Re: Commissions -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office</td>
<td>Mayor’s Office Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:10 PM - 7:10 PM</td>
<td>Shanti Project 45th Anniversary Dinner Benefit -- Palace Hotel; 2 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:33 PM - 7:45 PM</td>
<td>San Francisco Beautiful Cocktail Reception to Honor Robert “Bob” Charles Friese -- St. Francis Yacht Club; 700 Marina Blvd, San Francisco, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### October 4, 2019
**Friday**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:30 AM - 9:45 AM</td>
<td>Senior Staff Check In -- Remote Conference Call</td>
<td>Mayor’s Office Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30 PM - 1:00 PM</td>
<td>District Attorney Appointment Press Conference -- Portsmouth Square; Clay St &amp; Kearny St, San Francisco, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 PM - 2:00 PM</td>
<td>San Francisco Fire Department EMT Class Graduation Ceremony -- San Francisco City College, San Francisco, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:45 PM - 2:51 PM</td>
<td>Meeting Re: Legislation Signing -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office</td>
<td>Mayor’s Office Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:12 PM - 3:47 PM</td>
<td>Meeting Re: School of the Arts -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office</td>
<td>Dede Wilsey, Philanthropist, Louise Renne, Founding Partner, Renne Public Law Group, Dr. Vincent Matthews, Superintendent, SFUSD, Gentle Blythe, Deputy Superintendent of Strategic Partnerships and Communications, SFUSD, Mayor’s Office Staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
October 4, 2019 Continued
Friday

3:50 PM - 3:58 PM
One Treasure Island Gala & BAYCAT 15th Anniversary Video Recordings -- City Hall, International Room
Attendees:
- Cameraman
- Mayor’s Office Staff

3:58 PM - 4:05 PM
Meeting Re: Human Rights Commission -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office
Attendees:
- Sheryl Davis, Executive Director, Human Rights Commission
- Mayor’s Office Staff

4:06 PM - 4:28 PM
Meeting Re: Homelessness -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office
Attendees:
- Nan Roman, Director and CEO, National Alliance to End Homelessness
- Cynthia Nagendra, Director, Center for Capacity Building, National Alliance to End Homelessness
- Mayor’s Office Staff

4:28 PM - 5:18 PM
Meeting with Juvenile Judges -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office
Attendees:
- Monica Wiley, Supervising Judge, Superior Court of San Francisco, Unified Family Court
- Roger Chan, Judge, Superior Court of San Francisco
- Daniel Flores, Judge, Superior Court of San Francisco
- Mayor’s Office Staff

5:20 PM - 6:02 PM
Meeting Re: Scheduling -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office
Attendees:
- Mayor’s Office Staff

6:11 PM - 6:41 PM
Tomiquia Moss’ Going Away Party -- Slate Bar; 2925 16th St., San Francisco, CA

October 5, 2019
Saturday

10:00 AM - 10:15 AM
Self- Help for the Elderly’s 34th Annual Longevity Walkathon Parade and Fair -- Portsmouth Square, Kearny St. & Clay St, San Francisco, CA

11:00 AM - 11:30 AM
Highland Avenue Block Party -- Highland Avenue, San Francisco, CA

October 7, 2019
Monday

9:00 AM - 9:18 AM
Senior Staff Check In -- Remote Conference Call
Attendees:
- Mayor’s Office Staff
October 7, 2019 Continued

Monday

10:30 AM - 11:00 AM  The San Francisco Fleet Week Press Conference -- James R. Herman Cruise Terminal, Pier 27, San Francisco, CA

11:22 AM - 12:00 PM  Senate Bill 40 Press Conference -- 275 10th St., Bishop Swing Community House, San Francisco, CA

12:30 PM - 1:09 PM  Firefighter and Police Legislation Signing Ceremony -- Fire Station 21, San Francisco, CA

2:30 PM - 3:04 PM  Meeting Re: Government Affairs -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office
Attendees:
- Mayor’s Office Staff

3:12 PM - 4:02 PM  Meeting Re: Personnel -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office
Attendees:
- Interviewee
- Mayor’s Office Staff

4:06 PM - 4:30 PM  Meeting Re: Public Health -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office
Attendees:
- Mayor’s Office Staff

4:45 PM - 4:53 PM  Swearing-in Ceremony for Sophia Andary -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office

October 8, 2019

Tuesday

9:00 AM - 9:30 AM  Senior Staff Check In -- Remote Conference Call
Attendees:
- Mayor’s Office Staff

11:00 AM - 11:30 AM  Visit to Recreation and Park Department’s Annual All Staff Meeting -- San Francisco County Fair Building; 1199 9th Ave, San Francisco, CA

12:00 PM - 12:30 PM  Opportunities for All Announcement with United Airlines -- Phillip and Sala Burton Academic High School; 400 Mansell Street, San Francisco, CA

1:00 PM - 1:45 PM  Meeting Re: Scheduling -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office
Attendees:
- Mayor’s Office Staff

1:45 PM - 2:15 PM  Question Time Prep -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office
Attendees:
- Mayor’s Office Staff
### October 8, 2019 Continued

#### Tuesday

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2:00 PM - 2:15 PM</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors Appearance -- City Hall, Board Chamber, Room 250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:46 PM - 3:08 PM</td>
<td>Meeting Re: Budget -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mayor’s Office Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:09 PM - 3:27 PM</td>
<td>Meeting Re: Housing, Land Use, Development -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office</td>
<td></td>
<td>en Rich, Director of Development, Office of Economic and Workforce Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:09 PM - 3:27 PM</td>
<td>Meeting Re: Housing, Land Use, Development -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mayor’s Office Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:45 PM - 4:05 PM</td>
<td>Loma Prieta Check In -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mayor’s Office Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:06 PM - 4:21 PM</td>
<td>Filipino Heritage Night Prep -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mayor’s Office Staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### October 9, 2019

#### Wednesday

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:30 AM - 8:45 AM</td>
<td>KTVU Live Interview -- Marines’ Memorial Club; 11th floor Library, San Francisco, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:50 AM - 9:15 AM</td>
<td>2019 San Francisco Fleet Week Senior Leaders Seminar -- Marines’ Memorial Club; 609 Sutter Street, San Francisco, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:15 AM - 9:30 AM</td>
<td>Senior Staff Check In -- Remote Conference Call</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mayor’s Office Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 PM - 1:15 PM</td>
<td>Thumbtack Visit and Town Hall -- Thumbtack Headquarters; 1355 Market Street, 6th Floor, San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:16 PM - 1:40 PM</td>
<td>Meeting Re: Methamphetamine Task Force -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mayor’s Office Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:42 PM - 2:11 PM</td>
<td>Meeting Re: Scheduling -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mayor’s Office Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:11 PM - 2:25 PM</td>
<td>Meeting Re: Communications -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mayor’s Office Staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
October 9, 2019 Continued
Wednesday

3:00 PM - 3:35 PM The Homeless Crisis in San Francisco Event at Congregation Emanu-El -- Congregation Emanu-El San Francisco; 2 Lake St, San Francisco, CA

3:59 PM - 4:11 PM Meeting Re: City Operations -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor's Office
Attendees:
- Naomi Ell, City Administrator, City and County of San Francisco
- Mayor’s Office Staff

4:38 PM - 4:58 PM Meeting Re: Public Safety -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor's Office
Attendees:
- Police Chief William Scott, SFPD
- Mayor’s Office Staff

5:02 PM - 5:18 PM Meeting Re: Transportation -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor's Office
Attendees:
- Tom Macguire, Interim Director of Transportation, San Francisco Municipal Transit
- Mayor’s Office Staff

5:55 PM - 6:40 PM 2019 Filipino-American History Month Celebration -- City Hall, Rotunda and North Light Court

October 10, 2019
Thursday

9:00 AM - 9:21 AM Senior Staff Check In -- Remote Conference Call
Attendees:
- Mayor’s Office Staff

10:30 AM - 11:05 AM Meeting Re: Transportation -- Remote Conference Call
Attendees:
- Amanda Eaken, Director, Transportation and Climate in Healthy People, Thriving Communities Program at the Natural Resources Defense Council
- Mayor’s Office Staff

11:49 AM - 12:00 PM Fleet Week: Senior Leaders Reception -- City Hall, Room 200, International room

12:00 PM - 12:43 PM Fleet Week Concert -- City Hall Rotunda

12:54 PM - 1:08 PM Meeting Re: Prep for Hall Winery Women’s Panel -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office
Attendees:
- Mayor’s Office Staff
### October 10, 2019 Continued

**Thursday**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:08 PM - 1:19 PM</td>
<td>Meeting Re: Legislation Signing -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor's Office</td>
<td>Mayor's Office Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:12 PM - 1:31 PM</td>
<td>Meeting Re: Small Business Week -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor's Office</td>
<td>Mayor's Office Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:34 PM - 2:13 PM</td>
<td>Meeting with Supervisor Sandra Fewer Re: District 1 -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor's Office</td>
<td>Supervisor Sandra Fewer, District 1, Mayor's Office Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:13 PM - 2:25 PM</td>
<td>Meeting with Supervisor Catherine Stefani Re: District 2 -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor's Office</td>
<td>Supervisor Catherine Stefani, District 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:31 PM - 3:07 PM</td>
<td>Meeting Re: Commissions -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor's Office</td>
<td>Mayor's Office Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:07 PM - 3:31 PM</td>
<td>Meeting with Supervisor Rafael Mandelman Re: District 8 -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor's Office</td>
<td>Supervisor Rafael Mandelman, District 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 PM - 4:45 PM</td>
<td>Bayview Historical Society's Dedication of BIG FISH Sculpture -- Café Alma, 888 Innes Avenue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:15 PM - 6:30 PM</td>
<td>2019 YIMBY Action VIP Cocktail Reception -- Swedish American Hall, 2174 Market Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:45 PM - 7:15 PM</td>
<td>United Playaz 25th Anniversary Celebration Fundraiser -- Press Club, 20 Yerba Buena Lane, San Francisco, CA 94103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**October 11, 2019**

**Friday**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:40 AM - 9:00 AM</td>
<td>San Francisco Association of Realtors Foundation's 4th Annual Harvest of Hope Break -- Airbnb Headquarters; 888 Brannan Street, San Francisco CA 94103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 AM - 9:42 AM</td>
<td>Senior Staff Check In -- Remote Conference Call</td>
<td>Mayor's Office Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 PM - 3:30 PM</td>
<td>HALL Wine High Powered High Heels Panel Conversation -- HALL Napa Valley; 401 St. Helena Way, St. Helena, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### October 13, 2019
**Sunday**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:20 PM - 1:50 PM</td>
<td>151st Italian Heritage Parade -- Powell Street, San Francisco, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 PM - 5:00 PM</td>
<td>St. Francis 3rd Annual Wine, Women and Shoes Gala -- Ritz Carlton; 600 Stockton Street, San Francisco CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### October 14, 2019
**Monday**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11:30 AM - 12:30 PM</td>
<td>Pre-Meeting for Mental Health Editorial Board -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### October 15, 2019
**Tuesday**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:30 AM - 9:52 AM</td>
<td>Senior Staff Check In -- Remote Conference Call</td>
<td>Attendees: Mayor’s Office Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 AM - 10:47 AM</td>
<td>Lighthouse for the Blind and Visually Impaired’s White Cane Day Celebration -- LightHouse headquarters; 1155 Market Street 10th Floor, San Francisco, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:02 AM - 11:43 AM</td>
<td>Wall Street Journal’s Women in the Workplace Conversation -- The Midway; 900 Marin Street, San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 PM - 1:00 PM</td>
<td>San Francisco Chronicle Editorial Re: Mental Health -- 901 Mission Street, San Francisco, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 PM - 2:20 PM</td>
<td>San Francisco Garden Club Opening Luncheon -- Presidio Golf and Concordia Club; 8 Presidio Terrace, San Francisco, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:55 PM - 3:12 PM</td>
<td>Meeting Re: Transportation -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office</td>
<td>Attendees: David im, California Transportation Secretary; Mayor’s Office Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15 PM - 3:22 PM</td>
<td>Swearing-in Ceremony for Suzanne Giraudo -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office</td>
<td>Attendees: Suzanne Giraudo, Health Commission Appointee; Dr. Grant Colfax, Director, Department of Public Health; Lou Giraudo, Appointee Guest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:35 PM - 3:59 PM</td>
<td>Consular Corps Meet and Greet Reception -- City Hall, Room 200, International Room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### October 15, 2019 Continued

**Tuesday**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4:04 PM - 4:18 PM | Meeting Re: Planning -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office         | - Ben Rich, Director of Development, Office of Economic and Workforce Development  
|               |                                                                      | - Mayor’s Office Staff                                                   |
| 6:30 PM - 7:00 PM | Access Institute for Psychological Services Annual Fundraiser Spectrum Gala -- Pier 27; The Embarcadero, San Francisco, CA |                                                                          |

**Wednesday**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:30 AM - 8:52 AM</td>
<td>Senior Staff Check In -- Remote Conference Call</td>
<td>- Mayor’s Office Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:12 AM - 9:42 AM</td>
<td>International Association of Fire Fighters Human Relations Committee Meeting -- Hotel Kabuki; 1625 Post St, San Francisco, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:20 AM - 10:35 AM</td>
<td>San Francisco Travel Board of Directors Meeting -- SF Travel Association; 1 Front St 29th Floor, San Francisco, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30 AM - 11:45 AM</td>
<td>Irish-Israeli-Italian Society of San Francisco 54th Columbus Day Luncheon -- San Francisco Italian Athletic Club; 1630 Stockton St, San Francisco, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 PM - 12:30 PM</td>
<td>Opportunities for All Employer Engagement Lunch -- Ground Floor Public Affairs; 58 2nd Street, 4th Floor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1:33 PM - 1:43 PM | 49 South Van Ness Certificate of Participations Bond Signing -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office | - Notary  
|               |                                                                      | - Mayor’s Office Staff                                                   |
| 1:43 PM - 2:00 PM | Meeting Re: Government Affairs -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office | - Mayor’s Office Staff                                                   |
| 2:14 PM - 2:33 PM | Meeting Re: Legislative -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office       | - Paul Yoder, Partner, Shaw/Yoder/Antwih  
|               |                                                                      | - Aaron Lange, Partner, Shaw/Yoder/Antwih  
|               |                                                                      | - Josh Shaw, Partner, Shaw/Yoder/Antwih  
|               |                                                                      | - Silvia Solis Shaw, Legislative Advocate  
|               |                                                                      | - Mayor’s Office Staff                                                   |
October 16, 2019 Continued

Wednesday

2:38 PM - 3:02 PM  Meeting Re: San Francisco Chamber of Commerce -- City Hall, Room 200
Attendees:
- Rodney Fong, CEO, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
- Mayor’s Office Staff

3:04 PM - 3:36 PM  Meeting Re: Scheduling -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office
Attendees:
- Mayor’s Office Staff

3:39 PM - 3:58 PM  Meeting Re: Public Safety -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office
Attendees:
- Police Chief William Scott, Chief, San Francisco Police Department
- Mayor’s Office Staff

4:04 PM - 4:30 PM  Meeting Re: Protocol -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office
Attendees:
- Charlotte Schultz, Chief of Protocol, City and County of San Francisco
- Mayor’s Office Staff

4:32 PM - 5:08 PM  Meeting Re: Staffing -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office Staff
Attendees:
- Mayor’s Office Staff

October 17, 2019

Thursday

9:00 AM - 9:12 AM  Senior Staff Check In -- Remote Conference Call
Attendees:
- Mayor’s Office Staff

10:10 AM - 11:00 AM  Annual Great California ShakeOut Earthquake Drill -- Rosa Parks Elementary School; 1501 O’Farrell Street, San Francisco, CA

11:00 AM - 11:10 AM  Press Conference Re: Hall of Justice and PG&E -- Rosa Parks Elementary School; 1501 O’Farrell Street, San Francisco, CA

12:20 PM - 12:35 PM  Meeting Re: Communications -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office
Attendees:
- Mayor’s Office Staff

12:34 PM - 1:07 PM  Bloomberg Team Meeting -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office
Attendees:
- Linda Gibbs, Principal, Bloomberg Associates
- Jim Anderson, Bloomberg Philanthropies
- Bridget Ackeifi, Bloomberg Associates
- Mayor’s Office Staff
October 17, 2019 Continued
Thursday

1:07 PM - 1:40 PM  Meeting Re: San Francisco AIDS Foundation -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office
Attendees:
- Joe Hollendoner, CEO, San Francisco AIDS Foundation
- Laura Thomas, Director, Harm Reduction Policy, San Francisco AIDS Foundation

1:41 PM - 2:16 PM  Meeting Re: Affordable Housing -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office
Attendees:
- John Elberling, President, Tenants and Owners Development Corporation
- Mayor’s Office Staff

2:23 PM - 3:00 PM  Blue Ribbon Panel Working Group -- City Hall, Room 201, Mayor’s Conference Room
Attendees:
- Sheryl Davis, Executive Director, Human Rights Commission
- Corey Monroe, Community Partner, Professional Facilitator
- Shawn Ginwright, President and Chief Executive Officer, Flourish
Agenda
- David Muhammed, Executive Director, National Institute for Criminal justice Reform
- Brittni Chicuata, Policy Director, Human Rights Commission
- Mayor’s Office Staff

3:00 PM - 3:13 PM  Meeting Re: Budget -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office
Attendees:
- Mayor’s Office Staff

3:17 PM - 3:34 PM  Meeting Re: Housing Delivery -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office
Attendees:
- Judson True, Director, Housing Delivery
- Mayor’s Office Staff

3:35 PM - 4:08 PM  Meeting Re: Public Safety -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office
Attendees:
- Greg Suhr, Former Police Chief, San Francisco Police Department
- Mayor’s Office Staff

4:30 PM - 5:30 PM  1989 Loma Prieta Earthquake Commemoration Ceremony -- Marina Green

6:20 PM - 7:05 PM  Women’s Foundation of California 40th Anniversary Celebration -- City Hall, Rotunda

7:13 PM - 8:00 PM  Miraloma Park Improvement Club Meeting -- MPIC Clubhouse, 350 O’Shaughnessy Blvd
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:30 AM - 10:41 AM</td>
<td>Senior Staff Check In -- Remote Conference Call</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mayor’s Office Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:40 AM - 12:15 PM</td>
<td>Bay Area Council’s Government Relations Committee Meeting -- 353 Sacramento Street, 10th Floor, San Francisco, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30 PM - 12:45 PM</td>
<td>St. Anthony’s 42nd Annual Penny Pitch -- Chief Sullivan’s; 622 Green St, San Francisco, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:10 PM - 2:12 PM</td>
<td>Visit to South of Market Mental Health Center and Client Housing Facilities -- South of Market Mental Health Services; 760 Harrison Street, San Francisco, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:47 PM - 2:50 PM</td>
<td>Meeting Re: Legislation Signing -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mayor’s Office Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:59 PM - 3:03 PM</td>
<td>PSA Recording Re: Neighborhood Empowerment Network Awards -- City Hall, International Room</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cameraman, Mayor’s Office Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:03 PM - 3:23 PM</td>
<td>Meeting Re: Economic and Workforce Development -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mayor’s Office Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:34 PM - 4:10 PM</td>
<td>Bloomberg Team Meeting -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office</td>
<td></td>
<td>Linda Gibbs, Principal, Bloomberg Associates, Jim Anderson, Bloomberg Philanthropies, Bridget Ackeifi, Bloomberg Associates, Mayor’s Office Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:11 PM - 4:27 PM</td>
<td>Meeting with Supervisor Peskin re: District 3 -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office</td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor Aaron Peskin, District 3 Supervisor, San Francisco Board of Supervisors, Mayor’s Office Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:50 PM - 5:30 PM</td>
<td>Courtesy Call with Italian President Sergio Mattarella -- Fairmont Hotel - Garden Room and Gold Room; 950 Mason Street, San Francisco, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 18, 2019 Continued</td>
<td>6:15 PM - 6:45 PM</td>
<td>GLBT Historical Society Annual Gala -- Salesforce Tower, 415 Mission Street, San Francisco, Ohana Floor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7:00 PM - 7:30 PM</td>
<td>Chinese Newcomers Service Center 2019 Emperor and Empress Charity Gala -- New Asia Restaurant, 772 Pacific Ave, San Francisco, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 19, 2019</td>
<td>10:00 AM - 10:30 AM</td>
<td>Swearing in Suzy Loftus -- 350 Rhode Island; North Building Suite 400N, San Francisco, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:00 PM - 1:30 PM</td>
<td>Monroe Elementary Fall Festival -- Monroe Elementary; 260 Madrid St. San Francisco, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:00 PM - 2:30 PM</td>
<td>Senator Scott Wiener’s 3rd Annual Pumpkin Carving Contest -- Noe Valley Courts, 4320 24th Street, San Francisco, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6:30 PM - 7:00 PM</td>
<td>MOAD’S Afropolitan Ball -- City View at Metreon; 135 4th St #4000, San Francisco, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8:30 PM - 10:30 PM</td>
<td>MOAD’S Afropolitan Ball -- City View at Metreon; 135 4th St #4000, San Francisco, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 21, 2019</td>
<td>9:00 AM - 9:14 AM</td>
<td>Senior Staff Check In -- Remote Conference Call</td>
<td>Attendees: Mayor’s Office Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11:00 AM - 11:30 AM</td>
<td>Jefferson Streetscape Improvement Project Groundbreaking -- Fisherman’s Wharf Plaza; Northeast corner of Jefferson Street and Taylor Street, San Francisco, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12:17 PM - 12:41 PM</td>
<td>Meeting Re: Staffing -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office</td>
<td>Attendees: Mayor’s Office Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12:42 PM - 1:10 PM</td>
<td>Meeting Re: Education -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office</td>
<td>Attendees: Mayor’s Office Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:10 PM - 1:36 PM</td>
<td>Meeting Re: Policy -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office</td>
<td>Attendees: Mayor’s Office Staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### October 21, 2019 Continued

**Monday**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2:00 PM - 2:23 PM</td>
<td>Meeting with Superintendent Matthews -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office</td>
<td>City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office</td>
<td>Vincent Matthews, Superintendent, San Francisco Unified School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Viva Mogi, City Government Liaison and School Partnerships, San Francisco Unified School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mayor’s Office Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:10 PM - 2:29 PM</td>
<td>Meeting Re: Government Affairs -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office</td>
<td>City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office</td>
<td>Mayor’s Office Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30 PM - 4:55 PM</td>
<td>Meeting Re: Children, Youth and Their Families -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office</td>
<td>City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office</td>
<td>Maria Su, Executive Director, Department of Children, Youth and Their Families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mayor’s Office Staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**October 22, 2019**

**Tuesday**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00 AM - 9:11 AM</td>
<td>Senior Staff Check In -- Remote Conference Call</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mayor’s Office Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30 AM - 12:00 PM</td>
<td>Methamphetamine Task Force -- Moscone Center South; 747 Howard Street, San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>Moscone Center South; 747 Howard Street, San Francisco, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:45 PM - 1:05 PM</td>
<td>2019 Silver SPUR Annual Awards Luncheon -- Moscone Center South; 747 Howard Street, San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>Moscone Center South; 747 Howard Street, San Francisco, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:37 PM - 3:08 PM</td>
<td>Our Children, Our Families Council -- City Hall, Room 201, Mayor’s Conference Room</td>
<td>City Hall, Room 201, Mayor’s Conference Room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:08 PM - 3:17 PM</td>
<td>Meeting Re: City Operations -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office</td>
<td>City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office</td>
<td>Naomi elly, City Administrator, City and County of San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mayor’s Office Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30 PM - 3:47 PM</td>
<td>Meeting Re: Budget -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office</td>
<td>City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office</td>
<td>Mayor’s Office Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:01 PM - 4:21 PM</td>
<td>Meeting Re: Recreation and Park -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office</td>
<td>City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office</td>
<td>Phil Ginsburg, General Manager, San Francisco Recreation and Park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**October 22, 2019 Continued**

*Tuesday*

Park Department  
- Mayor’s Office Staff

---

**October 23, 2019**  

*Wednesday*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00 AM - 9:09 AM</td>
<td>Senior Staff Check In -- Remote Conference Call</td>
<td>Mayor’s Office Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 AM - 11:30 AM</td>
<td>Bloomberg Harvard City Leadership Initiative Virtual Class -- Residence</td>
<td>Mayor’s Office Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:35 PM - 1:06 PM</td>
<td>Meeting Re: Public Safety -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office</td>
<td>Chief William Scott, Police Chief, City and County of San Francisco</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1:07 PM - 1:38 PM | Meeting with Supervisor Yee, Re: District 7 -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office | Norman Yee, District 7 President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors  
- Mayor’s Office |
| 1:38 PM - 2:07 PM | Meeting Re: Criminal Justice -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office | James Caldwell, Community Outreach Coordinator, City and County of San Francisco |
| 2:36 PM - 2:52 PM | KTVU Homelessness Interview Re: Homelessness -- City Hall, International Room | Greg Lee, Political Reporter, TVU  
- Cameraman  
- Mayor’s Office Staff |
| 2:58 PM - 3:11 PM | Meeting with Supervisor Safai Re: District 11 -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office | Supervisor Ahsha Safai, District 11 Supervisor, City and County of San Francisco  
- Mayor’s Office Staff |
| 3:12 PM - 3:38 PM | Meeting Re: Stern Grove Festival -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office | Matthew Goldman, Chair, Stern Grove Festival Board  
- Jason Goldman, Vice Chair, Stern Grove Festival Board  
- Phil Ginsburg, General Manager, San Francisco Recreation and Parks  
- Mayor’s Office Staff |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Date and Time</th>
<th>Location/Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior Staff Check In -- Remote Conference Call</td>
<td>October 24, 2019 9:00 AM - 9:13 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodwill Training and Career Center Grand Opening -- 750 Post St; San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>October 24, 2019 11:00 AM - 11:30 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Re: Communications -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office</td>
<td>October 24, 2019 3:41 PM - 4:08 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Re: Housing, Land Use, Development -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office</td>
<td>October 24, 2019 4:08 PM - 4:25 PM</td>
<td>Mayor’s Office Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Re: Commissions -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office</td>
<td>October 24, 2019 4:33 PM - 5:13 PM</td>
<td>Mayor’s Office Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Re: Personnel -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office</td>
<td>October 24, 2019 5:14 PM - 5:44 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Vincent de Paul Society of San Francisco’s 27th Brennan Awards Dinner --</td>
<td>October 24, 2019 6:09 PM - 6:45 PM</td>
<td>Westin St. Francis Union Square; 335 Powell Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:44 AM - 9:52 AM Senior Staff Check In -- Remote Conference Call</td>
<td>October 25, 2019 9:44 AM - 9:52 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor’s Visitacion Valley Job Fair -- 1099 Sunnydale Ave, San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>October 25, 2019 12:31 PM - 12:50 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Re: Port Operations -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office</td>
<td>October 25, 2019 1:16 PM - 1:31 PM</td>
<td>Mayor’s Office Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Re: Legislation Signing -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office</td>
<td>October 25, 2019 1:34 PM - 1:38 PM</td>
<td>Mayor’s Office Staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### October 25, 2019 Continued

**Friday**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1:52 PM - 2:02 PM | PSA Recording Re: Welcome Message -- City Hall, International Room                  | - Cameraman, SFTV  
               |                                                                                     | - Mayor’s Office Staff                                          |
| 2:12 PM - 2:36 PM | Meeting Re: Scheduling -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office                      | - Mayor’s Office Staff                                          |
| 2:37 PM - 2:59 PM | Meeting Re: Public Health -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office                    | - Dr. Grant Colfax, Director, Department of Public Health  
               |                                                                                     | - Mayor’s Office Staff                                          |
| 3:03 PM - 3:29 PM | Meeting Re: Homelessness and Supportive Housing -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office | - Jeff ositsky, Director, Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing  
               |                                                                                     | - Mayor’s Office Staff                                          |
| 3:32 PM - 4:09 PM | Meeting with Supervisor Haney Re: District 6 -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office  | - Matt Haney, District 6 Supervisor  
               |                                                                                     | - Mayor’s Office Staff                                          |
| 4:13 PM - 4:22 PM | Meeting Re: Scheduling -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office                      | - Mayor’s Office Staff                                          |
| 6:08 PM - 6:25 PM | Diwali Celebration Meet and Greet -- Cathedral of Saint Mary of the Assumption; 1111 Gough Street, San Francisco, CA |                                                                  |

### October 26, 2019

**Saturday**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:00 PM - 12:30 PM</td>
<td>10th Annual Financial Planning Day -- San Francisco Main Library; 100 Larkin St, San Francisco, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 PM - 1:30 PM</td>
<td>Pop-Up Pumpkin Patch -- Gene Suttle Plaza; 1508 Fillmore St and O’Farrell St, San Francisco, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### October 27, 2019

**Sunday**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:00 PM - 3:30 PM</td>
<td>Divisadero Annual Block Party -- 99 Divisadero Street, San Francisco, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### October 28, 2019

**Monday**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00 AM - 9:12 AM</td>
<td>Senior Staff Check In -- Remote Conference Call</td>
<td>Mayor’s Office Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30 AM - 11:49 AM</td>
<td>Meeting Re: Scheduling -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office</td>
<td>Mayor’s Office Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:04 PM - 12:31 PM</td>
<td>Meeting with City Attorney Dennis Herrera Re: Legal and City Issues -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office</td>
<td>Dennis Herrera, City Attorney, Mayor’s Office Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:03 PM - 1:21 PM</td>
<td>Meeting Re: Staffing -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office</td>
<td>Mayor’s Office Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:36 PM - 2:03 PM</td>
<td>Meeting Re: Airport -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office</td>
<td>Ivar Satero, Director, San Francisco International Airport, Mayor’s Office Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:06 PM - 2:39 PM</td>
<td>Courtesy Call with Mayor of Heidelberg, Germany -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office</td>
<td>Professor Doctor Eckhart Wurzner, Mayor of Heidelberg Germany, Nicole Huber, City Director of Heidelberg, Chief of Staff to Mayor Wurzner, General Manager, Heidelberg Club International, Mayor’s Office Staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### October 29, 2019

**Tuesday**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:30 AM - 9:52 AM</td>
<td>Senior Staff Check In -- Remote Conference Call</td>
<td>Mayor’s Office Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:35 AM - 12:00 PM</td>
<td>Ribbon-Cutting Event to Celebrate Opening of Grand Hyatt at SFO -- Grand Hyatt at SFO; 56 S. McDonnell Road, San Francisco, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:31 PM - 2:56 PM</td>
<td>Meeting Re: Budget -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office</td>
<td>Mayor’s Office Staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
October 29, 2019 Continued

Tuesday

3:03 PM - 3:41 PM  Meeting Re: Housing and Community Development -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office
Attendees:
- Dan Adams, Deputy Director, Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development
- Theo Miller, Director HOPE SF
- Tonia Lediju, Transition Team Leader, San Francisco Housing Authority
- Mayor’s Office Staff

October 30, 2019

Wednesday

9:00 AM - 9:25 AM  Senior Staff Check In -- Remote Conference Call
Attendees:
- Mayor’s Office Staff

11:00 AM - 11:33 AM  Ellis Gardens RAD Rededication Ceremony -- 350 Ellis Street, San Francisco, CA

12:00 PM - 12:30 PM  Transport Workers Union Women’s Working Committee Meeting -- Sheraton Fisherman’s Wharf; 2500 Mason Street, San Francisco, CA

12:50 PM - 1:45 PM  Visit to the World Economic Forum’s Centre for the Fourth Industrial Revolution -- 1201 Ralston Avenue, San Francisco, CA

3:20 PM - 3:41 PM  Meeting Re: Scheduling -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office
Attendees:
- Mayor’s Office Staff

3:43 PM - 3:54 PM  Meeting Re: Public Safety -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office
Attendees:
- Police Chief William Scott, San Francisco Police Department
- Mayor’s Office Staff

4:07 PM - 4:48 PM  Meeting Re: UCSF -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office
Attendees:
- Sam Hawgood, Chancellor, UCSF
- Francesca Vega, Vice Chancellor, UCSF
- Mayor’s Office Staff

5:30 PM - 6:04 PM  Mayor Breed’s 2019 Backpack and Turkey Giveaway Reception -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 30, 2019</td>
<td>6:51 PM - 7:01 PM</td>
<td>Felton Institute's 130th Anniversary Celebration - War Memorial and Performing Arts Center, the Green Room, 401 Van Ness Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>October 31, 2019</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Thursday</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9:00 AM - 9:22 AM</td>
<td>Senior Staff Check In -- Remote Conference Call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Attendees:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>⦿ Mayor’s Office Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11:45 AM - 12:09 PM</td>
<td>Healthy Streets Operations Center Principals Meeting -- City Hall, Room 201, Mayor’s Conference Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:02 PM - 2:05 PM</td>
<td>Meeting Re: Legislation Signing -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Attendees:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>⦿ Mayor’s Office Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:08 PM - 2:34 PM</td>
<td>Swiss Student Exchange Meet and Greet -- City Hall, Room 201, Mayor’s Conference Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3:32 PM - 4:05 PM</td>
<td>Greet Trick or Treaters on Clement -- Corner of 5th and Clement, San Francisco, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:00 PM - 5:30 PM</td>
<td>SoMa Youth Collaborative and United Playaz Halloween Event -- Gene Friend Rec Center; 270 6th Street, San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6:00 PM - 6:30 PM</td>
<td>Bayview Opera House Haunted House -- Bayview Opera House; 4705 3rd St., San Francisco, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>November 1, 2019</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Friday</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9:30 AM - 10:00 AM</td>
<td>Senior Staff Check In -- Remote Conference Call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Attendees:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>⦿ Mayor’s Office Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11:00 AM - 11:30 AM</td>
<td>San Francisco Public Utilities Commission’s 6th Annual Women in Construction Expo -- War Memorial; 301 Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11:45 AM - 12:20 PM</td>
<td>73rd Annual Greater Geary Boulevard Merchants Association Awards -- Hotel Kabuki, 1625 Post Street, San Francisco, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3:25 PM - 3:49 PM</td>
<td>Meeting Re: Scheduling -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Attendees:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>⦿ Mayor’s Office Staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Trans Awareness Month Kickoff and Flag Raising -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor's Office
To Whom It May Concern -

We write in response to your petition below. With regard to the first issue, we understand that the Mayor’s Office confirmed on December 30, 2020 that it had no records responsive to the request. With regard to the second issue, we understand that the Mayor’s Office produced responsive records on February 3 and February 11, 2021. Accordingly, we believe the issues raised in your petition have been resolved and consider the petition closed. Thank you.

Bradley Russi  
Deputy City Attorney  
Office of City Attorney David Chiu  
City Hall, Room 234  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., San Francisco, CA 94102  
www.sfcityattorney.org

December 30, 2020

This is a follow up to a previous request:

Supervisor of Records Dennis Herrera:

This is a petition under 67.21(d) with for different requests made from this email address:

1. I requested from Sean Elsbernd on Dec 18, 2020 before close of business his copies of the specific text messages disclosed by the Police Commission in EX 1, attached. He refuses to comply with my request as I have received no determination of disclosable public records nor extension nor any other response in 10 days as required by Gov Code 6253(c). Today is Dec 30.

2. On December 3 and 4th I requested various communications from London Breed and her staff. Breed, Cretan, Heckel, Elsbernd, and Bruss have all refused to comply with my requests, as I have received no determination of disclosable public records within the 10 + 14 day extension deadline under Gov Code 6253(c). Today is Dec 30.
Please determine in writing that one or more records or parts thereof not yet disclosed to me in these requests in public and order them disclosed.

--Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 98380-37550836@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:
%3Fnext%3D%252Fagency%252Fagency_login%252Foffice-of-the-mayor-3891%252Ftext-messages-walter-wong-and-others-immediate-disclosure-request-98380%252F%253Femail%253Dsupervisor.records%2540sfcityatty.org&url_auth_token=AAAxJOK2OUULoYu4xv2F8WXKz5U%3A1kuXRx%3A5AFCTCvNd0oevhswna6VuO1vfN1A
Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 98380
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.

---

On Dec. 18, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text Messages / Walter Wong and others - Immediate Disclosure Request
Sean Elsbernd,

Please provide as an immediate disclosure request your copy of the attached public record texts disclosed by Commissioner Taylor.

--Anonymous

---

On Dec. 15, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text Messages / Walter Wong and others - Immediate Disclosure Request
Anonymous,

We are continuing our response to the request below for up to 14 days due to the need to consult with another department. See Cal. Gov. Code § 6253(c) and San Francisco Admin. Code § 67.25(b).
Regards,

Hank Heckel
Compliance Officer
Office of the Mayor
On Dec. 15, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text Messages / Walter Wong and others - Immediate Disclosure Request
Anonymous,

We are continuing our response to the request below for up to 14 days due to the need to consult with another department. See Cal. Gov. Code § 6253(c) and San Francisco Admin. Code § 67.25(b).

Regards,

Hank Heckel
Compliance Officer
Office of the Mayor
City and County of San Francisco

---

On Dec. 15, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text Messages / Walter Wong and others - Immediate Disclosure Request
Anonymous,

We are continuing our response to the request below for up to 14 days due to the need to consult with another department. See Cal. Gov. Code § 6253(c) and San Francisco Admin. Code § 67.25(b).

Regards,

Hank Heckel
Compliance Officer
Office of the Mayor
City and County of San Francisco

---

On July 17, 2020:
Subject: California Public Records Act Request: Text Messages / Walter Wong and others - Immediate Disclosure Request

MASON LEE:
NOTE: THE EMAIL ADDRESS SENDING THIS REQUEST IS A PUBLICLY-VIEWABLE MAILBOX. Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Below are new Immediate Disclosure Requests (SF Admin Code 67.25(a)) directed to your agency and its department head.

Your initial response is required by Feb 20, 2020. Rolling records responses are requested (SFAC 67.25(d)) if you are unable to immediately produce records.

Exact copies of every responsive record are requested (Gov Code 6253(b)) - do not: provide mere URLs, print and scan electronic records, convert native files to PDFs, or provide black and white versions of any color record. Provide only copies of records not requiring fees and in-person inspection of all other records (GC 6253).

Your non-exhaustive obligations:
- All withholding of any information must be justified in writing by specific statutory authority (SFAC 67.27).
- All withholdings by masking or deletion (aka redactions) must be keyed by footnote or other clear reference to the specific justification for that redaction, and only the minimal exempt portion of any record may be withheld (SFAC 67.26).
- You must respond to emailed requests (SFAC 67.21(b)).
- You must notify us of whether or not responsive records exist and/or were withheld for each below request (Gov Code 6253(c), 6255(b)).
- You must state the name and title of each person responsible for withholding any information (Gov Code 6253(d)).
- Do not impose any end-user restrictions upon me (Santa Clara Co. vs Superior Ct, 170 Cal.App 4th 1301); so if you use a third-party website to publish records, please make them completely public without any login or sign-in.

Your agency must do all of the above things in your response, and you cannot wait until we file complaints.

******* We have no duty to, and we will not again, remind the City of its obligations. Instead, we will file complaints for every Sunshine Ordinance or CPRA violation. We will continue to file complaints until the City's procedures are modified to fully comply with the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA, without caveat or exception. *******

1. all text/chat messages (of any form or application, including all attachments/images) public records on government or personal accounts between Mason Lee and any of Walter Wong, Harlan Wong, Melanie Lok, Irene Lok, Washington Wong, Florence Kong, Michael Tracy, Rudolph Dwayne Jones (Dwayne Jones), Dionjay Brookter, or Harlan Kelly Jr. for all time frames.

NOTE: Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. The email address sending this request is a publicly-viewable mailbox. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.
Sincerely,
Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 98380-37550836@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:
%3Fnext%3D%252Fagency_login%252Foffice-of-the-mayor-3891%252Ftext-messages-walter-wong-and-others-immediate-disclosure-request-
98380%252F%253Femail%253Dsupervisor.records%2540sfcityatty.org&url_auth_token=AAAxJOK2OUULoYu4xv2F8WXKz5U%3A1kuXRx%3ASAfTCvNd0oevhswna6VuO1vfN1A
Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 98380
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.
December 30, 2020

This is a follow up to a previous request:

Supervisor of Records Dennis Herrera:

This is a petition under 67.21(d) with for different requests made from this email address:

1. I requested from Sean Elsbernd on Dec 18, 2020 before close of business his copies of the specific text messages disclosed by the Police Commission in EX 1, attached. He refuses to comply with my request as I have received no determination of disclosable public records nor extension nor any other response in 10 days as required by Gov Code 6253(c). Today is Dec 30.

2. On December 3 and 4th I requested various communications from London Breed and her staff. Breed, Cretan, Heckel, Elsbernd, and Bruss have all refused to comply with my requests, as I have received no determination of disclosable public records within the 10 + 14 day extension deadline under Gov Code 6253(c). Today is Dec 30.

Please determine in writing that one or more records or parts thereof not yet disclosed to me in these requests in public and order them disclosed.

--Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 98380-37550836@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:
https://accounts.muckrock.com/accounts/login/?next=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.muckrock.com%2Faccounts%2Flogin%2F%3Fnest%3D%2Faccounts%2Fagency_login%2Foffice-of-the-mayor-3891%2Ftext-messages-walter-wong-and-others-immediate-disclosure-request-98380%252F%253D%253D2Femail%253Dsupervisor.records%252540sfcityatty.org&url_auth_token=AAAxJOK2OUUoYu4xv2F8Wkz5U%3AkuXRx%3AASATc2vNd0oevhswna6Vu01vF1A
Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 98380
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the
requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.

---

On Dec. 18, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text Messages / Walter Wong and others - Immediate Disclosure Request
Sean Elsbernd,

Please provide as an immediate disclosure request your copy of the attached public record texts disclosed by Commissioner Taylor.

--Anonymous
---

On Dec. 15, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text Messages / Walter Wong and others - Immediate Disclosure Request
Anonymous,

We are continuing our response to the request below for up to 14 days due to the need to consult with another department. See Cal. Gov. Code § 6253(c) and San Francisco Admin. Code § 67.25(b).
Regards,

Hank Heckel
Compliance Officer
Office of the Mayor
City and County of San Francisco
---

On Dec. 15, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text Messages / Walter Wong and others - Immediate Disclosure Request
Anonymous,

We are continuing our response to the request below for up to 14 days due to the need to consult with another department. See Cal. Gov. Code § 6253(c) and San Francisco Admin. Code § 67.25(b).
Regards,

Hank Heckel
Compliance Officer
Office of the Mayor
City and County of San Francisco
---

On Dec. 15, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text Messages / Walter Wong and others - Immediate Disclosure Request
Anonymous,
We are continuing our response to the request below for up to 14 days due to the need to consult with another department. See Cal. Gov. Code § 6253(c) and San Francisco Admin. Code § 67.25(b).

Regards,

Hank Heckel
Compliance Officer
Office of the Mayor
City and County of San Francisco

---

On Dec. 15, 2020:

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text Messages / Walter Wong and others - Immediate Disclosure Request
Anonymous,

We are continuing our response to the request below for up to 14 days due to the need to consult with another department. See Cal. Gov. Code § 6253(c) and San Francisco Admin. Code § 67.25(b).

Regards,

Hank Heckel
Compliance Officer
Office of the Mayor
City and County of San Francisco

---

On July 17, 2020:

Subject: California Public Records Act Request: Text Messages / Walter Wong and others - Immediate Disclosure Request
MASON LEE:

NOTE: THE EMAIL ADDRESS SENDING THIS REQUEST IS A PUBLICLY-VIEWABLE MAILBOX. Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Below are new Immediate Disclosure Requests (SF Admin Code 67.25(a)) directed to your agency and its department head. Your initial response is required by Feb 20, 2020. Rolling records responses are requested (SFAC 67.25(d)) if you are unable to immediately produce records.

Exact copies of every responsive record are requested (Gov Code 6253(b)) - do not: provide mere URLs, print and scan electronic records, convert native files to PDFs, or provide black and white versions of any color record. Provide only copies of records not requiring fees and in-person inspection of all other records (GC 6253).

Your non-exhaustive obligations:
- All withholding of any information must be justified in writing by specific statutory authority (SFAC 67.27).
- All withholdings by masking or deletion (aka redactions) must be keyed by footnote or other clear reference to the specific justification for that redaction, and only the minimal exempt portion of any record may be withheld (SFAC 67.26).
- You must respond to emailed requests (SFAC 67.21(b)).
- You must notify us of whether or not responsive records exist and/or were withheld for each below request (Gov Code 6253(c), 6255(b)).
- You must state the name and title of each person responsible for withholding any information (Gov Code 6253(d)).
- Do not impose any end-user restrictions upon me (Santa Clara Co. vs Superior Ct, 170 Cal.App 4th 1301); so if you use a third-party website to publish records, please make them completely public without any login or sign-in.

Your agency must do all of the above things in your response, and you cannot wait until we file complaints.

****** We have no duty to, and we will not again, remind the City of its obligations. Instead, we will file complaints for every Sunshine Ordinance or CPRA violation. We will continue to file complaints until the City's procedures are modified to fully comply with the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA, without caveat or exception. ******

1. all text/chat messages (of any form or application, including all attachments/images) public records on government or personal accounts between Mason Lee and any of Walter Wong, Harlan Wong, Melanie Lok, Irene Lok, Washington Wong, Florence Kong, Michael Tracy, Rudolph Dwayne Jones (Dwayne Jones), Dionjay Brookter, or Harlan Kelly Jr. for all time frames.

NOTE: Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. The email address sending this request is a publicly-viewable mailbox. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,
Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 98380-37550836@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:
https://accounts.muckrock.com/accounts/login/?next=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.muckrock.com%2Faccounts%2Flogin%2F%3Fnext%3D%253D%252Faccounts%252Fagency_login%252Foffice-of-the-mayor-3891%252Ftext-messages-walter-wong-and-others-immediate-disclosure-request-98380%252F%253Femail%252Dsfcityatty.org&url_auth_token=AAAxJOK2OUULoYu4xv2F8W4Zz5U%3A1kuXRx%3ASAfTCvNd00eVhswna6VuO1vfN1APL0x

Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 98380
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.
Public Records from Other Departments / Part 1

1. Police Commission Disclosure (Damali Taylor / Sean Elsbernd)
1. Police Commission Disclosure (Damali Taylor / Sean Elsbernd)
All redactions made voluntarily by complainant (phone numbers and Elsbernd family info was not redacted by Police Commission)

Commissioner Taylor,
Sean Elsbernd here from the mayors office.

Just curious. The curfew kicked in 30 minutes ago. There remain thousands of protestors throughout the City. Can you tell me why the Commission is still questioning Chief Scott? Don’t you all think he might be needed elsewhere right now?

I tried and told the chief to go. He said he wanted to answer these questions.

That sounds like him. Thanks.

And thank you for trying. Good luck.

He’s so graceful. I keep telling him to leave.

He’s gone btw.

Finally.

Great!!!
Text Message
Wed, Jul 16, 11:52 AM

Depositing new message Molly hi it's Sean Elston from the Mayor's office. If you get a chance if you got a couple HR issues city attorney issues coming to your commission meeting tonight that I just wanted to talk to you about briefly.

Thanks... Click here:  to listen to full voice message.

Mon, Nov 9, 7:11 PM

Hi Sean. It's Damali from the police commission. Let me know if you have a few minutes to talk at any point this week. Just wanted to alert you to a couple of things.

Do you have time tomorrow morning?

Yup. I'm free between 8
a few minutes to talk at any point this week. Just wanted to alert you to a couple of things.

Do you have time tomorrow morning?

Yup. I'm free between 8 and 9 am and then after 10 am.

I'll call around 8:15ish (once I...)

Lol—totally understand. That works for me.
To Whom It May Concern –

We understand that the Office of the City Administrator responded to the request at issue in your petition below on February 23, 2021, confirming it had no records responsive to the first request and producing one record in response to the second request. Accordingly, we consider this petition closed.

Bradley Russi  
Deputy City Attorney  
Office of City Attorney David Chiu  
City Hall, Room 234  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., San Francisco, CA 94102  
www.sfcityattorney.org

Office of the City Administrator  
PRA Office  
Room 362  
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, CA 94102

December 30, 2020

This is a follow up to a previous request:

Supervisor of Records Dennis Herrera,

Naomi Kelly refuses to comply with the below Dec 2, 2020 request - after 24 days she has failed to provide a determination and justification pursuant to Gov Code 6253(c). Unlike Nuru and her husband, Ms. Kelly does not get the excuse that she is no longer a public employee. Pursuant to SFAC 67.21(d) please determine in writing that one or more records or parts thereof are public and order their disclosure.

1. all text/chat/instant messages (of any form or application, including all attachments/images, including on encrypted chat platforms) related to the conduct of public business on government or personal accounts between Naomi Kelly and
any of Walter Wong, Harlan Wong, Melanie Lok, Irene Lok, Washington Wong, Florence Kong, Michael Tracy, Rudolph Dwayne Jones (Dwayne Jones), Dionjay Brookter, or Harlan Kelly Jr. for all time frames. Note that PUC initially produced unredacted messages between Mr. Kelly and Walter Wong in a prior records request, including regarding travel, payments, etc, that also mentioned Ms. Kelly. Then, later, PUC requested to retract that production, which has been appealed as a violation of the CPRA and Sunshine Ordinance. We know records exist in some form, whether by Mr. Kelly or Ms. Kelly.

2. Every document mentioning or otherwise related to United States v. Harlan Kelly (Ms. Kelly's husband), including every subpoena, subpoena response, warrant, court document, court filing, etc.

Sincerely,
Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 105335-44496792@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:

Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 105335
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.

---

On Dec. 14, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text Messages / Walter Wong and others - Immediate Disclosure Request (Naomi Kelly, SF ADM)
Dear Requestor,

We are invoking a 14-day extension due to the need to consult with other departments. See Cal. Gov. Code § 6253(c) and San Francisco Admin. Code § 67.25(b).

Sincerely,
Office of the City Administrator
(415) 554-4148

---

On Dec. 4, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text Messages / Walter Wong and others - Immediate Disclosure
Request (Naomi Kelly, SF ADM)
Let me be clear: I will immediately appeal if you "unreasonably delay" (67.21(a)) access. I am well aware of the tricks your office has used against sunshine in the past. The tribunal will determine whether your delay is unreasonable.

--Anonymous
---

On Dec. 4, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text Messages / Walter Wong and others - Immediate Disclosure Request (Naomi Kelly, SF ADM)
Dear Requestor,

We have received your request and we are processing our response.

Please note that city workers are naturally working under unusual and difficult conditions with many called in for emergency service as disaster relief workers, or otherwise prioritizing work on the public health emergency, and with many working remotely, sometimes while also providing care for children or other family members. This impacts the City's ability to respond to records requests, particularly in gathering documents when working from a remote location. These issues are noted in the Mayor's recent emergency orders (attached) which, among other things, have suspended certain provisions of the Sunshine Ordinance, including immediate disclosure requests and the 10-day period in which to provide or withhold documents.

Pursuant to these orders, we will respond further within 10 days of your request, barring a further extension, to notify you of the existence of any disclosable records and our timetable for production pursuant to the California Public Records Act.

Sincerely,

Office of the City Administrator
(415) 554-4148
Pronouns: He, Him, His

---

On Dec. 3, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text Messages / Walter Wong and others - Immediate Disclosure Request (Naomi Kelly, SF ADM)
Naomi Kelly must respond to the below records request. It was requested around 9am yesterday directly from her email *prior* to her leave of absence and Kelly remains a city employee, fully subject to CPRA and Sunshine Ordinance.

I intend to litigate any failure to produce these records.

Sincerely,
Anonymous

---

On Dec. 3, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text Messages / Walter Wong and others - Immediate Disclosure Request (Naomi Kelly, SF ADM)
Naomi Kelly must respond to the below records request. It was requested around 9am yesterday directly from her email *prior* to her leave of absence and Kelly remains a city employee, fully subject to CPRA and Sunshine Ordinance.
I intend to litigate any failure to produce these records.

Sincerely,
Anonymous

---

On Dec. 2, 2020:
Subject: California Public Records Act Request: Text Messages / Walter Wong and others - Immediate Disclosure Request (Naomi Kelly, SF ADM)
NAOMI KELLY:

*** DO NOT DESTROY ANY RESPONSIVE RECORDS. WE WILL APPEAL EVERY WITHHOLDING OF RECORDS ***

Below are new Immediate Disclosure Requests (SF Admin Code 67.25(a)) directed to your agency and its department head.
Your initial response is required by Dec 3, 2020. Rolling records responses are requested (SFAC 67.25(d)) if you are unable to immediately produce records.
Exact copies of every responsive record are requested (Gov Code 6253(b)) - do not: provide mere URLs, print and scan electronic records, convert native files to PDFs, or provide black and white versions of any color record. Provide only copies of records not requiring fees and in-person inspection of all other records (GC 6253).

Your non-exhaustive obligations:
- All withholding of any information must be justified in writing by specific statutory authority (SFAC 67.27).
- All withholdings by masking or deletion (aka redactions) must be keyed by footnote or other clear reference to the specific justification for that redaction, and only the minimal exempt portion of any record may be withheld (SFAC 67.26).
- You must respond to emailed requests (SFAC 67.21(b)).
- You must notify us of whether or not responsive records exist and/or were withheld for each below request (Gov Code 6253(c), 6255(b)).
- You must state the name and title of each person responsible for withholding any information (Gov Code 6253(d)).
- Do not impose any end-user restrictions upon me (Santa Clara Co. vs Superior Ct, 170 Cal.App 4th 1301); so if you use a third-party website to publish records, please make them completely public without any login or sign-in.

Your agency must do all of the above things in your response, and you cannot wait until we file complaints.

****** We have no duty to, and we will not again, remind the City of its obligations. Instead, we will file complaints for every Sunshine Ordinance or CPRA violation. We will continue to file complaints until the City's procedures are modified to fully comply with the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA, without caveat or exception. ******

1. all text/chat/instant messages (of any form or application, including all attachments/images, including on encrypted chat platforms) related to the conduct of public business on government or personal accounts between Naomi Kelly and any of Walter Wong, Harlan Wong, Melanie Lok, Irene Lok, Washington Wong, Florence Kong, Michael Tracy, Rudolph Dwayne Jones (Dwayne Jones), Dionjay Brookter, or Harlan Kelly Jr. for all time frames. Note that PUC initially produced unredacted messages between Mr. Kelly and Walter Wong in a prior records request, including regarding travel, payments, etc, that also mentioned Ms. Kelly. Then, later, PUC requested to retract that production, which has been appealed as a violation of the CPRA and Sunshine Ordinance. We know records exist in some form, whether by Mr. Kelly or Ms. Kelly.

2. Every document mentioning or otherwise related to United States v. Harlan Kelly (Ms. Kelly's husband), including every subpoena, subpoena response, warrant, court document, court filing, etc.
NOTE: Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. The email address sending this request is a publicly-viewable mailbox. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,
Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 105335-44496792@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:
%3Fnext%3D%252Faccounts%2Fagency_login%252Fsan-fransisco-311-18636%252Ftext-messages-walter-wong-and-others-immediate-disclosure-request-naomi-kelly-sf-adm-105335%252F%253Femail%253Dsupervisor.records%2540sfcityatty.org&url_auth_token=AABkDcrkc2hpnhG1e4bE80_Zx1c%3A1kuFN0%3APlm_ZdTcJf0dNMVp8KIW0jPeViY
Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 105335
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.
From: 105335-44496792@requests.muckrock.com on behalf of ‘105335-44496792
@requests.muckrock.com’ <105335-44496792@requests.muckrock.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 30, 2020 9:35 AM
To: Supervisor Records (CAT)
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text Messages / Walter Wong and others - Immediate Disclosure Request (Naomi Kelly, SF ADM)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Office of the City Administrator
PRA Office
Room 362
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

December 30, 2020

This is a follow up to a previous request:

Supervisor of Records Dennis Herrera,

Naomi Kelly refuses to comply with the below Dec 2, 2020 request - after 24 days she has failed to provide a determination and justification pursuant to Gov Code 6253(c). Unlike Nuru and her husband, Ms. Kelly does not get the excuse that she is no longer a public employee. Pursuant to SFAC 67.21(d) please determine in writing that one or more records or parts thereof are public and order their disclosure.

1. all text/chat/instant messages (of any form or application, including all attachments/images, including on encrypted chat platforms) related to the conduct of public business on government or personal accounts between Naomi Kelly and any of Walter Wong, Harlan Wong, Melanie Lok, Irene Lok, Washington Wong, Florence Kong, Michael Tracy, Rudolph Dwayne Jones (Dwayne Jones), Dionjay Brookter, or Harlan Kelly Jr. for all time frames. Note that PUC initially produced unreadacted messages between Mr. Kelly and Walter Wong in a prior records request, including regarding travel, payments, etc, that also mentioned Ms. Kelly. Then, later, PUC requested to retract that production, which has been appealed as a violation of the CPRA and Sunshine Ordinance. We know records exist in some form, whether by Mr. Kelly or Ms. Kelly.

2. Every document mentioning or otherwise related to United States v. Harlan Kelly (Ms. Kelly's husband), including every subpoena, subpoena response, warrant, court document, court filing, etc.

Sincerely,
Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 105335-44496792@requests.muckrock.com
On Dec. 14, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text Messages / Walter Wong and others - Immediate Disclosure Request (Naomi Kelly, SF ADM)

Dear Requestor,

We are invoking a 14-day extension due to the need to consult with other departments. See Cal. Gov. Code § 6253(c) and San Francisco Admin. Code § 67.25(b).

Sincerely,
Office of the City Administrator
(415) 554-4148

On Dec. 4, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text Messages / Walter Wong and others - Immediate Disclosure Request (Naomi Kelly, SF ADM)

Let me be clear: I will immediately appeal if you "unreasonably delay" (67.21(a)) access. I am well aware of the tricks your office has used against sunshine in the past. The tribunal will determine whether your delay is unreasonable.

--Anonymous

On Dec. 4, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text Messages / Walter Wong and others - Immediate Disclosure Request (Naomi Kelly, SF ADM)

Dear Requestor,

We have received your request and we are processing our response.

Please note that city workers are naturally working under unusual and difficult conditions with many called in for emergency service as disaster relief workers, or otherwise prioritizing work on the public health emergency, and with many working remotely, sometimes while also providing care for children or other family members. This impacts the City's ability to respond to records requests, particularly in gathering documents when working from a remote location.
These issues are noted in the Mayor’s recent emergency orders (attached) which, among other things, have suspended certain provisions of the Sunshine Ordinance, including immediate disclosure requests and the 10-day period in which to provide or withhold documents.

Pursuant to these orders, we will respond further within 10 days of your request, barring a further extension, to notify you of the existence of any disclosable records and our timetable for production pursuant to the California Public Records Act.

Sincerely,

Office of the City Administrator
(415) 554-4148
Pronouns: He, Him, His

---

On Dec. 3, 2020:
Naomi Kelly must respond to the below records request. It was requested around 9am yesterday directly from her email *prior* to her leave of absence and Kelly remains a city employee, fully subject to CPRA and Sunshine Ordinance.

I intend to litigate any failure to produce these records.

Sincerely,
Anonymous
---

On Dec. 3, 2020:
Naomi Kelly must respond to the below records request. It was requested around 9am yesterday directly from her email *prior* to her leave of absence and Kelly remains a city employee, fully subject to CPRA and Sunshine Ordinance.

I intend to litigate any failure to produce these records.

Sincerely,
Anonymous
---

On Dec. 2, 2020:
Subject: California Public Records Act Request: Text Messages / Walter Wong and others – Immediate Disclosure Request (Naomi Kelly, SF ADM)
NAOMI KELLY:

*** DO NOT DESTROY ANY RESPONSIVE RECORDS. WE WILL APPEAL EVERY WITHHOLDING OF RECORDS ***

Below are new Immediate Disclosure Requests (SF Admin Code 67.25(a)) directed to your agency and its department head.
Your initial response is required by Dec 3, 2020. Rolling records responses are requested (SFAC 67.25(d)) if you are unable to immediately produce records.
Exact copies of every responsive record are requested (Gov Code 6253(b)) - do not: provide mere URLs, print and scan
electronic records, convert native files to PDFs, or provide black and white versions of any color record. Provide only copies of records not requiring fees and in-person inspection of all other records (GC 6253).

Your non-exhaustive obligations:
- All withholding of any information must be justified in writing by specific statutory authority (SFAC 67.27).
- All withholdings by masking or deletion (aka redactions) must be keyed by footnote or other clear reference to the specific justification for that redaction, and only the minimal exempt portion of any record may be withheld (SFAC 67.26).
- You must respond to emailed requests (SFAC 67.21(b)).
- You must notify us of whether or not responsive records exist and/or were withheld for each below request (Gov Code 6253(c), 6255(b)).
- You must state the name and title of each person responsible for withholding any information (Gov Code 6253(d)).
- Do not impose any end-user restrictions upon me (Santa Clara Co. vs Superior Ct, 170 Cal.App 4th 1301); so if you use a third-party website to publish records, please make them completely public without any login or sign-in.

Your agency must do all of the above things in your response, and you cannot wait until we file complaints.

****** We have no duty to, and we will not again, remind the City of its obligations. Instead, we will file complaints for every Sunshine Ordinance or CPRA violation. We will continue to file complaints until the City's procedures are modified to fully comply with the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA, without caveat or exception. ******

1. all text/chat/instant messages (of any form or application, including all attachments/images, including on encrypted chat platforms) related to the conduct of public business on government or personal accounts between Naomi Kelly and any of Walter Wong, Harlan Wong, Melanie Lok, Irene Lok, Washington Wong, Florence Kong, Michael Tracy, Rudolph Dwayne Jones (Dwayne Jones), Dionjay Brookter, or Harlan Kelly Jr. for all time frames. Note that PUC initially produced unredacted messages between Mr. Kelly and Walter Wong in a prior records request, including regarding travel, payments, etc, that also mentioned Ms. Kelly. Then, later, PUC requested to retract that production, which has been appealed as a violation of the CPRA and Sunshine Ordinance. We know records exist in some form, whether by Mr. Kelly or Ms. Kelly.

2. Every document mentioning or otherwise related to United States v. Harlan Kelly (Ms. Kelly's husband), including every subpoena, subpoena response, warrant, court document, court filing, etc.

NOTE: Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. The email address sending this request is a publicly-viewable mailbox. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,
Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 105335-44496792@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:
To Whom It May Concern:

We understand that the Department of Emergency Management confirmed on March 8, 2021, that it had no records responsive to your request. Accordingly, we consider this petition closed. Thank you.

Bradley Russi  
Deputy City Attorney  
Office of City Attorney David Chiu  
City Hall, Room 234  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., San Francisco, CA 94102  
www.sfcityattorney.org

Department of Emergency Management  
PRA Office  
1011 Turk Street  
SF, CA 94102

December 30, 2020

This is a follow up to a previous request:

Supervisor of Records Dennis Herrera,

The DEM and its department head Mary Ellen Carroll refuse to comply in any way to the below December 5, 2020 request - no response whatsoever. Please determine in writing that one or more records or parts thereof not disclosed are public and order them disclosed.

Sincerely,  
Anonymous
On Dec. 30, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (DEM)
Supervisor of Records Dennis Herrera,

The DEM and its department head Mary Ellen Carroll refuse to comply in any way to the below December 5, 2020 request - no response whatsoever. Please determine in writing that one or more records or parts thereof not disclosed are public and order them disclosed.

Sincerely,
Anonymous

---

On Dec. 5, 2020:
Subject: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (DEM)
To Department of Emergency Management and its Department Head or Elected Official:

** DO NOT DESTROY ANY RESPONSIVE RECORDS. YOU MUST PRESERVE AND ORDER YOUR EMPLOYEES TO PRESERVE RECORDS DURING THE PENDENCY OF ALL APPEALS. WE WILL APPEAL ALL REDACTIONS OR WITHHOLDINGS. **
Immediate Disclosure Request.

Every department head/elected official must preserve and maintain all correspondence in a professional and businesslike manner (SFAC 67.29-7(a)) and also separately must comply with retention policies (SFAC 67.29-1). Note that if your retention policies do not retain text messages, I will argue before the SOTF and court that this is a failure to maintain **all correspondence** in a professional and businesslike manner.

Relevant precedent: SOTF 19098 - Anonymous v SFPD. Unanimous finding of violation for unlawfully withholding text message metadata (including the to/from/etc. - note SFPD had provided the dates and times, and you must as well), and
also for unlawfully printing and scanning electronic records which does not constitute a "copy" of an electronic record. See also prior rulings in my favor in SOTF 19044, 19047, 19091, 19098, 19103, and 19108 which ruled against the City for email, text messages, past and future calendar entries, meeting details, electronic metadata, and attachments.

The Mayor's Office appears to have destroyed their copies of certain text messages. I'd be happy to get them from her, if she preserved every record. Alas she did not, therefore we must now conduct a universal search of the City. You cannot refer me to another department unless you search and determine that you have no copies in your department. If this is causing more work for you, ask your Mayor to stop destroying her public records.

Note there are many anonymous requesters using MuckRock - I am just one of them. If you previously produced some subset of these records to a MuckRock email address, please reference that prior response so you do not duplicate work. If I am unable to get the prior MuckRock response because it is someone else's and they have marked it private, you will however need to provide me a copy here as well.

1. This is an immediate disclosure request for text, chat, or instant messages between the Department Head/Elected Official and either Sean Elsbernd, Andrea Bruss, London Breed, Harlan Kelly, Jr., Naomi Kelly, Hank Heckel, or Walter Wong, including all group messages, and all messages in threads, in any form and any app (including, but not limited to, SMS, MMS, text, iMessage, Teams, Discord, WeChat, QQ, Signal, Telegram, WhatsApp, Facebook, Facebook Messenger, Twitter, Instagram, Hangouts, Meet, Slack, Skype, Viber, Snapchat, Line, Kik, FaceTime, Wickr Me, Chatroulette, Threema, KakaoTalk, Duo, GroupMe, Wire, Voicer, Allo, Tango, Bumble, Grindr, Tinder, Olive, Taimi, but NOT including email), on any government accounts/devices or on personal accounts or devices regarding the conduct of public business, including all participant names, message text, images, attachments, dates, and times, including any in trash or deleted folders or similar (see Good Government Guide - if the records have not been permanently deleted as of the time you receive this request, you must retrieve them from the so-called trash folders and provide them). Provide rolling responses. Provide exact copies including all metadata. There is no limitation by subject or date. If the total pages to produce numbers over 500, inform me of the rough dates, employees involved, and subject matter, and I may be willing to narrow the initial production, AS LONG AS YOU PRESERVE ALL THE RECORDS.

2. This is a regular records request for text, chat, or instant messages between any non-department head/elected official (i.e. the other dept employees) and either Sean Elsbernd, Andrea Bruss, London Breed, Harlan Kelly, Jr., Naomi Kelly, Hank Heckel, or Walter Wong, including all group messages, and all messages in threads, in any form and any app (including, but not limited to, SMS, MMS, text, iMessage, Teams, Discord, WeChat, QQ, Signal, Telegram, WhatsApp, Facebook, Facebook Messenger, Twitter, Instagram, Hangouts, Meet, Slack, Skype, Viber, Snapchat, Line, Kik, FaceTime, Wickr Me, Chatroulette, Threema, KakaoTalk, Duo, GroupMe, Wire, Voicer, Allo, Tango, Bumble, Grindr, Tinder, Olive, Taimi, but NOT including email), on any government accounts/devices or on personal accounts or devices regarding the conduct of public business, including all participant names, message text, images, attachments, dates, and times, including any in trash or deleted folders or similar (see Good Government Guide - if the records have not been permanently deleted as of the time you receive this request, you must retrieve them from the so-called trash folders and provide them). Provide rolling responses. Provide exact copies including all metadata. There is no limitation by subject or date. If the total pages to produce numbers over 500, inform me of the rough dates, employees involved, and subject matter, and I may be willing to narrow the initial production, AS LONG AS YOU PRESERVE ALL THE RECORDS.

Please provide only those copies of records available without any fees. If you determine certain records would require fees, please instead provide the required notice of which of those records are available and non-exempt for inspection in-person if we so choose.

Your non-exhaustive obligations:
- All withholding of any information must be justified in writing by specific statutory authority (SFAC 67.27).
- Every redaction must be keyed by footnote or by other clear reference to the specific justification for that redaction, and only the minimal exempt portion of any record may be withheld (SFAC 67.26).
- You must respond to emailed requests (SFAC 67.21(b)).
- You must notify us of whether or not responsive records exist and/or were withheld for each above request (Gov Code
6253(c), 6255(b)).
- You must state the name and title of each person responsible for withholding any information (Gov Code 6253(d)).
- Do not impose any end-user restrictions upon me (Santa Clara Co. vs Superior Ct, 170 Cal.App 4th 1301); so if you use a
third-party website to publish records, please make them completely public without any login or sign-in.

Your agency must do all of the above things in your response, and you cannot wait until we file complaints.

****** We have no duty to, and we will not again, remind the City of its obligations. Instead, we will file complaints for
every Sunshine Ordinance or CPRA violation. We will continue to file complaints until the City's procedures are modified
to fully comply with the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA, without caveat or exception. ******

I look forward to your lawful response.

NOTE: THE EMAIL ADDRESS SENDING THIS REQUEST IS A PUBLICLY-VIEWABLE MAILBOX. Please be certain you have
properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. All of your responses
(including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the
MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative
of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express
or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable
for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this
email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any
confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 105576-66847014@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:
%3Fnext%3D%252Faccounts%252Fagency_login%252Fdepartment-of-emergency-management-8080%252Ftext-and-
chat-messages-immediate-disclosure-request-san-francisco-universal-search-dem-
105576%252F%253Femail%253Dsupervisor.records%252540sfcityatty.org&url_auth_token=AAAdJ9FV6yN5uNDURxRr0
UgBs2U%3A1kuftm%3AFrh0Jhobn2sx7jZjto23QhrIVc
Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 105576
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in
order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the
requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as
undeliverable.
Buta, Odaya (CAT)

From: 105576-66847014@requests.muckrock.com
Sent: Wednesday, December 30, 2020 9:42 AM
To: Supervisor Records (CAT)
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (DEM)

Department of Emergency Management
PRA Office
1011 Turk Street
SF, CA 94102

December 30, 2020

This is a follow up to a previous request:

Supervisor of Records Dennis Herrera,

The DEM and its department head Mary Ellen Carroll refuse to comply in any way to the below December 5, 2020 request - no response whatsoever. Please determine in writing that one or more records or parts thereof not disclosed are public and order them disclosed.

Sincerely,
Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 105576-66847014@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:
https://accounts.muckrock.com/accounts/login/?next=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.muckrock.com%2Faccounts%2Flogin%2F%3Fnext%3D%253Fnext%253D%252Faccounts%252FAgency_login%252Fdepartment-of-emergency-management-8080%252Ftext-and-chat-messages-immediate-disclosure-request-san-francisco-universal-search-dem-105576%252F%253Femail%253Dsupervisor.records%2540sfcityatty.org&url_auth_token=AAAdJ9FV6yN5uNDURxRr0UgBs2U%3A%253A1kuFTm%3AFrhrOJhobn2sx7jZjto23QhriVc

Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 105576
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.

---
On Dec. 30, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (DEM)
Supervisor of Records Dennis Herrera,

The DEM and its department head Mary Ellen Carroll refuse to comply in any way to the below December 5, 2020 request - no response whatsoever. Please determine in writing that one or more records or parts thereof not disclosed are public and order them disclosed.

Sincerely,
Anonymous

On Dec. 5, 2020:
Subject: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (DEM)
To Department of Emergency Management and its Department Head or Elected Official:

** DO NOT DESTROY ANY RESPONSIVE RECORDS. YOU MUST PRESERVE AND ORDER YOUR EMPLOYEES TO PRESERVE RECORDS DURING THE PENDENCY OF ALL APPEALS. WE WILL APPEAL ALL REDACTIONS OR WITHHOLDINGS. **
Immediate Disclosure Request.

Every department head/elected official must preserve and maintain all correspondence in a professional and businesslike manner (SFAC 67.29-7(a)) and also separately must comply with retention policies (SFAC 67.29-1). Note that if your retention policies do not retain text messages, I will argue before the SOTF and court that this is a failure to maintain **all correspondence** in a professional and businesslike manner.

Relevant precedent: SOTF 19098 - Anonymous v SFPD. Unanimous finding of violation for unlawfully withholding text message metadata (including the to/from/et al. - note SFPD had provided the dates and times, and you must as well), and also for unlawfully printing and scanning electronic records which does not constitute a "copy" of an electronic record. See also prior rulings in my favor in SOTF 19044, 19047, 19091, 19098, 19103, and 19108 which ruled against the City for email, text messages, past and future calendar entries, meeting details, electronic metadata, and attachments.

The Mayor's Office appears to have destroyed their copies of certain text messages. I'd be happy to get them from her, if she preserved every record. Alas she did not, therefore we must now conduct a universal search of the City. You cannot refer me to another department unless you search and determine that you have no copies in your department. If this is causing more work for you, ask your Mayor to stop destroying her public records.

Note there are many anonymous requesters using MuckRock - I am just one of them. If you previously produced some subset of these records to a MuckRock email address, please reference that prior response so you do not duplicate work. If I am unable to get the prior MuckRock response because it is someone else's and they have marked it private, you will however need to provide me a copy here as well.

1. This is an immediate disclosure request for text, chat, or instant messages between the Department Head/Elected Official and either Sean Elsbernd, Andrea Bruss, London Breed, Harlan Kelly, Jr., Naomi Kelly, Hank Heckel, or Walter Wong, including all group messages, and all messages in threads, in any form and any app (including, but not limited to, SMS, MMS, text, iMessage, Teams, Discord, WeChat, QQ, Signal, Telegram, WhatsApp, Facebook, Facebook Messenger, Twitter, Instagram, Hangouts, Meet, Slack, Skype, Viber, Snapchat, Line, Kik, FaceTime, Wickr Me, Chatroulette, Threema, KakaoTalk, Duo, GroupMe, Wire, Voxel, Allo, Tango, Bumble, Grindr, Tinder, Olive, Taimi, but NOT including email), on any government accounts/devices or on personal accounts or devices regarding the conduct of public business, including all participant names, message text, images, attachments, dates, and times, including any in trash or deleted folders or similar (see Good Government Guide - if the records have not been permanently deleted as of the
time you receive this request, you must retrieve them from the so-called trash folders and provide them). Provide rolling responses. Provide exact copies including all metadata. There is no limitation by subject or date. If the total pages to produce numbers over 500, inform me of the rough dates, employees involved, and subject matter, and I may be willing to narrow the initial production, AS LONG AS YOU PRESERVE ALL THE RECORDS.

2. This is a regular records request for text, chat, or instant messages between any non-department head/elected official (i.e. the other dept employees) and either Sean Elsbernd, Andrea Bruss, London Breed, Harlan Kelly, Jr., Naomi Kelly, Hank Heckel, or Walter Wong, including all group messages, and all messages in threads, in any form and any app (including, but not limited to, SMS, MMS, text, iMessage, Teams, Discord, WeChat, QQ, Signal, Telegram, WhatsApp, Facebook, Facebook Messenger, Twitter, Instagram, Hangouts, Meet, Slack, Skype, Viber, Snapchat, Line, Kik, FaceTime, Wickr Me, Chatroulette, Threema, KakaoTalk, Duo, GroupMe, Wire, Voxer, Allo, Tango, Bumble, Grindr, Tinder, Olive, Taimi, but NOT including email), on any government accounts/devices or on personal accounts or devices regarding the conduct of public business, including all participant names, message text, images, attachments, dates, and times, including any in trash or deleted folders or similar (see Good Government Guide - if the records have not been permanently deleted as of the time you receive this request, you must retrieve them from the so-called trash folders and provide them). Provide rolling responses. Provide exact copies including all metadata. There is no limitation by subject or date. If the total pages to produce numbers over 500, inform me of the rough dates, employees involved, and subject matter, and I may be willing to narrow the initial production, AS LONG AS YOU PRESERVE ALL THE RECORDS.

Please provide only those copies of records available without any fees. If you determine certain records would require fees, please instead provide the required notice of which of those records are available and non-exempt for inspection in-person if we so choose.

Your non-exhaustive obligations:
- All withholding of any information must be justified in writing by specific statutory authority (SFAC 67.27).
- Every redaction must be keyed by footnote or by other clear reference to the specific justification for that redaction, and only the minimal exempt portion of any record may be withheld (SFAC 67.26).
- You must respond to emailed requests (SFAC 67.21(b)).
- You must notify us of whether or not responsive records exist and/or were withheld for each above request (Gov Code 6253(c), 6255(b)).
- You must state the name and title of each person responsible for withholding any information (Gov Code 6253(d)).
- Do not impose any end-user restrictions upon me (Santa Clara Co. vs Superior Ct, 170 Cal.App 4th 1301); so if you use a third-party website to publish records, please make them completely public without any login or sign-in.

Your agency must do all of the above things in your response, and you cannot wait until we file complaints.

****** We have no duty to, and we will not again, remind the City of its obligations. Instead, we will file complaints for every Sunshine Ordinance or CPRA violation. We will continue to file complaints until the City's procedures are modified to fully comply with the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA, without caveat or exception. ******

I look forward to your lawful response.

NOTE: THE EMAIL ADDRESS SENDING THIS REQUEST IS A PUBLICLY-VIEWABLE MAILBOX. Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.
Sincerely,

Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 105576-66847014@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:
%3Fnext%3D%252Faccounts%252Fagency_login%252Fdepartment-of-emergency-management-8080%252Ftext-and-
chat-messages-immediate-disclosure-request-san-francisco-universal-search-dem-105576%252F%253Femail%253Dsupervisor.records%252F252540sfcityatty.org&url_auth_token=AAAdJ9FV6yN5uNDURxRr0
UgBs2U%3A1kuFTm%3AFrhrOJhobn2sx7jIzto23QhriVc
Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 105576
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.
To Whom It May Concern –

We understand that the Department of Public Health produced the records in its possession responsive to your request dated December 5, 2020 on January 27, 2021 and May 6, 2021. With regard to your request dated December 8, 2020, the department confirmed on January 12, 2021, that it had no responsive records. Accordingly, we believe the department has addressed the concern raised in your petition and consider it closed. Thank you.

Bradley Russi  
Deputy City Attorney  
Office of City Attorney David Chiu  
City Hall, Room 234  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., San Francisco, CA 94102  
www.sfcityattorney.org

Department of Public Health  
PRA Office  
Room 302  
101 Grove Street  
San Francisco, CA 94102

January 4, 2021

This is a follow up to a previous request:

Supervisor of Records Dennis Herrera:

67.21(d) petition:  
DPH, Grant Colfax, and Tomas Aragon refuse to comply with requests for public records from this email address from Dec 5-8, 2020.  
Please determine in writing that one or more records or parts thereof not disclosed are public and order them disclosed.
On Dec. 8, 2020:

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (DPH)

TOMAS ARAGON:

You remain a city employee as of this email. This is a NEW Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA request.

** DO NOT DESTROY ANY RESPONSIVE RECORDS. YOU MUST PRESERVE AND ORDER YOUR EMPLOYEES TO PRESERVE RECORDS DURING THE PENDENCY OF ALL APPEALS. WE WILL APPEAL ALL REDATIONS OR WITHHOLDINGS. **

Immediate Disclosure Request.

4. This is an immediate disclosure request for text, chat, or instant messages between TOMAS ARAGON and either Gov. NEWSOM, Sean Elsbernd, Andrea Bruss, London Breed, Harlan Kelly, Jr., Naomi Kelly, Hank Heckel, or Walter Wong, including all group messages, and all messages in threads, in any form and any app (including, but not limited to, SMS, MMS, text, iMessage, Teams, Discord, WeChat, QQ, Signal, Telegram, WhatsApp, Facebook, Facebook Messenger, Twitter, Instagram, Hangouts, Meet, Slack, Skype, Viber, Snapchat, Line, Kik, FaceTime, Wickr Me, Chatroulette, Threema, KakaoTalk, Duo, GroupMe, Wire, Voozer, Allo, Tango, Bumble, Grindr, Tinder, Olive, Taimi, but NOT including email), on any government accounts/devices or on personal accounts or devices regarding the conduct of public business, including all participant names, message text, images, attachments, dates, and times, including any in trash or deleted folders or similar (see Good Government Guide - if the records have not been permanently deleted as of the time you receive this request, you must retrieve them from the so-called trash folders and provide them). Provide rolling responses. Provide exact copies including all metadata. There is no limitation by subject or date. If the total pages to produce numbers over 500, inform me of the rough dates, employees involved, and subject matter, and I may be willing to narrow the initial production, AS LONG AS YOU PRESERVE ALL THE RECORDS.

Please provide only those copies of records available without any fees. If you determine certain records would require fees, please instead provide the required notice of which of those records are available and non-exempt for inspection in-person if we so choose.
Note there are many anonymous requesters using MuckRock - I am just one of them. If you previously produced some subset of these records to a MuckRock email address, please reference that prior response so you do not duplicate work. If I am unable to get the prior MuckRock response because it is someone else's and they have marked it private, you will however need to provide me a copy here as well.

Your non-exhaustive obligations:
- All withholding of any information must be justified in writing by specific statutory authority (SFAC 67.27).
- Every redaction must be keyed by footnote or by other clear reference to the specific justification for that redaction, and only the minimal exempt portion of any record may be withheld (SFAC 67.26).
- You must respond to emailed requests (SFAC 67.21(b)).
- You must notify us of whether or not responsive records exist and/or were withheld for each above request (Gov Code 6253(c), 6255(b)).
- You must state the name and title of each person responsible for withholding any information (Gov Code 6253(d)).
- Do not impose any end-user restrictions upon me (Santa Clara Co. vs Superior Ct, 170 Cal.App 4th 1301); so if you use a third-party website to publish records, please make them completely public without any login or sign-in.

Your agency must do all of the above things in your response, and you cannot wait until we file complaints.

****** We have no duty to, and we will not again, remind the City of its obligations. Instead, we will file complaints for every Sunshine Ordinance or CPRA violation. We will continue to file complaints until the City's procedures are modified to fully comply with the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA, without caveat or exception. ******

I look forward to your lawful response.

NOTE: THE EMAIL ADDRESS SENDING THIS REQUEST IS A PUBLICLY-VIEWABLE MAILBOX. Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

---

On Dec. 5, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (DPH)
To DPH and its Department Head or Elected Official:

** DO NOT DESTROY ANY RESPONSIVE RECORDS. YOU MUST PRESERVE AND ORDER YOUR EMPLOYEES TO PRESERVE RECORDS DURING THE PENDENCY OF ALL APPEALS. WE WILL APPEAL ALL REDACTIONS OR WITHHOLDINGS. **
Immediate Disclosure Request.

Every department head/elected official must preserve and maintain all correspondence in a professional and businesslike manner (SFAC 67.29-7(a)) and also separately must comply with retention policies (SFAC 67.29-1). Note that
if your retention policies do not retain text messages, I will argue before the SOTF and court that this is a failure to maintain **all correspondence** in a professional and businesslike manner.

Relevant precedent: SOTF 19098 - Anonymous v SFPD. Unanimous finding of violation for unlawfully withholding text message metadata (including the to/from/etc. - note SFPD had provided the dates and times, and you must as well), and also for unlawfully printing and scanning electronic records which does not constitute a "copy" of an electronic record. See also prior rulings in my favor in SOTF 19044, 19047, 19091, 19098, 19103, and 19108 which ruled against the City for email, text messages, past and future calendar entries, meeting details, electronic metadata, and attachments.

The Mayor's Office appears to have destroyed their copies of certain text messages. I'd be happy to get them from her, if she preserved every record. Alas she did not, therefore we must now conduct a universal search of the City. You cannot refer me to another department unless you search and determine that you have no copies in your department. If this is causing more work for you, ask your Mayor to stop destroying her public records.

Note there are many anonymous requesters using MuckRock - I am just one of them. If you previously produced some subset of these records to a MuckRock email address, please reference that prior response so you do not duplicate work. If I am unable to get the prior MuckRock response because it is someone else's and they have marked it private, you will however need to provide me a copy here as well.

1. This is an immediate disclosure request for text, chat, or instant messages between the Department Head/Elected Official and either Sean Elsbernd, Andrea Bruss, London Breed, Harlan Kelly, Jr., Naomi Kelly, Hank Heckel, or Walter Wong, including all group messages, and all messages in threads, in any form and any app (including, but not limited to, SMS, MMS, text, iMessage, Teams, Discord, WeChat, QQ, Signal, Telegram, WhatsApp, Facebook, Facebook Messenger, Twitter, Instagram, Hangouts, Meet, Slack, Skype, Viber, Snapchat, Line, Kik, FaceTime, Wickr Me, Chatroulette, Threema, KakaoTalk, Duo, GroupMe, Wire, Voxer, Allo, Tango, Bumble, Grindr, Tinder, Olive, Taimi, but NOT including email), on any government accounts/devices or on personal accounts or devices regarding the conduct of public business, including all participant names, message text, images, attachments, dates, and times, including any in trash or deleted folders or similar (see Good Government Guide - if the records have not been permanently deleted as of the time you receive this request, you must retrieve them from the so-called trash folders and provide them). Provide rolling responses. Provide exact copies including all metadata. There is no limitation by subject or date. If the total pages to produce numbers over 500, inform me of the rough dates, employees involved, and subject matter, and I may be willing to narrow the initial production, AS LONG AS YOU PRESERVE ALL THE RECORDS.

2. This is a regular records request for text, chat, or instant messages between any non-department head/elected official (i.e. the other dept employees) and either Sean Elsbernd, Andrea Bruss, London Breed, Harlan Kelly, Jr., Naomi Kelly, Hank Heckel, or Walter Wong, including all group messages, and all messages in threads, in any form and any app (including, but not limited to, SMS, MMS, text, iMessage, Teams, Discord, WeChat, QQ, Signal, Telegram, WhatsApp, Facebook, Facebook Messenger, Twitter, Instagram, Hangouts, Meet, Slack, Skype, Viber, Snapchat, Line, Kik, FaceTime, Wickr Me, Chatroulette, Threema, KakaoTalk, Duo, GroupMe, Wire, Voxer, Allo, Tango, Bumble, Grindr, Tinder, Olive, Taimi, but NOT including email), on any government accounts/devices or on personal accounts or devices regarding the conduct of public business, including all participant names, message text, images, attachments, dates, and times, including any in trash or deleted folders or similar (see Good Government Guide - if the records have not been permanently deleted as of the time you receive this request, you must retrieve them from the so-called trash folders and provide them). Provide rolling responses. Provide exact copies including all metadata. There is no limitation by subject or date. If the total pages to produce numbers over 500, inform me of the rough dates, employees involved, and subject matter, and I may be willing to narrow the initial production, AS LONG AS YOU PRESERVE ALL THE RECORDS.

Please provide only those copies of records available without any fees. If you determine certain records would require fees, please instead provide the required notice of which of those records are available and non-exempt for inspection in-person if we so choose.
Your non-exhaustive obligations:
- All withholding of any information must be justified in writing by specific statutory authority (SFAC 67.27).
- Every redaction must be keyed by footnote or by other clear reference to the specific justification for that redaction, and only the minimal exempt portion of any record may be withheld (SFAC 67.26).
- You must respond to emailed requests (SFAC 67.21(b)).
- You must notify us of whether or not responsive records exist and/or were withheld for each above request (Gov Code 6253(c), 6255(b)).
- You must state the name and title of each person responsible for withholding any information (Gov Code 6253(d)).
- Do not impose any end-user restrictions upon me (Santa Clara Co. vs Superior Ct, 170 Cal.App 4th 1301); so if you use a third-party website to publish records, please make them completely public without any login or sign-in.

Your agency must do all of the above things in your response, and you cannot wait until we file complaints.

****** We have no duty to, and we will not again, remind the City of its obligations. Instead, we will file complaints for every Sunshine Ordinance or CPRA violation. We will continue to file complaints until the City's procedures are modified to fully comply with the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA, without caveat or exception. ******

I look forward to your lawful response.

NOTE: THE EMAIL ADDRESS SENDING THIS REQUEST IS A PUBLICLY-VIEWABLE MAILBOX. Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

---

On Dec. 5, 2020:
Subject: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (DPH)
To Department of Public Health and its Department Head or Elected Official:

** DO NOT DESTROY ANY RESPONSIVE RECORDS. YOU MUST PRESERVE AND ORDER YOUR EMPLOYEES TO PRESERVE RECORDS DURING THE PENDENCY OF ALL APPEALS. WE WILL APPEAL ALL REDACTIONS OR WITHHOLDINGS. **
Immediate Disclosure Request.

Every department head/elected official must preserve and maintain all correspondence in a professional and businesslike manner (SFAC 67.29-7(a)) and also separately must comply with retention policies (SFAC 67.29-1). Note that if your retention policies do not retain text messages, I will argue before the SOTF and court that this is a failure to maintain **all correspondence** in a professional and businesslike manner.

Relevant precedent: SOTF 19098 - Anonymous v SFPD. Unanimous finding of violation for unlawfully withholding text message metadata (including the to/from/etc. - note SFPD had provided the dates and times, and you must as well), and also for unlawfully printing and scanning electronic records which does not constitute a "copy" of an electronic record.
See also prior rulings in my favor in SOTF 19044, 19047, 19091, 19098, 19103, and 19108 which ruled against the City for email, text messages, past and future calendar entries, meeting details, electronic metadata, and attachments.

The Mayor’s Office appears to have destroyed their copies of certain text messages. I’d be happy to get them from her, if she preserved every record. Alas she did not, therefore we must now conduct a universal search of the City. You cannot refer me to another department unless you search and determine that you have no copies in your department. If this is causing more work for you, ask your Mayor to stop destroying her public records.

Note there are many anonymous requesters using MuckRock - I am just one of them. If you previously produced some subset of these records to a MuckRock email address, please reference that prior response so you do not duplicate work. If I am unable to get the prior MuckRock response because it is someone else's and they have marked it private, you will however need to provide me a copy here as well.

1. This is an immediate disclosure request for text, chat, or instant messages between Grant Colfax and either Sean Elsbernd, Andrea Bruss, London Breed, Harlan Kelly, Jr., Naomi Kelly, Hank Heckel, or Walter Wong, including all group messages, and all messages in threads, in any form and any app (including, but not limited to, SMS, MMS, text, iMessage, Teams, Discord, WeChat, QQ, Signal, Telegram, WhatsApp, Facebook, Facebook Messenger, Twitter, Instagram, Hangouts, Meet, Slack, Skype, Viber, Snapchat, Line, Kik, FaceTime, Wickr Me, Chatroulette, Threema, KakaoTalk, Duo, GroupMe, Wire, Voxer, Allo, Tango, Bumble, Grindr, Tinder, Olive, Taimi, but NOT including email), on any government accounts/devices or on personal accounts or devices regarding the conduct of public business, including all participant names, message text, images, attachments, dates, and times, including any in trash or deleted folders or similar (see Good Government Guide - if the records have not been permanently deleted as of the time you receive this request, you must retrieve them from the so-called trash folders and provide them). Provide rolling responses. Provide exact copies including all metadata. There is no limitation by subject or date. If the total pages to produce numbers over 500, inform me of the rough dates, employees involved, and subject matter, and I may be willing to narrow the initial production, AS LONG AS YOU PRESERVE ALL THE RECORDS.

2. This is an immediate disclosure request for text, chat, or instant messages between Tomas Aragon and either Sean Elsbernd, Andrea Bruss, London Breed, Harlan Kelly, Jr., Naomi Kelly, Hank Heckel, or Walter Wong, including all group messages, and all messages in threads, in any form and any app (including, but not limited to, SMS, MMS, text, iMessage, Teams, Discord, WeChat, QQ, Signal, Telegram, WhatsApp, Facebook, Facebook Messenger, Twitter, Instagram, Hangouts, Meet, Slack, Skype, Viber, Snapchat, Line, Kik, FaceTime, Wickr Me, Chatroulette, Threema, KakaoTalk, Duo, GroupMe, Wire, Voxer, Allo, Tango, Bumble, Grindr, Tinder, Olive, Taimi, but NOT including email), on any government accounts/devices or on personal accounts or devices regarding the conduct of public business, including all participant names, message text, images, attachments, dates, and times, including any in trash or deleted folders or similar (see Good Government Guide - if the records have not been permanently deleted as of the time you receive this request, you must retrieve them from the so-called trash folders and provide them). Provide rolling responses. Provide exact copies including all metadata. There is no limitation by subject or date. If the total pages to produce numbers over 500, inform me of the rough dates, employees involved, and subject matter, and I may be willing to narrow the initial production, AS LONG AS YOU PRESERVE ALL THE RECORDS.

3. This is a regular records request for text, chat, or instant messages between the other dept employees (not Colfax or Aragon) and either Sean Elsbernd, Andrea Bruss, London Breed, Harlan Kelly, Jr., Naomi Kelly, Hank Heckel, or Walter Wong, including all group messages, and all messages in threads, in any form and any app (including, but not limited to, SMS, MMS, text, iMessage, Teams, Discord, WeChat, QQ, Signal, Telegram, WhatsApp, Facebook, Facebook Messenger, Twitter, Instagram, Hangouts, Meet, Slack, Skype, Viber, Snapchat, Line, Kik, FaceTime, Wickr Me, Chatroulette, Threema, KakaoTalk, Duo, GroupMe, Wire, Voxer, Allo, Tango, Bumble, Grindr, Tinder, Olive, Taimi, but NOT including email), on any government accounts/devices or on personal accounts or devices regarding the conduct of public business, including all participant names, message text, images, attachments, dates, and times, including any in trash or deleted folders or similar (see Good Government Guide - if the records have not been permanently deleted as of the time you receive this request, you must retrieve them from the so-called trash folders and provide them). Provide rolling responses. Provide exact copies including all metadata. There is no limitation by subject or date. If the total pages to
produce numbers over 500, inform me of the rough dates, employees involved, and subject matter, and I may be willing to narrow the initial production, AS LONG AS YOU PRESERVE ALL THE RECORDS.

Please provide only those copies of records available without any fees. If you determine certain records would require fees, please instead provide the required notice of which of those records are available and non-exempt for inspection in-person if we so choose.

Your non-exhaustive obligations:
- All withholding of any information must be justified in writing by specific statutory authority (SFAC 67.27).
- Every redaction must be keyed by footnote or by other clear reference to the specific justification for that redaction, and only the minimal exempt portion of any record may be withheld (SFAC 67.26).
- You must respond to emailed requests (SFAC 67.21(b)).
- You must notify us of whether or not responsive records exist and/or were withheld for each above request (Gov Code 6253(c), 6255(b)).
- You must state the name and title of each person responsible for withholding any information (Gov Code 6253(d)).
- Do not impose any end-user restrictions upon me (Santa Clara Co. vs Superior Ct, 170 Cal.App 4th 1301); so if you use a third-party website to publish records, please make them completely public without any login or sign-in.

Your agency must do all of the above things in your response, and you cannot wait until we file complaints.

****** We have no duty to, and we will not again, remind the City of its obligations. Instead, we will file complaints for every Sunshine Ordinance or CPRA violation. We will continue to file complaints until the City's procedures are modified to fully comply with the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA, without caveat or exception. ******

I look forward to your lawful response.

NOTE: THE EMAIL ADDRESS SENDING THIS REQUEST IS A PUBLICLY-VIEWABLE MAILBOX. Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 105584-70579615@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:
Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 105584
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.
Buta, Odaya (CAT)

From: 105584-70579615@requests.muckrock.com
Sent: Monday, January 4, 2021 1:00 PM
To: Supervisor Records (CAT)
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (DPH)

Department of Public Health
PRA Office
Room 302
101 Grove Street
San Francisco, CA 94102

January 4, 2021

This is a follow up to a previous request:

Supervisor of Records Dennis Herrera:

67.21(d) petition:
DPH, Grant Colfax, and Tomas Aragon refuse to comply with requests for public records from this email address from Dec 5-8, 2020.
Please determine in writing that one or more records or parts thereof not disclosed are public and order them disclosed.

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 105584-70579615@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:
%3Fnext%3D%2Faccounts%2Fagency_login%2Fdepartment-of-public-health-4836%2Ftext-and-chat-messages-
immediate-disclosure-request-san-francisco-universal-search-dph-
105584%2F252Femail%253Dsupervisor.records%2540sfcityatty.org&url_auth_token=AAAe_VQf-k0KzR9XR24yQKwiCpl%3A1kwWxF%3AnmzKapLluWlb40e2fyql7DVXsYg
Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 105584
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester’s name rather than “MuckRock News” and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.

---
On Dec. 8, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (DPH)

TOMAS ARAGON:

You remain a city employee as of this email. This is a NEW Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA request.

** DO NOT DESTROY ANY RESPONSIVE RECORDS. YOU MUST PRESERVE AND ORDER YOUR EMPLOYEES TO PRESERVE RECORDS DURING THE PENDENCY OF ALL APPEALS. WE WILL APPEAL ALL REDACTIONS OR WITHHOLDINGS. **

Immediate Disclosure Request.

4. This is an immediate disclosure request for text, chat, or instant messages between TOMAS ARAGON and either Gov. NEWSOM, Sean Elsbernd, Andrea Bruss, London Breed, Harlan Kelly, Jr., Naomi Kelly, Hank Heckel, or Walter Wong, including all group messages, and all messages in threads, in any form and any app (including, but not limited to, SMS, MMS, text, iMessage, Teams, Discord, WeChat, QQ, Signal, Telegram, WhatsApp, Facebook, Facebook Messenger, Twitter, Instagram, Hangouts, Meet, Slack, Skype, Viber, Snapchat, Line, Kik, FaceTime, Wickr Me, Chatroulette, Threema, KakaoTalk, Duo, GroupMe, Wire, Voxer, Allo, Tango, Bumble, Grindr, Tinder, Olive, Taimi, but NOT including email), on any government accounts/devices or on personal accounts or devices regarding the conduct of public business, including all participant names, message text, images, attachments, dates, and times, including any in trash or deleted folders or similar (see Good Government Guide - if the records have not been permanently deleted as of the time you receive this request, you must retrieve them from the so-called trash folders and provide them). Provide rolling responses. Provide exact copies including all metadata. There is no limitation by subject or date. If the total pages to produce numbers over 500, inform me of the rough dates, employees involved, and subject matter, and I may be willing to narrow the initial production, AS LONG AS YOU PRESERVE ALL THE RECORDS.

Please provide only those copies of records available without any fees. If you determine certain records would require fees, please instead provide the required notice of which of those records are available and non-exempt for inspection in-person if we so choose.

Note there are many anonymous requesters using MuckRock - I am just one of them. If you previously produced some subset of these records to a MuckRock email address, please reference that prior response so you do not duplicate work. If I am unable to get the prior MuckRock response because it is someone else's and they have marked it private, you will however need to provide me a copy here as well.

Your non-exhaustive obligations:
- All withholding of any information must be justified in writing by specific statutory authority (SFAC 67.27).
- Every redaction must be keyed by footnote or by other clear reference to the specific justification for that redaction, and only the minimal exempt portion of any record may be withheld (SFAC 67.26).
- You must respond to emailed requests (SFAC 67.21(b)).
- You must notify us of whether or not responsive records exist and/or were withheld for each above request (Gov Code 6253(c), 6255(b)).
- You must state the name and title of each person responsible for withholding any information (Gov Code 6253(d)).
- Do not impose any end-user restrictions upon me (Santa Clara Co. vs Superior Ct, 170 Cal.App 4th 1301); so if you use a third-party website to publish records, please make them completely public without any login or sign-in.

Your agency must do all of the above things in your response, and you cannot wait until we file complaints.

****** We have no duty to, and we will not again, remind the City of its obligations. Instead, we will file complaints for every Sunshine Ordinance or CPRA violation. We will continue to file complaints until the City's procedures are modified to fully comply with the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA, without caveat or exception. ******

I look forward to your lawful response.
NOTE: THE EMAIL ADDRESS SENDING THIS REQUEST IS A PUBLICLY-VIEWABLE MAILBOX. Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

---

On Dec. 5, 2020:

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (DPH)

To DPH and its Department Head or Elected Official:

** DO NOT DESTROY ANY RESPONSIVE RECORDS. YOU MUST PRESERVE AND ORDER YOUR EMPLOYEES TO PRESERVE RECORDS DURING THE PENDENCY OF ALL APPEALS. WE WILL APPEAL ALL REDACTIONS OR WITHHOLDINGS. **

Immediate Disclosure Request.

Every department head/elected official must preserve and maintain all correspondence in a professional and businesslike manner (SFAC 67.29-7(a)) and also separately must comply with retention policies (SFAC 67.29-1). Note that if your retention policies do not retain text messages, I will argue before the SOTF and court that this is a failure to maintain **all correspondence** in a professional and businesslike manner.

Relevant precedent: SOTF 19098 - Anonymous v SFPD. Unanimous finding of violation for unlawfully withholding text message metadata (including the to/from/etc. - note SFPD had provided the dates and times, and you must as well), and also for unlawfully printing and scanning electronic records which does not constitute a "copy" of an electronic record. See also prior rulings in my favor in SOTF 19044, 19047, 19091, 19098, 19103, and 19108 which ruled against the City for email, text messages, past and future calendar entries, meeting details, electronic metadata, and attachments.

The Mayor's Office appears to have destroyed their copies of certain text messages. I'd be happy to get them from her, if she preserved every record. Alas she did not, therefore we must now conduct a universal search of the City. You cannot refer me to another department unless you search and determine that you have no copies in your department. If this is causing more work for you, ask your Mayor to stop destroying her public records.

Note there are many anonymous requesters using MuckRock - I am just one of them. If you previously produced some subset of these records to a MuckRock email address, please reference that prior response so you do not duplicate work. If I am unable to get the prior MuckRock response because it is someone else's and they have marked it private, you will however need to provide me a copy here as well.

1. This is an immediate disclosure request for text, chat, or instant messages between the Department Head/Elected Official and either Sean Elsbernd, Andrea Bruss, London Breed, Harlan Kelly, Jr., Naomi Kelly, Hank Heckel, or Walter Wong, including all group messages, and all messages in threads, in any form and any app (including, but not limited to, SMS, MMS, text, iMessage, Teams, Discord, WeChat, QQ, Signal, Telegram, WhatsApp, Facebook, Facebook Messenger, Twitter, Instagram, Hangouts, Meet, Slack, Skype, Viber, Snapchat, Line, Kik, FaceTime, Wickr Me, Chatroulette, Threema, KakaoTalk, Duo, GroupMe, Wire, Voxer, Allo, Tango, Bumble, Grindr, Tinder, Olive, Taimi, but NOT including
email), on any government accounts/devices or on personal accounts or devices regarding the conduct of public business, including all participant names, message text, images, attachments, dates, and times, including any in trash or deleted folders or similar (see Good Government Guide - if the records have not been permanently deleted as of the time you receive this request, you must retrieve them from the so-called trash folders and provide them). Provide rolling responses. Provide exact copies including all metadata. There is no limitation by subject or date. If the total pages to produce numbers over 500, inform me of the rough dates, employees involved, and subject matter, and I may be willing to narrow the initial production, AS LONG AS YOU PRESERVE ALL THE RECORDS.

2. This is a regular records request for text, chat, or instant messages between any non-department head/elected official (i.e. the other dept employees) and either Sean Elsbernd, Andrea Bruss, London Breed, Harlan Kelly, Jr., Naomi Kelly, Hank Heckel, or Walter Wong, including all group messages, and all messages in threads, in any form and any app (including, but not limited to, SMS, MMS, text, iMessage, Teams, Discord, WeChat, QQ, Signal, Telegram, WhatsApp, Facebook, Facebook Messenger, Twitter, Instagram, Hangouts, Meet, Slack, Skype, Viber, Snapchat, Line, Kik, FaceTime, Wickr Me, Chatroulette, Threema, KakaoTalk, Duo, GroupMe, Wire, Voxer, Allo, Tango, Bumble, Grindr, Tinder, Olive, Taimi, but NOT including email), on any government accounts/devices or on personal accounts or devices regarding the conduct of public business, including all participant names, message text, images, attachments, dates, and times, including any in trash or deleted folders or similar (see Good Government Guide - if the records have not been permanently deleted as of the time you receive this request, you must retrieve them from the so-called trash folders and provide them). Provide rolling responses. Provide exact copies including all metadata. There is no limitation by subject or date. If the total pages to produce numbers over 500, inform me of the rough dates, employees involved, and subject matter, and I may be willing to narrow the initial production, AS LONG AS YOU PRESERVE ALL THE RECORDS.

Please provide only those copies of records available without any fees. If you determine certain records would require fees, please instead provide the required notice of which of those records are available and non-exempt for inspection in-person if we so choose.

Your non-exhaustive obligations:
- All withholding of any information must be justified in writing by specific statutory authority (SFAC 67.27).
- Every redaction must be keyed by footnote or by other clear reference to the specific justification for that redaction, and only the minimal exempt portion of any record may be withheld (SFAC 67.26).
- You must respond to emailed requests (SFAC 67.21(b)).
- You must notify us of whether or not responsive records exist and/or were withheld for each above request (Gov Code 6253(c), 6255(b)).
- You must state the name and title of each person responsible for withholding any information (Gov Code 6253(d)).
- Do not impose any end-user restrictions upon me (Santa Clara Co. vs Superior Ct, 170 Cal.App 4th 1301); so if you use a third-party website to publish records, please make them completely public without any login or sign-in.

Your agency must do all of the above things in your response, and you cannot wait until we file complaints.

****** We have no duty to, and we will not again, remind the City of its obligations. Instead, we will file complaints for every Sunshine Ordinance or CPRA violation. We will continue to file complaints until the City’s procedures are modified to fully comply with the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA, without caveat or exception. ******

I look forward to your lawful response.

NOTE: THE EMAIL ADDRESS SENDING THIS REQUEST IS A PUBLICLY-VIEWABLE MAILBOX. Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this
email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

---

On Dec. 5, 2020:
Subject: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (DPH)
To Department of Public Health and its Department Head or Elected Official:

** DO NOT DESTROY ANY RESPONSIVE RECORDS. YOU MUST PRESERVE AND ORDER YOUR EMPLOYEES TO PRESERVE RECORDS DURING THE PENDENCY OF ALL APPEALS. WE WILL APPEAL ALL REDACTIONS OR WITHHOLDINGS. **

Immediate Disclosure Request.

Every department head/elected official must preserve and maintain all correspondence in a professional and businesslike manner (SFAC 67.29-7(a)) and also separately must comply with retention policies (SFAC 67.29-1). Note that if your retention policies do not retain text messages, I will argue before the SOTF and court that this is a failure to maintain **all correspondence** in a professional and businesslike manner.

Relevant precedent: SOTF 19098 - Anonymous v SFPD. Unanimous finding of violation for unlawfully withholding text message metadata (including the to/from/etc. - note SFPD had provided the dates and times, and you must as well), and also for unlawfully printing and scanning electronic records which does not constitute a "copy" of an electronic record. See also prior rulings in my favor in SOTF 19044, 19047, 19091, 19098, 19103, and 19108 which ruled against the City for email, text messages, past and future calendar entries, meeting details, electronic metadata, and attachments.

The Mayor's Office appears to have destroyed their copies of certain text messages. I'd be happy to get them from her, if she preserved every record. Alas she did not, therefore we must now conduct a universal search of the City. You cannot refer me to another department unless you search and determine that you have no copies in your department. If this is causing more work for you, ask your Mayor to stop destroying her public records.

Note there are many anonymous requesters using MuckRock - I am just one of them. If you previously produced some subset of these records to a MuckRock email address, please reference that prior response so you do not duplicate work. If I am unable to get the prior MuckRock response because it is someone else's and they have marked it private, you will however need to provide me a copy here as well.

1. This is an immediate disclosure request for text, chat, or instant messages between Grant Colfax and either Sean Elsbernd, Andrea Bruss, London Breed, Harlan Kelly, Jr., Naomi Kelly, Hank Heckel, or Walter Wong, including all group messages, and all messages in threads, in any form and any app (including, but not limited to, SMS, MMS, text, iMessage, Teams, Discord, WeChat, QQ, Signal, Telegram, WhatsApp, Facebook, Facebook Messenger, Twitter, Instagram, Hangouts, Meet, Slack, Skype, Viber, Snapchat, Line, Kik, FaceTime, Wickr Me, Chatroulette, Threema, KakaoTalk, Duo, GroupMe, Wire, Voxer, Allo, Tango, Bumble, Grindr, Tinder, Olive, Taimi, but NOT including email), on any government accounts/devices or on personal accounts or devices regarding the conduct of public business, including all participant names, message text, images, attachments, dates, and times, including any in trash or deleted folders or similar (see Good Government Guide - if the records have not been permanently deleted as of the time you receive this request, you must retrieve them from the so-called trash folders and provide them). Provide rolling responses. Provide exact copies including all metadata. There is no limitation by subject or date. If the total pages to produce numbers over 500, inform me of the rough dates, employees involved, and subject matter, and I may be willing to narrow the initial production, AS LONG AS YOU PRESERVE ALL THE RECORDS.
2. This is an immediate disclosure request for text, chat, or instant messages between Tomas Aragon and either Sean Elsbernd, Andrea Bruss, London Breed, Harlan Kelly, Jr., Naomi Kelly, Hank Heckel, or Walter Wong, including all group messages, and all messages in threads, in any form and any app (including, but not limited to, SMS, MMS, text, iMessage, Teams, Discord, WeChat, QQ, Signal, Telegram, WhatsApp, Facebook, Facebook Messenger, Twitter, Instagram, Hangouts, Meet, Slack, Skype, Viber, Snapchat, Line, Kik, FaceTime, Wickr Me, Chatroulette, Threema, KakaoTalk, Duo, GroupMe, Wire, Voxer, Allo, Tango, Bumble, Grindr, Tinder, Olive, Taimi, but NOT including email), on any government accounts/devices or on personal accounts or devices regarding the conduct of public business, including all participant names, message text, images, attachments, dates, and times, including any in trash or deleted folders or similar (see Good Government Guide - if the records have not been permanently deleted as of the time you receive this request, you must retrieve them from the so-called trash folders and provide them). Provide rolling responses. Provide exact copies including all metadata. There is no limitation by subject or date. If the total pages to produce numbers over 500, inform me of the rough dates, employees involved, and subject matter, and I may be willing to narrow the initial production, AS LONG AS YOU PRESERVE ALL THE RECORDS.

3. This is a regular records request for text, chat, or instant messages between the other dept employees (not Colfax or Aragon) and either Sean Elsbernd, Andrea Bruss, London Breed, Harlan Kelly, Jr., Naomi Kelly, Hank Heckel, or Walter Wong, including all group messages, and all messages in threads, in any form and any app (including, but not limited to, SMS, MMS, text, iMessage, Teams, Discord, WeChat, QQ, Signal, Telegram, WhatsApp, Facebook, Facebook Messenger, Twitter, Instagram, Hangouts, Meet, Slack, Skype, Viber, Snapchat, Line, Kik, FaceTime, Wickr Me, Chatroulette, Threema, KakaoTalk, Duo, GroupMe, Wire, Voxer, Allo, Tango, Bumble, Grindr, Tinder, Olive, Taimi, but NOT including email), on any government accounts/devices or on personal accounts or devices regarding the conduct of public business, including all participant names, message text, images, attachments, dates, and times, including any in trash or deleted folders or similar (see Good Government Guide - if the records have not been permanently deleted as of the time you receive this request, you must retrieve them from the so-called trash folders and provide them). Provide rolling responses. Provide exact copies including all metadata. There is no limitation by subject or date. If the total pages to produce numbers over 500, inform me of the rough dates, employees involved, and subject matter, and I may be willing to narrow the initial production, AS LONG AS YOU PRESERVE ALL THE RECORDS.

Please provide only those copies of records available without any fees. If you determine certain records would require fees, please instead provide the required notice of which of those records are available and non-exempt for inspection in-person if we so choose.

Your non-exhaustive obligations:
- All withholding of any information must be justified in writing by specific statutory authority (SFAC 67.27).
- Every redaction must be keyed by footnote or by other clear reference to the specific justification for that redaction, and only the minimal exempt portion of any record may be withheld (SFAC 67.26).
- You must respond to emailed requests (SFAC 67.21(b)).
- You must notify us of whether or not responsive records exist and/or were withheld for each above request (Gov Code 6253(c), 6255(b)).
- You must state the name and title of each person responsible for withholding any information (Gov Code 6253(d)).
- Do not impose any end-user restrictions upon me (Santa Clara Co. vs Superior Ct, 170 Cal.App 4th 1301); so if you use a third-party website to publish records, please make them completely public without any login or sign-in.

Your agency must do all of the above things in your response, and you cannot wait until we file complaints.

****** We have no duty to, and we will not again, remind the City of its obligations. Instead, we will file complaints for every Sunshine Ordinance or CPRA violation. We will continue to file complaints until the City's procedures are modified to fully comply with the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA, without caveat or exception. ******

I look forward to your lawful response.
NOTE: THE EMAIL ADDRESS SENDING THIS REQUEST IS A PUBLICLY-VIEWABLE MAILBOX. Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 105584-70579615@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly: https://accounts.muckrock.com/accounts/login/?next=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.muckrock.com%2Faccounts%2Flogin%2F%3Fnext%3D%253D%2Faccounts%252Fagency_login%252Fdepartment-of-public-health-4836%252Ftext-and-chat-messages-immediate-disclosure-request-san-francisco-universal-search-dph-105584%252F252Femail%25253Femail%25253Dsupervisor.records%252540sfcityatty.org&url_auth_token=AA Ae_VQf-k0KzR9XR24yQKwiCpl%3A1kwWxf%3AnmzKapLluWlb40e2fyqI7DVXsYg
Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 105584
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.
To Whom It May Concern –

We write in response to your petition below. The City Attorney’s Office provided a further response to your request on March 17, 2022, producing the records requested processed through the metadata redaction tool that the Department of Technology developed since you submitted your request and this petition. We conclude that the department properly redacted the records under Section 6254.19 of the Government Code and the official information privilege (Gov’t Code Sec. 6254(k); Evid. Code Sec. 1040) based on security concerns. Thank you.

Bradley Russi  
Deputy City Attorney  
Office of City Attorney David Chiu  
City Hall, Room 234  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., San Francisco, CA 94102  
www.sfcityattorney.org

From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, January 7, 2021 7:19 PM  
To: CityAttorney (CAT) <cityattorney@SFCITYATTY.ORG>; Supervisor Records (CAT) <supervisor.records@SFCITYATTY.ORG>  
Subject: RE: Jon Givner and John Cote Calendar Entry in Electronic Form of ICS - Immediate Disclosure Request

Ms. Coolbrith: I have no intent of making new requests subject to your whims about the somehow-changing nature of disclosability over time. If you change your mind, your office can go through all my complaints, provide the corrected records and apologize in writing for unlawfully withholding public information and then perhaps I'll withdraw them. Reality doesn't change because some lawyer changed their mind about what the law says.

Supervisor of Records: This is a 67.21(d) petition that one or more parts of the calendar records withheld under "Cal. Evid. Code section 1040 and Cal. Gov’t Code sections 6255 and 6254.19" are public and an order for their disclosure.

NOTE: Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the government all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,
Anonymous

------- Original Message -------

On Thursday, January 7th, 2021 at 3:17 PM, CityAttorney (CAT) <cityattorney@SFCITYATTY.ORG> wrote:
Dear anonymous,

Thanks for your request. We are attaching the calendar items you requested, with redactions on pages 1 and 3 under California Evidence Code section 1040, which provides an exception under state law for official information. This includes information acquired in confidence by a public employee in the course of his or her duties. In response to your request for the metadata for these calendar items, please note that we are declining to produce this metadata information at this time. To the extent that information is a public record, we are withholding it based on Cal. Evid. Code section 1040 and Cal. Gov’t Code sections 6255 and 6254.19. As we have explained, we are continuing to review these issues, and we will let you know if our analysis changes so that you have the option of submitting a follow-up request if desired.

Please send replies to cityattorney@sfcityatty.org

Best,

Elizabeth A. Coolbrith
Paralegal
Office of City Attorney Dennis Herrera

(415) 554-4685 Direct
www.sfcityattorney.org

From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 28, 2020 1:58 PM
To: Bedard, Meiling (CAT) <Meiling.Bedard@sfcityatty.org>; John Cote (Press Secretary, City Attorney, SF) <john.cote@sfgov.org>; Givner, Jon (CAT) <Jon.Givner@sfcityatty.org>; CityAttorney (CAT) <cityattorney@SFCITYATTY.ORG>
Subject: Fw: Jon Givner and John Cote Calendar Entry in Electronic Form of ICS - Immediate Disclosure Request

+Meiling Bedard per OOF

------- Original Message -------
On Monday, December 28th, 2020 at 1:47 PM, Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:

Jon Givner, John Cote, and Office of the City Attorney:

This is an immediate disclosure request for the single earliest non-attorney/client-privileged and non-work-product-privileged calendar entry occurring after October 1, 2020 5am in each of Givner’s and Cote’s Outlook calendar(s), each in the electronic form of an iCalendar or ICS file with minimal redactions and keys for the redactions. (if there are no responsive entries on Oct 1, you must continue on to the next day and so forth to find the single earliest
enter).

Here’s DT's example:
https://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/documents/6211042 - note how there are almost no redactions whatsoever.

Jon Givner and/or John Cote are believed to be managerial city employees. If either refuses to provide the requested information with minimum redactions, I will ask that the SOTF find that they have committed official misconduct for willful violation of the Sunshine Ordinance.

Messrs. Givner and Cote does not get the protection of the Ethics Commission afforded to Dennis Herrera as an elected official - the SOTF will decide instead. See SF Admin Code 67.34.

Please Note:
1) Metadata has been ruled by the SOTF to be public and disclosable, and it must be redacted with footnote or other clear reference. (See SOTF 19044, 19047, 19098, 19105).
2) Your office has already accepted the public/disclosable nature of metadata by providing some, but not all, of such data previously.
3) The iCalendar (ICS) format is "available" or "easily generated" (note, nothing is said about the ease of redaction, merely the ease of generation or availability). In fact, in SOTF 19047, an SOTF member demonstrated to the Mayor's Office, live during the hearing, in a few seconds how to generate .ICS files from their own Outlook calendar.
4) The Dept of Technology has provided minimally redacted ICS files of the Chief Information Security Officer's calendar, demonstrating that this is possible and does not pose a security risk: https://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/documents/6211042 (note how almost nothing is redacted)

NOTE: Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the government all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous
Ms. Coolbrith: I have no intent of making new requests subject to your whims about the somehow-changing nature of disclosability over time. If you change your mind, your office can go through all my complaints, provide the corrected records and apologize in writing for unlawfully withholding public information and then perhaps I'll withdraw them. Reality doesn't change because some lawyer changed their mind about what the law says.

Supervisor of Records: This is a 67.21(d) petition that one or more parts of the calendar records withheld under "Cal. Evid. Code section 1040 and Cal. Gov’t Code sections 6255 and 6254.19" are public and an order for their disclosure.

NOTE: Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the government all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

-------- Original Message --------
On Thursday, January 7th, 2021 at 3:17 PM, CityAttorney (CAT) <cityattorney@SFCITYATTY.ORG> wrote:

Dear anonymous,

Thanks for your request. We are attaching the calendar items you requested, with redactions on pages 1 and 3 under California Evidence Code section 1040, which provides an exception under state law for official information. This includes information acquired in confidence by a public employee in the course of his or her duties. In response to your request for the metadata for these calendar items, please note that we are declining to produce this metadata information at this time. To the extent that information is a public record, we are withholding it based on Cal. Evid. Code section 1040 and Cal. Gov’t Code sections 6255 and 6254.19. As we have explained, we are continuing to review these issues, and we will let you know if our analysis changes so that you have the option of submitting a
follow-up request if desired.

Please send replies to cityattorney@sfcityatty.org

Best,

Elizabeth A. Coolbrith
Paralegal
Office of City Attorney Dennis Herrera
(415) 554-4685 Direct
www.sfcityattorney.org

From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 28, 2020 1:58 PM
To: Bedard, Meiling (CAT) <Meiling.Bedard@sfcityatty.org>; John Cote (Press Secretary, City Attorney, SF) <john.cote@sfgov.org>; Givner, Jon (CAT) <Jon.Givner@sfcityatty.org>; CityAttorney (CAT) <cityattorney@SFCITYATTY.ORG>
Subject: Fw: Jon Givner and John Cote Calendar Entry in Electronic Form of ICS - Immediate Disclosure Request

+Meiling Bedard per OOF

------- Original Message -------
On Monday, December 28th, 2020 at 1:47 PM, Anonymous
<arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:

Jon Givner, John Cote, and Office of the City Attorney:

This is an immediate disclosure request for the single earliest non-atty/client-privileged and non-work-product-privileged calendar entry occurring after October 1, 2020 5am in each of Givner’s and Cote’s Outlook calendar(s), each in the electronic form of an iCalendar or ICS file with minimal redactions and keys for the redactions. (if there are no responsive entries on Oct 1, you must continue on to the next day and so forth to find the single earliest entry).

Here's DT's example: [https://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/documents/6211042](https://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/documents/6211042) - note how there are almost no redactions whatsoever.

Jon Givner and/or John Cote are believed to be managerial city employees. If either refuses to provide the requested information with minimum redactions, I will ask that the SOTF find that they have committed official misconduct for willful violation of the Sunshine Ordinance.

Messrs. Givner and Cote does not get the protection of the Ethics Commission afforded to Dennis Herrera as an elected official - the SOTF will decide instead. See SF Admin Code 67.34.

Please Note:
1) Metadata has been ruled by the SOTF to be public and disclosable, and it must be redacted with footnote or other clear reference. (See SOTF 19044, 19047, 19098, 19105).
2) Your office has already accepted the public/disclosable nature of metadata by providing some, but not all, of such data previously.
3) The iCalendar (ICS) format is "available" or "easily generated" (note, nothing is said about the ease of redaction, merely the ease of generation or availability). In fact, in SOTF 19047, an SOTF member demonstrated to the Mayor's Office, live during the hearing, in a few seconds how to generate .ICS files from their own
Outlook calendar.
4) The Dept of Technology has provided minimally redacted ICS files of the Chief Information Security Officer’s calendar, demonstrating that this is possible and does not pose a security risk: https://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/documents/6211042 (note how almost nothing is redacted)

NOTE: Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the government all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous
To Whom It May Concern –

We write in response to your petition to the Supervisor of Records below. The Office of the Mayor has indicated it did not withhold or redact records responsive to your request. As a result, there is nothing within the jurisdiction of the Supervisor of Records to determine and we consider this petition closed. Thank you.

Bradley Russi
Deputy City Attorney
Office of City Attorney David Chiu
City Hall, Room 234
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., San Francisco, CA 94102
www.sfcityattorney.org

From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Friday, January 8, 2021 10:14 PM
To: mayorsunshinerequests@sfgov.org; SOTF, (BOS) <sotf@sfgov.org>; Supervisor Records (CAT) <supervisor.records@SFCITYATTY.ORG>
Subject: Re: Mayor’s Office Texts - Immediate Disclosure Request

SOTF and Supervisor of Records,

Please file a complaint Anonymous v London Breed and Hank Heckel. Violation of CPRA Gov Code 6254.21, SF Admin Code 67.21(K)

Complaint:

As background DPW released what appears to be a mobile phone number for the Mayor on their NextRequest platform in response to one of my requests. I informed the City and issued further requests (see below thread).

Respondents purport to have issued me a written demand under Gov Code 6254.21. Their demand is illegal under that law for at least one of the following reasons:
1) the telephone number at issue is not a home telephone number
2) *I* did not in fact post her home telephone number publicly on the Internet
3) Breed failed to personally provide the written statement of fear required under the law
4) Breed did not in writing authorize Heckel to issue the demand as her agent as also required under the law
5) Heckel did not as purported agent for Breed provide the written statement of fear required under the law.

I prevail if any of the above 5 statements is true.

Purporting to order me to limit my speech *without meeting the lawful requirements* is an effort to chill my rights under the First Amendment of the US Constitution and Article 1 Section 3 of the California Constitution.

Supervisor of Records: you may determine that the statements in 3, 4, or 5 do exist and order them disclosed.
Anonymous,

I consider my email to you of December 23rd invoking 6254.21 responsive to this request. You have that email. We have closed out this request.

Regards,

Hank Heckel
Compliance Officer
Office of the Mayor
City and County of San Francisco

From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 28, 2020 1:38 PM
To: MayorSunshineRequests, MYR (MYR) <mayorsunshinerequests@sfgov.org>
Subject: RE: Mayor's Office Texts - Immediate Disclosure Request

Nope. CPRA requires you to give me a notice of whether or not there are disclosable public records. I'll look forward to that by the 10 day deadline.

NOTE: Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the government all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

------- Original Message -------
On Monday, December 28th, 2020 at 1:36 PM, MayorSunshineRequests, MYR (MYR) <mayorsunshinerequests@sfgov.org> wrote:

Anonymous,

In either case, you have the document so your request has been fulfilled.
Its not my decision to make. Is your answer no responsive records or 1 record?

Only your office knows whether or not you issued a written demand under 6254.21 or not.

NOTE: Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the government all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

Sent from ProtonMail Mobile

On Thu, Dec 24, 2020 at 12:00 AM, Heckel, Hank (MYR) <hank.heckel@sfgov.org> wrote:

Dear Anonymous,
We have no responsive records in the Office of the Mayor beyond my email to you yesterday referencing 6254.21 to the extent you view that as responsive.

Regards,

Hank Heckel
Compliance Officer
Office of the Mayor
City and County of San Francisco

From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 23, 2020 6:47 AM
To: Heckel, Hank (MYR) <hank.heckel@sfgov.org>
Cc: Elsbernd, Sean (MYR) <sean.elsbernd@sfgov.org>; Bruss, Andrea (MYR) <andrea.bruss@sfgov.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; MayorSunshineRequests, MYR (MYR) <mayorsunshinerequests@sfgov.org>
Subject: RE: Mayor's Office Texts - Immediate Disclosure Request

Mr. Heckel, Mayor Breed, and Office of Mayor,

This is an immediate disclosure request for all Gov Code 6254.21 written demands issued by the Mayor or her agents sent in 2020, all statements of threat or fear pursuant to that section sent in 2020, and all statements authorizing an agent on Breed's behalf for any time.

NOTE: Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an
indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the government all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

Sent from ProtonMail Mobile

On Tue, Dec 22, 2020 at 1:52 PM, Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:

Supervisor of Records Dennis Herrera - Please determine pursuant to SFAC 67.21(d) against DPW on Request 20-4788 that the phone number redacted on the top left of the attached redacted public record (CCSF source: https://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/documents/6192843) is not exempt under Gov Code 6254.21. I am aware of what the number is, as this record was initially provided unredacted - I do not believe it is exempt under 6254.21. Note that the number may still be exempt solely under Constitutional privacy, but that doesn't mean it is exempt under Gov Code 6254.21 which is a very narrow exemption for home telephone numbers (it doesn't make sense for a home number to be used in iMessage), and requires a written statement of threat or fear for safety from Breed. It is also unclear what authority the Mayor's Office - as opposed to DPW who produced the record - has to assert an exemption in another agency's disclosed record.

Mr. Heckel,
Is Mayor Breed issuing a written demand pursuant to Gov Code 6254.21? I have not publicly posted this record on the Internet.

If it was a demand, it fails to meet the requirements of Gov Code 6254.21(c) - which does not require the destruction of my own records, but is about public posting of them on the Internet. Please provide as required by law:

- "A written demand made under this paragraph by a state constitutional officer, a mayor, or a Member of the Legislature, a city council, or a board of supervisors shall include a statement describing a threat or fear for the safety of that official or of any person residing at the official's home address." Please provide Mayor Breed’s statement.
- Hank Heckel also is not "the official’s employer, a related governmental entity, or any voluntary professional association of similar officials to act," and appears to lack the authority as agent to issue such a demand as an agent for Breed. Please issue the appropriate demand by the City and Country of San Francisco or by Mayor Breed personally. If the demand is issued by the employer, please provide Breed's written designation of agency pursuant to Gov Code 6254.21(c)(3).

A demand will only be effective when you actually provide a legally compliant one. You have not done so at this time.

Breed's demand to me (or to MuckRock, or NextRequest, see below) will itself be a public record that I will immediately request.

If you do not provide an appropriate written demand, I will file further complaints of your violation of Gov Code 6254.21 (a part of the CPRA, and thus under SOTF's jurisdiction). Also if the censored phone number turns out not to be the Mayor's home telephone number, I will also file a complaint based on the fact you are misusing this law and lying. Please let me know as soon as possible how you wish to proceed.
Legalese aside, I had, voluntarily, and with no obligation to do so, already requested that MuckRock take down their uploaded copy of the record at https://cdn.muckrock.com/foia_files/2020/12/22/Messages20-20London20Breed.pdf-redacted.pdf - they have not done so yet.

However, if you wish to issue MuckRock a written demand under 6254.21, you will have to contact them, not me, for example at info@muckrock.com - referencing Request #105571 and the above URL.

MuckRock is not a website that I "maintain[,"] so you need to contact them directly, and I have no ability to delete the record myself. I can't know if they will comply without formal demands, nor can I provide any legal advice on how to engage with them. If you attempt to take down records other than the specific one above, (i.e. the many texts disclosed by DPW), I will file further complaints.

I had also 'embargoed' the whole request when I noticed the issue, which makes the record harder to find by the MuckRock journalist community, but it is not impossible, and only Breed can issue a takedown not me.

As with anything on the Internet, whether on NextRequest or on MuckRock, it is entirely possible that the record has been replicated and cached.

Moreover, the copy on NextRequest has been completely public for a lot longer and is thus even more likely already indexed and replicated by the search engines and public caches/archives of the world.

Finally, I will remind you that these kinds of bad redactions are done by CCSF all the time - including your office, and many other agencies. I am one of the few people who actually inform you of these issues. As I have reminded you and Herrera's office in those prior cases, CCSF's continued refusal to do systematic, consistent redactions causes numerous violations of the law, both regarding public access and also privacy.
None of this means that you don't have to respond to my records request by the way...

NOTE: Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the government all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

-------- Original Message --------

On Tuesday, December 22nd, 2020 at 12:47 PM, Heckel, Hank (MYR) <hank.heckel@sfgov.org> wrote:

Anonymous,

The production of that number by DPW was inadvertent. Please immediately delete the records provided with that number and any copies thereof. DPW has provided replacement copies with the appropriate redactions.
Per Cal. Gov. Code 6254.21, please also refrain from publicly displaying this inadvertently produced exempt information. See also Cal. Govt. Code Secs. 6254(c), California Constitution, Art. I, Sec. 1 (regarding personal privacy).

We reserve all of our rights under these provisions.

Hank Heckel
Compliance Officer
Office of the Mayor
City and County of San Francisco

From: Anonymous
<arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, December 22, 2020 12:27 PM

To: Steinberg, David (DPW)
<david.steinberg@sfdpw.org>

Cc: Elsbernd, Sean (MYR)
<sean.elsbernd@sfgov.org>; Bruss, Andrea (MYR)
<andrea.bruss@sfgov.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
<mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; Heckel, Hank (MYR)
<hank.heckel@sfgov.org>; MayorSunshineRequests, MYR (MYR)
<mayorsunshinerequests@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: Mayor's Office Texts

Thank you - my request to the Mayor's Office stands, regardless of whether they redact the number or not.

If Mayor Breed wishes to invoke Gov Code 6254.21, through herself or her agent, she will have to do so with MuckRock or NextRequest, not with me, and follow all of the legal particulars in that section, asserting the danger in writing, Breed's wishes in writing, and the fact that this number constitutes a home telephone number.

NOTE: Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the government all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous
------ Original Message ------

On Tuesday, December 22nd, 2020 at 12:21 PM, Steinberg, David (DPW) <david.steinberg@sfdpw.org> wrote:

Anonymous,

Thank you for bringing to our attention the inadvertent release of that unredacted record. You will notice that the file name ends in “redacted,” but an apparent glitch in the NextRequest platform failed to save the redactions. We have made the correction and are re-releasing the document to you.

Regards,

David A. Steinberg

Custodian of Records & Executive Assistant to the Director

San Francisco Public Works | City and County of San Francisco
For public records requests, please go to sfpublicworks.org/records.

Given that this record https://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/documents/6183368 is still on the CCSF NR website, I assume there is no Gov Code 6254.21 issue - so remember to produce the requested records.

NOTE: Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it
merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the government all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

------ Original Message
-------

On Monday, December 21st, 2020 at 11:18 AM, Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:

DPW: You, a local agency under the CPRA, appear to have posted the below phone number on the Internet for London Breed, an elected official. Therefore it is presumed that either Breed consented to the disclosure of this number OR this number does not constitute a home telephone number (presumably it is a cellular telephone number instead) (Gov Code 6254.21).
**Mayor’s Office:** Per DPW’s disclosed public records, these are four immediate disclosure requests (you must conduct *City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017)* searches in all cases):

1. **To London Breed,** for all messages (including, but not limited to, SMS, MMS, iMessage, FaceTime) about the conduct of public business sent to or from [XX]

2. **To Sean Elsbernd,** for all messages about the conduct of public business sent to or from [XX]

3. **To Andrea Bruss,** for all messages about the conduct of public business sent to or from [XX]

4. **To Hank Heckel,** for all messages about the conduct of public business sent to or from [XX]

Note also that I, Anonymous, have not posted this phone number on the Internet. Other parties may have such as
NextRequest and DPW, but I have not.

Also, you cannot deny my records request even if you want to redact the phone number from your response.

Finally, to both of your departments, I will suggest speaking to the City Attorney and DT, both of whom I previously sent links to publicly available software that can detect erroneous redactions.

**NOTE: Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential**
information, as I intend that these communications with the government all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous
To Whom It May Concern –

We understand that the department produced the record responsive to your request on January 11, 2021. Accordingly, we consider this petition closed. Thank you.

Bradley Russi  
Deputy City Attorney  
Office of City Attorney David Chiu  
City Hall, Room 234  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., San Francisco, CA 94102  
www.sfcityattorney.org

From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, January 7, 2021 6:26 PM  
To: Supervisor Records (CAT) <supervisor.records@SFCITYATTY.ORG>; SOTF, (BOS) <sotf@sfgov.org>  
Cc: John Cote (Press Secretary, City Attorney, SF) <john.cote@sfgov.org>; Coolbrith, Elizabeth (CAT) <Elizabeth.Coolbrith@sfcityatty.org>; Givner, Jon (CAT) <Jon.Givner@sfcityatty.org>; Brad Russi (Deputy City Attorney, SF) <brad.russi@sfgov.org>  
Subject: Violation of Gov Code 6254.5 by the City Attorney

Supervisor of Records:  
This is a SF Admin Code 67.21(d) petition against Dennis Herrera, Elizabeth Coolbrith and the Office of the City Attorney. Please determine in writing that some or all portions of the record withheld, namely some or all of the email headers, are public and order them disclosed.

SOTF: Please file complaint Anonymous (106278-45502273@requests.muckrock.com) v Dennis Herrera, Elizabeth Coolbrith, and the Office of the City Attorney. 
Allegations: CPRA Gov Code 6254.5, Sunshine Ordinance 67.21(K) and 67.26 and 67.34

Argument:  
See the attached 2020 request and response in Ex. A and record produced in Ex. B.  
On May 17, 2019, Respondents voluntarily disclosed additional parts (namely email headers) for this specific record, thus waiving any potential argument for their exemption, to a different records request.  
Under Gov Code 6254.5, Respondents are estopped from now claiming that those parts previously disclosed to the public in this same record are now exempt.

67.34: Because Respondents were ordered to produce even more data in this same record in SOTF 19044, and because Respondents themselves did in fact produce more data in 2019 for this same record, Respondents' non-minimal withholding and violation of the CPRA (incorporated by reference via SFAC 67.21(K)) is a willful violation of the Sunshine Ordinance.
Respondents are, like soon to be former President Trump, merely sore losers. Instead of contesting my arguments - which have prevailed in at least five different cases against various City agencies including Herrera - through the lawful timely procedural means which are now past, Respondents simply use the force of their government authority to refuse to comply with the law, because they believe themselves above the law, and above tribunals such as the SOTF.

Mr. Cote, Respondents' director of propaganda, argued on January 6 that my efforts to enforce the City's laws, exactly as the laws itself dictate, against his boss are somehow improper - a view SOTF rejected. There is only one law-breaking party in these disputes, and that is Dennis Herrera (see SOTF 19108) and his Office (see SOTF 19044 and 19120). Mr. Herrera's attempt, through Mr. Cote, to delegitimize the enforcement of the Sunshine Ordinance is also pure hypocrisy - Herrera's job involves going after those who break various City laws; the only difference is in my case the persons held to account are him and his staff, and the laws enforced are those that protect public access to government. The day Herrera fully and totally submits to the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA is the day that I can stop bringing complaints against him.

NOTE: Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the government all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous
Mr. Braden –

I understand that DPH has now produced the remainder of the records responsive to your request. If you believe they have improperly withheld or redacted records based on a legal exemption, please let us know and we can look into it. Otherwise, we consider your petition closed. Thank you.

Best,

Bradley Russi  
Deputy City Attorney  
Office of City Attorney Dennis Herrera  
City Hall, Room 234  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., San Francisco, CA 94102  
www.sfcityattorney.org

Hello Bradley,

After your involvement, DPH staff did respond for clarification on my request (thank you!). However, I responded to their request for clarification on Feb 16th, and have yet to see any response from them, again.

Would you mind refreshing this request - I'm simply asking for basic information that should be available to the public, with the original request now dating back to Dec 1st 2020.

Thank you,  
Ross

On Wednesday, January 13, 2021, 11:20:36 AM PST, Supervisor Records (CAT) <supervisor.records@sfcityatty.org> wrote:

Mr. Braden –
I write to confirm receipt of your petition below. We will consult with the Department of Public Health concerning the status of your request and get back to you. Thank you.

Bradley Russi
Deputy City Attorney
Office of City Attorney Dennis Herrera
City Hall, Room 234
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., San Francisco, CA 94102
www.sfcityattorney.org

From: Ross Braden <Personal Info.>
Sent: Tuesday, January 12, 2021 2:30 PM
To: Supervisor Records (CAT) <supervisor.records@SFCITYATTY.ORG>
Subject: Sunshine Appeal

Hello,

I'm a resident of D7 in San Francisco.

I've submitted a records inquiry to the Department of Public Health, and am not getting any response. I'm asking for assistance from the Supervisor of Records to fulfill this request, or respond with reasoning as to why these records cannot be published. Here are the details of my request:

Request #20-4694

Pursuant to my rights under San Francisco's Sunshine Ordinance (S.F. Admin. Code § 67.1), I am requesting an opportunity to inspect or obtain copies of the following:
- correspondence between Department of Public Health and testing companies "Color" and/or "Carbon Health" including email, letters of understanding, memorandums, etc regarding COVID-19 testing processes and methodologies

- any directives or guidance provided by or to DPH regarding polymerase chain reaction (PCR) testing, "PCR cycle threshold", or cycles

I'm happy to collaborate on narrowing this request to ensure it is not unduly burdensome and can be processed quickly. I am requesting these records in electronic format and not authorizing the payment of any duplication fees, but please advise if these records are only held on paper and any duplication is necessary.

Received

December 1, 2020 via web

Departments

Public Health: Other

Requester

Ross Braden

< Plus a follow up message I submitted >

Hello,

I have not seen any response to this request.

Under the SF Sunshine Ordinance, records responsive to public records requests must be furnished within 10 days of the request. SF. Admin. Code Sec. 67.21(a). In addition, if the record contains nondisclosable information, the record custodian must segregate those portions which are disclosable. Id. If a record is withheld based on an exemption to the Sunshine Ordinance, the record custodian must provide justification for the withholding, in writing, within 10 days of the request. SF Admin. Code Sec. 67.21(b). The record custodian has an obligation "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[.]" SF Admin. Code Sec. 67.21(c).
Looking forward to further guidance and please don’t hesitate to reach out to me directly if more information is needed.

Best Regards,

Ross

December 29, 2020, 8:55am by the requester

I believe my request to be in good faith. Presently this data has not been released, as far as I can find, to the public. As it is data related to a contract the city has undertaken with private companies, this is data that should be open for public scrutiny.

As well, I did consult with the First Amendment Coalition, who did confirm that this data does fall under the sunshine ordinance, and should not fall under any of the Sunshine Ordinances that were suspended early in 2020.

I’m happy to work with the City Attorney’s office to help clarify this request, and ask that you assist in getting these records released.

I prefer contact by email - [Personal Info.] though, if a call is required, please schedule that and I will be happy to join.

Best Regards,

Ross Braden
Hello,

I'm a resident of D7 in San Francisco.

I've submitted a records inquiry to the Department of Public Health, and am not getting any response. I'm asking for assistance from the Supervisor of Records to fulfill this request, or respond with reasoning as to why these records cannot be published. Here are the details of my request:

Request #20-4694

Pursuant to my rights under San Francisco’s Sunshine Ordinance (S.F. Admin. Code § 67.1), I am requesting an opportunity to inspect or obtain copies of the following:

- correspondence between Department of Public Health and testing companies "Color" and/or "Carbon Health" including email, letters of understanding, memorandums, etc regarding COVID-19 testing processes and methodologies

- any directives or guidance provided by or to DPH regarding polymerase chain reaction (PCR) testing, "PCR cycle threshold", or cycles

I'm happy to collaborate on narrowing this request to ensure it is not unduly burdensome and can be processed quickly. I am requesting these records in electronic format and not authorizing the payment of any duplication fees, but please advise if these records are only held on paper and any duplication is necessary.

Received

December 1, 2020 via web
Ross Braden

< Plus a follow up message I submitted >

Hello,

I have not seen any response to this request.

Under the SF Sunshine Ordinance, records responsive to public records requests must be furnished within 10 days of the request. SF. Admin. Code Sec. 67.21(a). In addition, if the record contains non-disclosable information, the record custodian must segregate those portions which are disclosable. Id. If a record is withheld based on an exemption to the Sunshine Ordinance, the record custodian must provide justification for the withholding, in writing, within 10 days of the request. SF Admin. Code Sec. 67.21(b). The record custodian has an obligation “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[,]” SF Admin. Code Sec. 67.21(c).

Looking forward to further guidance and please don't hesitate to reach out to me directly if more information is needed.

Best Regards,

Ross

December 29, 2020, 8:55am by the requester

I believe my request to be in good faith. Presently this data has not been released, as far as I can find, to the public. As it is data related to a contract the city has undertaken with private companies, this is data that should be open for public scrutiny.

As well, I did consult with the First Amendment Coalition, who did confirm that this data does fall under the sunshine ordinance, and should not fall under any of the Sunshine Ordinances that were suspended early in 2020.

I'm happy to work with the City Attorney’s office to help clarify this request, and ask that you assist in getting these records released.

I prefer contact by email - rossbraden@yahoo.com though, if a call is required, please schedule that and I will be happy to join.

Best Regards,
Ross Braden
To Whom It May Concern –

We understand that the Mayor’s Office produced documents responsive to the request at issue in your petition below on February 11, 2021. Accordingly, we consider the petition closed. Thank you.

Bradley Russi  
Deputy City Attorney  
Office of City Attorney David Chiu  
City Hall, Room 234  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., San Francisco, CA 94102  
www.sfcityattorney.org

January 17, 2021

This is a follow up to a previous request:

Supervisor of Records,

The Mayor's Office has stopped responding to records requests - and thus has refused to comply with my requests.

See attached thread.

Please determine in writing one or more of the requested records for requests #1 and/or #2 is public and order them disclosed.

--Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com  
E-mail (Preferred): 105579-91983283@requests.muckrock.com  
Upload documents directly:  
Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 105579
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.

---

On Jan. 17, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (MYR)
SOTF - this is a new complaint against Hank Heckel personally for 67.34 willful violation of the Sunshine Ordinance. Mr. Heckel simply refuses to respond to records requests. In doing so, he has committed official misconduct. On December 15 he issued a 14-day extension. It has been one month.

---

On Dec. 15, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (MYR)
Anonymous,

We are continuing our response to the request below for up to 14 days due to the need to consult with another department. See Cal. Gov. Code § 6253(c) and San Francisco Admin. Code § 67.25(b).

Regards,

Hank Heckel
Compliance Officer
Office of the Mayor
City and County of San Francisco

---

On Dec. 15, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (MYR)
Anonymous,

We are continuing our response to the request below for up to 14 days due to the need to consult with another department. See Cal. Gov. Code § 6253(c) and San Francisco Admin. Code § 67.25(b).

Regards,

Hank Heckel
Compliance Officer
Office of the Mayor
City and County of San Francisco
---

On Dec. 10, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (MYR)

This is a further immediate disclosure request for all communications between the person managing the Dec 5 2020 request in this thread and all dept staff either requesting or receiving or discussing responsive records in that request, including all attachments, and to/from/cc/bcc and sent dates produced directly as an exact PDF copy (the remaining metadata is not relevant at this moment). My goal is to find out who has been asked for records and who is giving the records and on what time frame this is occurring.

Note that the fact that the mere fact that an attorney is providing a record to someone else does not make that information attorney-client privileged or attorney work-product. And for all your non-attorneys you don't even have those citations.

Here's what DPW gave me for this kind of meta-request:

https://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/requests/20-4829

--Anonymous
---

On Dec. 5, 2020:
Subject: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (MYR)

To Office of the Mayor and its Department Head or Elected Official:

** DO NOT DESTROY ANY RESPONSIVE RECORDS. YOU MUST PRESERVE AND ORDER YOUR EMPLOYEES TO PRESERVE RECORDS DURING THE PENDENCY OF ALL APPEALS. WE WILL APPEAL ALL REDACTIONS OR WITHHOLDINGS. **

Immediate Disclosure Request.

Every department head/elected official must preserve and maintain all correspondence in a professional and businesslike manner (SFAC 67.29-7(a)) and also separately must comply with retention policies (SFAC 67.29-1). Note that if your retention policies do not retain text messages, I will argue before the SOTF and court that this is a failure to maintain **all correspondence** in a professional and businesslike manner.

Relevant precedent: SOTF 19098 - Anonymous v SFPD. Unanimous finding of violation for unlawfully withholding text message metadata (including the to/from/etc. - note SFPD had provided the dates and times, and you must as well), and also for unlawfully printing and scanning electronic records which does not constitute a "copy" of an electronic record. See also prior rulings in my favor in SOTF 19044, 19047, 19091, 19098, 19103, and 19108 which ruled against the City for email, text messages, past and future calendar entries, meeting details, electronic metadata, and attachments.

The Mayor's Office appears to have destroyed their copies of certain text messages. I'd be happy to get them from her, if she preserved every record. Alas she did not, therefore we must now conduct a universal search of the City. You cannot refer me to another department unless you search and determine that you have no copies in your department. If this is causing more work for you, ask your Mayor to stop destroying her public records.

Note there are many anonymous requesters using MuckRock - I am just one of them. If you previously produced some subset of these records to a MuckRock email address, please reference that prior response so you do not duplicate work. If I am unable to get the prior MuckRock response because it is someone else's and they have marked it private, you will however need to provide me a copy here as well.
1. This is an immediate disclosure request for text, chat, or instant messages between the Department Head/Elected Official and either Sean Elsbernd, Andrea Bruss, London Breed, Harlan Kelly, Jr., Naomi Kelly, Hank Heckel, or Walter Wong, including all group messages, and all messages in threads, in any form and any app (including, but not limited to, SMS, MMS, text, iMessage, Teams, Discord, WeChat, QQ, Signal, Telegram, WhatsApp, Facebook, Facebook Messenger, Twitter, Instagram, Hangouts, Meet, Slack, Skype, Viber, Snapchat, Line, Kik, FaceTime, Wickr Me, Chatroulette, Threema, KakaoTalk, Duo, GroupMe, Wire, Voxer, Allo, Tango, Bumble, Grindr, Tinder, Olive, Taimi, but NOT including email), on any government accounts/devices or on personal accounts or devices regarding the conduct of public business, including all participant names, message text, images, attachments, dates, and times, including any in trash or deleted folders or similar (see Good Government Guide - if the records have not been permanently deleted as of the time you receive this request, you must retrieve them from the so-called trash folders and provide them). Provide rolling responses. Provide exact copies including all metadata. There is no limitation by subject or date. If the total pages to produce numbers over 500, inform me of the rough dates, employees involved, and subject matter, and I may be willing to narrow the initial production, AS LONG AS YOU PRESERVE ALL THE RECORDS.

2. This is a regular records request for text, chat, or instant messages between any non-department head/elected official (i.e. the other dept employees) and either Sean Elsbernd, Andrea Bruss, London Breed, Harlan Kelly, Jr., Naomi Kelly, Hank Heckel, or Walter Wong, including all group messages, and all messages in threads, in any form and any app (including, but not limited to, SMS, MMS, text, iMessage, Teams, Discord, WeChat, QQ, Signal, Telegram, WhatsApp, Facebook, Facebook Messenger, Twitter, Instagram, Hangouts, Meet, Slack, Skype, Viber, Snapchat, Line, Kik, FaceTime, Wickr Me, Chatroulette, Threema, KakaoTalk, Duo, GroupMe, Wire, Voxer, Allo, Tango, Bumble, Grindr, Tinder, Olive, Taimi, but NOT including email), on any government accounts/devices or on personal accounts or devices regarding the conduct of public business, including all participant names, message text, images, attachments, dates, and times, including any in trash or deleted folders or similar (see Good Government Guide - if the records have not been permanently deleted as of the time you receive this request, you must retrieve them from the so-called trash folders and provide them). Provide rolling responses. Provide exact copies including all metadata. There is no limitation by subject or date. If the total pages to produce numbers over 500, inform me of the rough dates, employees involved, and subject matter, and I may be willing to narrow the initial production, AS LONG AS YOU PRESERVE ALL THE RECORDS.

Please provide only those copies of records available without any fees. If you determine certain records would require fees, please instead provide the required notice of which of those records are available and non-exempt for inspection in-person if we so choose.

Your non-exhaustive obligations:
- All withholding of any information must be justified in writing by specific statutory authority (SFAC 67.27).
- Every redaction must be keyed by footnote or by other clear reference to the specific justification for that redaction, and only the minimal exempt portion of any record may be withheld (SFAC 67.26).
- You must respond to emailed requests (SFAC 67.21(b)).
- You must notify us of whether or not responsive records exist and/or were withheld for each above request (Gov Code 6253(c), 6255(b)).
- You must state the name and title of each person responsible for withholding any information (Gov Code 6253(d)).
- Do not impose any end-user restrictions upon me (Santa Clara Co. vs Superior Ct, 170 Cal.App 4th 1301); so if you use a third-party website to publish records, please make them completely public without any login or sign-in.

Your agency must do all of the above things in your response, and you cannot wait until we file complaints.

***** We have no duty to, and we will not again, remind the City of its obligations. Instead, we will file complaints for every Sunshine Ordinance or CPRA violation. We will continue to file complaints until the City's procedures are modified to fully comply with the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA, without caveat or exception. *****

I look forward to your lawful response.
NOTE: THE EMAIL ADDRESS SENDING THIS REQUEST IS A PUBLICLY-VIEWABLE MAILBOX. Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 105579-91983283@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:
%3Fnext%3D%252Faccounts%252Fagency_login%252Foffice-of-the-mayor-3891%252Ftext-and-chat-messages-
immediate-disclosure-request-san-francisco-universal-search-myr-
105579%252F253Femail%25253Dsupervisor.records%252540sfcityatty.org&url_auth_token=AAxJOK2OUULoYu4 xv2F8
WXKz5U%3A1l1JNi%3AN8vUjHOU6xUHuqIoD-LCJuZcjU

Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 105579
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.
January 17, 2021

This is a follow up to a previous request:

Supervisor of Records,

The Mayor's Office has stopped responding to records requests - and thus has refused to comply with my requests.

See attached thread.

Please determine in writing one or more of the requested records for requests #1 and/or #2 is public and order them disclosed.

--Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 105579-91983283@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:
%3Fnext%3D%252F%253Faccounts%252Fagency%252Foffice-of-the-mayor%252F3891%252Ftext-and-chat-messages-
immediate-disclosure-request-san-francisco-universal-search-myr-
105579%252F%252Femail%252Dsupervisor.records%2520%252D%2520sfcityatty.org&url_auth_token=AAAxJK2OUULoYu4xv2F8
WXXkz5U%3A11j1JNi%3AN8vUjHOHX6xUHumloD-LCJuZcJU
Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 105579
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.

---

On Jan. 17, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San
Francisco Universal Search (MYR)
SOTF - this is a new complaint against Hank Heckel personally for 67.34 willful violation of the Sunshine Ordinance. Mr. Heckel simply refuses to respond to records requests. In doing so, he has committed official misconduct. On December 15 he issued a 14-day extension. It has been one month.

---

On Dec. 15, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (MYR)
Anonymous,

We are continuing our response to the request below for up to 14 days due to the need to consult with another department. See Cal. Gov. Code § 6253(c) and San Francisco Admin. Code § 67.25(b).
Regards,

Hank Heckel
Compliance Officer
Office of the Mayor
City and County of San Francisco

---

On Dec. 15, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (MYR)
Anonymous,

We are continuing our response to the request below for up to 14 days due to the need to consult with another department. See Cal. Gov. Code § 6253(c) and San Francisco Admin. Code § 67.25(b).
Regards,

Hank Heckel
Compliance Officer
Office of the Mayor
City and County of San Francisco

---

On Dec. 10, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (MYR)
This is a further immediate disclosure request for all communications between the person managing the Dec 5 2020 request in this thread and all dept staff either requesting or receiving or discussing responsive records in that request, including all attachments, and to/from/cc/bcc and sent dates produced directly as an exact PDF copy (the remaining metadata is not relevant at this moment). My goal is to find out who has been asked for records and who is giving the records and on what time frame this is occurring.

Note that the fact that the mere fact that an attorney is providing a record to someone else does not make that information attorney-client privileged or attorney work-product. And for all your non-attorneys you don't even have those citations.

Here's what DPW gave me for this kind of meta-request:

https://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/requests/20-4829
On Dec. 5, 2020:
Subject: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (MYR)
To Office of the Mayor and its Department Head or Elected Official:

** DO NOT DESTROY ANY RESPONSIVE RECORDS. YOU MUST PRESERVE AND ORDER YOUR EMPLOYEES TO PRESERVE RECORDS DURING THE PENDENCY OF ALL APPEALS. WE WILL APPEAL ALL REDACTIONS OR WITHHOLDINGS. **

Immediate Disclosure Request.

Every department head/elected official must preserve and maintain all correspondence in a professional and businesslike manner (SFAC 67.29-7(a)) and also separately must comply with retention policies (SFAC 67.29-1). Note that if your retention policies do not retain text messages, I will argue before the SOTF and court that this is a failure to maintain **all correspondence** in a professional and businesslike manner.

Relevant precedent: SOTF 19098 - Anonymous v SFPD. Unanimous finding of violation for unlawfully withholding text message metadata (including the to/from/etc. - note SFPD had provided the dates and times, and you must as well), and also for unlawfully printing and scanning electronic records which does not constitute a "copy" of an electronic record. See also prior rulings in my favor in SOTF 19044, 19047, 19091, 19098, 19103, and 19108 which ruled against the City for email, text messages, past and future calendar entries, meeting details, electronic metadata, and attachments.

The Mayor's Office appears to have destroyed their copies of certain text messages. I'd be happy to get them from her, if she preserved every record. Alas she did not, therefore we must now conduct a universal search of the City. You cannot refer me to another department unless you search and determine that you have no copies in your department. If this is causing more work for you, ask your Mayor to stop destroying her public records.

Note there are many anonymous requesters using MuckRock - I am just one of them. If you previously produced some subset of these records to a MuckRock email address, please reference that prior response so you do not duplicate work. If I am unable to get the prior MuckRock response because it is someone else's and they have marked it private, you will however need to provide me a copy here as well.

1. This is an immediate disclosure request for text, chat, or instant messages between the Department Head/Elected Official and either Sean Elsbernd, Andrea Bruss, London Breed, Harlan Kelly, Jr., Naomi Kelly, Hank Heckel, or Walter Wong, including all group messages, and all messages in threads, in any form and any app (including, but not limited to, SMS, MMS, text, iMessage, Teams, Discord, WeChat, QQ, Signal, Telegram, WhatsApp, Facebook, Facebook Messenger, Twitter, Instagram, Hangouts, Meet, Slack, Skype, Viber, Snapchat, Line, Kik, FaceTime, Wickr Me, Chatroulette, Threema, KakaoTalk, Duo, GroupMe, Wire, Voxer, Allo, Tango, Bumble, Grindr, Tinder, Olive, Ta...
Wickr Me, Chatroulette, Threema, KakaoTalk, Duo, GroupMe, Wire, Voxer, Allo, Tango, Bumble, Grindr, Tinder, Olive, Taimi, but NOT including email), on any government accounts/devices or on personal accounts or devices regarding the conduct of public business, including all participant names, message text, images, attachments, dates, and times, including any in trash or deleted folders or similar (see Good Government Guide - if the records have not been permanently deleted as of the time you receive this request, you must retrieve them from the so-called trash folders and provide them). Provide rolling responses. Provide exact copies including all metadata. There is no limitation by subject or date. If the total pages to produce numbers over 500, inform me of the rough dates, employees involved, and subject matter, and I may be willing to narrow the initial production, AS LONG AS YOU PRESERVE ALL THE RECORDS.

Please provide only those copies of records available without any fees. If you determine certain records would require fees, please instead provide the required notice of which of those records are available and non-exempt for inspection in-person if we so choose.

Your non-exhaustive obligations:
- All withholding of any information must be justified in writing by specific statutory authority (SFAC 67.27).
- Every redaction must be keyed by footnote or by other clear reference to the specific justification for that redaction, and only the minimal exempt portion of any record may be withheld (SFAC 67.26).
- You must respond to emailed requests (SFAC 67.21(b)).
- You must notify us of whether or not responsive records exist and/or were withheld for each above request (Gov Code 6253(c), 6255(b)).
- You must state the name and title of each person responsible for withholding any information (Gov Code 6253(d)).
- Do not impose any end-user restrictions upon me (Santa Clara Co. vs Superior Ct, 170 Cal.App 4th 1301); so if you use a third-party website to publish records, please make them completely public without any login or sign-in.

Your agency must do all of the above things in your response, and you cannot wait until we file complaints.

****** We have no duty to, and we will not again, remind the City of its obligations. Instead, we will file complaints for every Sunshine Ordinance or CPRA violation. We will continue to file complaints until the City's procedures are modified to fully comply with the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA, without caveat or exception. ******

I look forward to your lawful response.

NOTE: THE EMAIL ADDRESS SENDING THIS REQUEST IS A PUBLICLY-VIEWABLE MAILBOX. Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 105579-91983283@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:
%3Fnext%3D%252Faccounts%252Fagency_login%252Foffice-of-the-mayor-3891%252Ftext-and-chat-messages-
immediate-disclosure-request-san-francisco-universal-search-myr-
For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 105579
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.
From: Anonymous Person

12/05/2020

Subject: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request... Email

To Office of the Mayor and its Department Head or Elected Official:

** DO NOT DESTROY ANY RESPONSIVE RECORDS. YOU MUST PRESERVE AND ORDER YOUR EMPLOYEES TO PRESERVE RECORDS DURING THE PENDENCY OF ALL APPEALS. WE WILL APPEAL ALL REDACTIONS OR WITHHOLDINGS. ** Immediate Disclosure Request.

Every department head/elected official must preserve and maintain all correspondence in a professional and businesslike manner (SFAC 67.29-7(a)) and also separately must comply with retention policies (SFAC 67.29-1). Note that if your retention policies do not retain text messages, I will argue before the SOTF and court that this is a failure to maintain **all correspondence** in a professional and businesslike manner.

Relevant precedent: SOTF 19098 - Anonymous v SFPD. Unanimous finding of violation for unlawfully withholding text message metadata (including the to/from/etc.- note SFPD had provided the dates and times, and you must as well), and also for unlawfully printing and scanning electronic records which does not constitute a "copy" of an electronic record. See also prior rulings in my favor in SOTF 19044, 19047, 19091, 19098, 19103, and 19108 which ruled against the City for email, text messages, past and future calendar entries, meeting details, electronic metadata, and attachments.

The Mayor's Office appears to have destroyed their copies of certain text messages. I'd be happy to get them from her, if she preserved every record. Alas she did not, therefore we must now conduct a universal search of the City. You cannot refer me to another department unless you search and determine that you have no copies in your department. If this is causing more work for you, ask your Mayor to stop destroying her public records.

Note there are many anonymous requester using MuckRock - I am just one of them. If you previously produced some subset of these records to a MuckRock email address, please reference that prior response so you do not duplicate work. If I am unable to get the prior MuckRock response because it is someone else's and they have marked it private, you will however need to provide me a copy here as well.

1. This is an immediate disclosure request for text, chat, or instant messages between the Department Head/Elected Official and either Sean Elsbernd, Andrea Bruss, London Breed, Harlan Kelly, Jr., Naomi Kelly, Hank Heckel, or Walter Wong, including all group messages, and all messages in threads, in any form and any app (including, but not limited to, SMS, MMS, text, iMessage, Teams, Discord, WeChat, QQ, Signal, Telegram, WhatsApp, Facebook, Facebook Messenger, Twitter, Instagram, Hangouts, Meet, Slack, Skype, Viber, Snapchat, Line, Kik, FaceTime, Wickr Me, Chatroulette, Threema, KakaoTalk, Duo, GroupMe, Wire, Voox, Allo, Tango, Bumble, Grindr, Tinder, Olive, Taimi, but NOT including email), on any government accounts/devices or on personal accounts or devices regarding the conduct of public business, including all participant names, message text, images, attachments, dates, and times, including any in trash or deleted folders or similar (see Good Government Guide - if the records have not been permanently deleted as of the time you receive this request, you must retrieve them from the so-called trash folders and provide them). Provide rolling responses. Provide exact copies including all metadata. There is no limitation by subject or date. If the total pages to produce numbers over 500, inform me of the rough dates, employees involved, and subject matter, and I may be willing to narrow the initial production, AS LONG AS YOU PRESERVE ALL THE RECORDS.
2. This is a regular records request for text, chat, or instant messages between any non-department head/elected official (i.e. the other dept employees) and either Sean Elsbernd, Andrea Bruss, London Breed, Harlan Kelly, Jr., Naomi Kelly, Hank Heckel, or Walter Wong, including all group messages, and all messages in threads, in any form and any app (including, but not limited to, SMS, MMS, text, iMessage, Teams, Discord, WeChat, QQ, Signal, Telegram, WhatsApp, Facebook, Facebook Messenger, Twitter, Instagram, Hangouts, Meet, Slack, Skype, Viber, Snapchat, Line, Kik, FaceTime, Wickr Me, Chatroulette, Threema, KakaoTalk, Duo, GroupMe, Wire, Voxer, Allo, Tango, Bumble, Grindr, Tinder, Olive, Taimi, but NOT including email), on any government accounts/devices or on personal accounts or devices regarding the conduct of public business, including all participant names, message text, images, attachments, dates, and times, including any in trash or deleted folders or similar (see Good Government Guide - if the records have not been permanently deleted as of the time you receive this request, you must retrieve them from the so-called trash folders and provide them). Provide rolling responses. Provide exact copies including all metadata. There is no limitation by subject or date. If the total pages to produce numbers over 500, inform me of the rough dates, employees involved, and subject matter, and I may be willing to narrow the initial production, AS LONG AS YOU PRESERVE ALL THE RECORDS.

Please provide only those copies of records available without any fees. If you determine certain records would require fees, please instead provide the required notice of which of those records are available and non-exempt for inspection in-person if we so choose.

Your non-exhaustive obligations:
- All withholding of any information must be justified in writing by specific statutory authority (SFAC 67.27).
- Every redaction must be keyed by footnote or by other clear reference to the specific justification for that redaction, and only the minimal exempt portion of any record may be withheld (SFAC 67.26).
- You must respond to emailed requests (SFAC 67.21(b)).
- You must notify us of whether or not responsive records exist and/or were withheld for each above request (Gov Code 6253(c), 6255(b)).
- You must state the name and title of each person responsible for withholding any information (Gov Code 6253(d)).
- Do not impose any end-user restrictions upon me (Santa Clara Co. vs Superior Ct, 170 Cal.App 4th 1301); so if you use a third-party website to publish records, please make them completely public without any login or sign-in.

Your agency must do all of the above things in your response, and you cannot wait until we file complaints.

***** We have no duty to, and we will not again, remind the City of its obligations. Instead, we will file complaints for every Sunshine Ordinance or CPRA violation. We will continue to file complaints until the City's procedures are modified to fully comply with the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA, without caveat or exception. *****

I look forward to your lawful response.

NOTE: THE EMAIL ADDRESS SENDING THIS REQUEST IS A PUBLICLY-VIEWABLE MAILBOX. Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties,
express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

From: Anonymous Person
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request

This is a further immediate disclosure request for all communications between the person managing the Dec 5 2020 request in this thread and all dept staff either requesting or receiving or discussing responsive records in that request, including all attachments, and to/from/cc/bcc and sent dates produced directly as an exact PDF copy (the remaining metadata is not relevant at this moment). My goal is to find out who has been asked for records and who is giving the records and on what time frame this is occurring.

Note that the fact that the mere fact that an attorney is providing a record to someone else does not make that information attorney-client privileged or attorney work-product. And for all your non-attorneys you don't even have those citations.

Here's what DPW gave me for this kind of meta-request:

https://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/requests/20-4829

--Anonymous

From: Office of the Mayor
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request

Anonymous,

We are continuing our response to the request below for up to 14 days due to the need to consult with another department. See Cal. Gov. Code § 6253(c) and San Francisco Admin. Code § 67.25(b).

Regards,

Hank Heckel
Compliance Officer
Office of the Mayor
City and County of San Francisco
Hank Heckel  
Compliance Officer  
Office of the Mayor  
City and County of San Francisco

From: Muckrock Staff  
12/31/2020

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Req...

To Whom It May Concern:

I wanted to follow up on the following California Public Records Act request, copied below, and originally submitted on Dec. 5, 2020. Please let me know when I can expect to receive a response.

Thanks for your help, and let me know if further clarification is needed.

From: Muckrock Staff  
01/15/2021

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Req...

To Whom It May Concern:

I wanted to follow up on the following California Public Records Act request, copied below, and originally submitted on Dec. 5, 2020. Please let me know when I can expect to receive a response.

Thanks for your help, and let me know if further clarification is needed.

From: Anonymous Person  
01/17/2021

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Req...

SOTF - this is a new complaint against Hank Heckel personally for 67.34 willful violation of the Sunshine Ordinance. Mr. Heckel simply refuses to respond to records requests. In doing so, he has committed official misconduct. On December 15 he issued a 14-day extension. It has been one month.
To Whom It May Concern:

We understand that the Mayor’s Office responded to the request referenced below on January 20, 2021 and March 3, 2021, and we therefore consider this petition closed. Thank you.

Bradley Russi  
Deputy City Attorney  
Office of City Attorney David Chiu  
City Hall, Room 234  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., San Francisco, CA 94102  
www.sfcityattorney.org

From: 79193-09677256@requests.muckrock.com <79193-09677256@requests.muckrock.com>  
Sent: Sunday, January 17, 2021 5:33 PM  
To: Supervisor Records (CAT) <supervisor.records@SFCITYATTY.ORG>  
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request #SOTF 19091

January 17, 2021

This is a follow up to request number SOTF 19091:

Supervisor of Records,

The Mayor’s Office has stopped responding to records requests - and thus has refused to comply with my requests.

See attached thread.

Please determine in writing one or more of the requested records for requests #D-1,D-2,D-3,D-4 is public and order them disclosed.

--Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com  
E-mail (Preferred): 79193-09677256@requests.muckrock.com  
Upload documents directly:  
%3Fnext%3D%252Faccounts%252Fagency_login%252Foffice-of-the-mayor-3891%252Fcustodian-of-records-working-group-immediate-disclosure-request-  
79193%252F%253Femail%253Ds supervisor.records%252540sfcityatty.org&url_auth_token=AAAxJOK2OUULoYu4xv2F8W
For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 79193
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.

---

On Jan. 17, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request #SOTF 19091
Supervisor of Records,

The Mayor's Office has stopped responding to records requests - and thus has refused to comply with my requests.

See attached thread.

Please determine in writing one or more of the requested records for requests #D-1,D-2,D-3,D-4 is public and order them disclosed.

--Anonymous

---

On Dec. 21, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request #SOTF 19091
This is a further immediate disclosure request to Hank Heckel for:

D-4: All communications in the following thread (all replies/forwards):
https://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/documents/6185180

---

On Dec. 15, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request #SOTF 19091
Anonymous,

We are continuing our response to the request below for up to 14 additional days from the 10 day response date due to the need to consult with another department. See Cal. Gov. Code § 6253(c) and San Francisco Admin. Code § 67.25(b).

Regards,

Hank Heckel
Compliance Officer
Office of the Mayor
City and County of San Francisco

---
On Dec. 15, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request #SOTF 19091
Anonymous,

We are continuing our response to the request below for up to 14 additional days from the 10 day response date due to the need to consult with another department. See Cal. Gov. Code § 6253(c) and San Francisco Admin. Code § 67.25(b).
Regards,

Hank Heckel
Compliance Officer
Office of the Mayor
City and County of San Francisco
---

On Dec. 14, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request #SOTF 19091
I will add:
D-3. All communications between the Mayor's Office and the Board of Supervisors (any member or office or staffmember) regarding amending the Sunshine Ordinance, or SOTF openings between Dec 1 2020 and present
---

On Aug. 22, 2019:
Subject: California Public Records Act Request: Custodian of Records Working Group - Immediate Disclosure Request
Dear Office of the Mayor,

This is a new Immediate Disclosure Request under the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance, made before start of business August 22, 2019.

** Please redact your responses correctly! This is a public mailbox, and all of your responses (including emails, attachments, file shares, and the disclosed records) may be automatically and instantly available to the general public on the MuckRock.com service used to issue this request (though I am not a MuckRock representative). Once you send them to us, there's no going back. **

The audio record of the August 7 SOTF meeting appears to reference a "Custodian of Records Working Group" (aka "Custodian Working Group", called the "Group" below) of public employees attempting to, among other things, lobby (in a colloquial sense), via a letter, the SOTF to impose certain suggestions or restrictions on the behavior of the public. Perhaps my impression is incorrect; I would like to know more.

I request under the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance (Ordinance) and the California Public Records Act (CPRA):

1. IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE REQUEST: all agendas (draft or final) of meetings of the Group
2. IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE REQUEST: all minutes (draft or final) of meetings of the Group
3. IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE REQUEST: all listings of the membership/roster of the Group
4. regular request: all supporting documentation used at meetings of the Group
5. IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE REQUEST: all records showing any budget allocations or other financial support given to the Group
6. regular request: all records that would demonstrate the public monies being used to support the activities of the Group (including showing the time spent by public employees performing Group work, for example calendar/schedule items showing when the meetings took place and who attended). Ms. Blackman said [in the Aug 7 SOTF audio record] that the signers spent "quite a lot of time" was spent writing this letter. Provide all records showing what public employee work time was spent writing this letter.
7. IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE REQUEST: all records related to the attempt to lobby the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force to
change their rules or procedures, including but not limited to the letter discussed at the SOTF Aug 7 meeting. Including a copy of the letter and all drafts or other versions of this letter.

8. regular request: all correspondence between your Compliance Officer and/or Custodian of Records and/or Public Records Manager and the Group as an entity

9. regular request: all correspondence between your Compliance Officer and/or Custodian of Records and/or Public Records Manager and any of { David Steinberg, Sue Blackman, Hank Heckel, Caroline Celaya, Marianne Mazzucco-Thompson } since Jan. 1, 2019.

10. regular request: Ms. Celaya stated [in the Aug 7 SOTF audio record] that certain best practices have been generated. Provide all policies/best practices written by the Group.

We remind you of your obligations to provide electronic records in any format we request them in, as long as either you hold them in that format, the format is available to you, or the format is easy to generate (Admin Code 67.21(l)). Therefore, calendars exported in the .ics, iCalendar, or vCard formats ("A") and emails exported in the .eml or .msg formats ("B") with all non-exempt headers, metadata, attachments, etc. are our desired formats. Such formats are easily exportable from Google Calendar/Gmail, Microsoft Outlook, Microsoft Exchange or other common calendaring/email systems. However, if you choose to convert electronic calendar items, for example, to PDF or printed format, to easily redact them, you must ensure that you have preserved the full content of the original calendar item record (as specified in requests 1 and 2), which contains many detailed headers beyond the ones generally printed out. If you provide PDFs or printed items with only a few of the headers or lacking attachments/images, and therefore withhold the other headers/attachments without justification, you may be in violation of SF Admin Code 67.21, 67.26, 67.27, Govt Code 6253(a), 6253.9, and/or 6255, and we may challenge your decision. We *do not* waive the requirement of 67.21(l) discussed above, and are merely instructing you to preserve information even if you provide to us the undesirable PDF format.

For word processing documents, either .docx or .pdf formats are fine. For physical items, scanning to PDF format is acceptable.

For this request, we are asking for a City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017) search be performed of the Compliance Officer/Custodian of Records/Public Records Manager and all other members of your department's staff who are a member of or have ever attended the Group, such that each such employee either provide all records responsive to this request present on their personal accounts/devices/property (solely to the extent the record or portion thereof relates to the public's business), or provide a declaration/affidavit that no such records exist. All such affidavits/declarations are also requested as responsive records to this request. Please handle the government account record search as an immediate disclosure search, and the personal search under regular timelines.

Please provide only those copies of records available without any fees. If you determine certain records would require fees, please instead provide the required notice of which of those records are available and non-exempt for inspection in-person if we so choose.

I look forward to your immediate disclosure.

Sincerely,
Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 79193-09677256@requests.muckrock.com
Buta, Odaya (CAT)

From: 79193-09677256@requests.muckrock.com
Sent: Sunday, January 17, 2021 5:33 PM
To: Supervisor Records (CAT)
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request #SOTF 19091
Attachments: Custodian20of20Records20Working20Group20-20Immediate20Disclosure20Request20E280A220_eOgCRmY.pdf; 12.08.2020Custodians20agenda_Zsg5ISW.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

January 17, 2021

This is a follow up to request number SOTF 19091:

Supervisor of Records,

The Mayor's Office has stopped responding to records requests - and thus has refused to comply with my requests.

See attached thread.

Please determine in writing one or more of the requested records for requests #D-1,D-2,D-3,D-4 is public and order them disclosed.

--Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 79193-09677256@requests.muckrock.com
Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 79193
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.

---
On Jan. 17, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request #SOTF 19091
Supervisor of Records,

The Mayor's Office has stopped responding to records requests - and thus has refused to comply with my requests.

See attached thread.

Please determine in writing one or more of the requested records for requests #D-1,D-2,D-3,D-4 is public and order them disclosed.

--Anonymous
---

On Dec. 21, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request #SOTF 19091
This is a further immediate disclosure request to Hank Heckel for:

D-4: All communications in the following thread (all replies/forwards):
https://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/documents/6185180
---

On Dec. 15, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request #SOTF 19091
Anonymous,

We are continuing our response to the request below for up to 14 additional days from the 10 day response date due to the need to consult with another department. See Cal. Gov. Code § 6253(c) and San Francisco Admin. Code § 67.25(b).
Regards,

Hank Heckel
Compliance Officer
Office of the Mayor
City and County of San Francisco
---

On Dec. 15, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request #SOTF 19091
Anonymous,

We are continuing our response to the request below for up to 14 additional days from the 10 day response date due to the need to consult with another department. See Cal. Gov. Code § 6253(c) and San Francisco Admin. Code § 67.25(b).
Regards,

Hank Heckel
Compliance Officer
Office of the Mayor
City and County of San Francisco
---

On Dec. 14, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request #SOTF 19091
I will add:
D-3. All communications between the Mayor's Office and the Board of Supervisors (any member or office or staffmember) regarding amending the Sunshine Ordinance, or SOTF openings between Dec 1 2020 and present ---

On Aug. 22, 2019:
Subject: California Public Records Act Request: Custodian of Records Working Group - Immediate Disclosure Request
Dear Office of the Mayor,

This is a new Immediate Disclosure Request under the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance, made before start of business August 22, 2019.

** Please redact your responses correctly! This is a public mailbox, and all of your responses (including emails, attachments, file shares, and the disclosed records) may be automatically and instantly available to the general public on the MuckRock.com service used to issue this request (though I am not a MuckRock representative). Once you send them to us, there's no going back. **

The audio record of the August 7 SOTF meeting appears to reference a "Custodian of Records Working Group" (aka "Custodian Working Group", called the "Group" below) of public employees attempting to, among other things, lobby (in a colloquial sense), via a letter, the SOTF to impose certain suggestions or restrictions on the behavior of the public. Perhaps my impression is incorrect; I would like to know more.

I request under the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance (Ordinance) and the California Public Records Act (CPRA):

1. IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE REQUEST: all agendas (draft or final) of meetings of the Group
2. IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE REQUEST: all minutes (draft or final) of meetings of the Group
3. IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE REQUEST: all listings of the membership/roster of the Group
4. regular request: all supporting documentation used at meetings of the Group
5. IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE REQUEST: all records showing any budget allocations or other financial support given to the Group
6. regular request: all records that would demonstrate the public monies being used to support the activities of the Group (including showing the time spent by public employees performing Group work, for example calendar/schedule items showing when the meetings took place and who attended). Ms. Blackman said [in the Aug 7 SOTF audio record] that the signers spent "quite a lot of time" was spent writing this letter. Provide all records showing what public employee work time was spent writing this letter.
7. IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE REQUEST: all records related to the attempt to lobby the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force to change their rules or procedures, including but not limited to the letter discussed at the SOTF Aug 7 meeting. Including a copy of the letter and all drafts or other versions of this letter.
8. regular request: all correspondence between your Compliance Officer and/or Custodian of Records and/or Public Records Manager and the Group as an entity
9. regular request: all correspondence between your Compliance Officer and/or Custodian of Records and/or Public Records Manager and any of { David Steinberg, Sue Blackman, Hank Heckel, Caroline Celaya, Marianne Mazzucco-Thompson } since Jan. 1, 2019.
10. regular request: Ms. Celaya stated [in the Aug 7 SOTF audio record] that certain best practices have been generated. Provide all policies/best practices written by the Group.

We remind you of your obligations to provide electronic records in any format we request them in, as long as either you hold them in that format, the format is available to you, or the format is easy to generate (Admin Code 67.21(1)). Therefore, calendars exported in the .ics, iCalendar, or vCard formats ("A") and emails exported in the .eml or .msg formats ("B") with all non-exempt headers, metadata, attachments, etc. are our desired formats. Such formats are easily exportable from Google Calendar/Gmail, Microsoft Outlook, Microsoft Exchange or other common calendaring/email systems. However, if you choose to convert electronic calendar items, for example, to PDF or printed format, to easily
redact them, you must ensure that you have preserved the full content of the original calendar item record (as specified in requests 1 and 2), which contains many detailed headers beyond the ones generally printed out. If you provide PDFs or printed items with only a few of the headers or lacking attachments/images, and therefore withhold the other headers/attachments without justification, you may be in violation of SF Admin Code 67.21, 67.26, 67.27, Govt Code 6253(a), 6253.9, and/or 6255, and we may challenge your decision. We *do not* waive the requirement of 67.21(l) discussed above, and are merely instructing you to preserve information even if you provide to us the undesirable PDF format.

For word processing documents, either .docx or .pdf formats are fine. For physical items, scanning to PDF format is acceptable.

For this request, we are asking for a City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017) search be performed of the Compliance Officer/Custodian of Records/Public Records Manager and all other members of your department's staff who are a member of or have ever attended the Group, such that each such employee either provide all records responsive to this request present on their personal accounts/devices/property (solely to the extent the record or portion thereof relates to the public's business), or provide a declaration/affidavit that no such records exist. All such affidavits/declarations are also requested as responsive records to this request. Please handle the government account record search as an immediate disclosure search, and the personal search under regular timelines.

Please provide only those copies of records available without any fees. If you determine certain records would require fees, please instead provide the required notice of which of those records are available and non-exempt for inspection in-person if we so choose.

I look forward to your immediate disclosure.

Sincerely,
Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 79193-09677256@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:
%3Fnext%3D%25Faccounts%2Fagency_login%252Foffice-of-the-mayor-3891%252Fcustodian-of-records-working-
group-immediate-disclosure-request-79193%252F%253Femail%253Dsupervisor.records%2540sfcityatty.org&url_auth_token=AAAxJOK2OUULoYu4xv2F8W
XKz5U%3A11JQ0%3AvGw4Gmc8jfcI%KwMvm_IT7-cjc5c
Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 79193
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.
Dear Mayor's Office and Hank Heckel,

Immediate Disclosure Request

The relevant period for this request is records prepared, sent, or received from Jan 14, 2020 to Dec 14, 2020 (inclusive).

Rolling responses working backwards from the present, and exact copies (in full-fidelity, exact copy, PDF format - WITH BCC fields from the sent folder of any employee of DPW - but headers other than To/From/Cc/BCC/Sent/Subject are not requested at this time) are requested.

D-1. All communications between Hank Heckel and anyone outside the Mayor's Office regarding items 2, 3, 5, or 6 of the attached agenda. Just because a DCA is on a thread does not make it privileged unless the DCA is being asked or is providing confidential legal advice. Adding a DCA to a random thread does not make the prior convos privileged.

D-2. Every copy, final or draft, and every version thereof, of the "SOTF amendment proposal" mentioned in the attachment.

Please provide only those copies of records available without any fees. If you determine certain records would require fees, please instead provide the required notice of which of those records are available and non-exempt for inspection in-person if we so choose. Please use email for all responses. I will not use any third-party records management private company's website requiring legal agreements beyond the CPRA's requirements, and I cannot be required to do so. If you publish records using such service, they must be completely publicly accessible without login or agreement to terms.

Remember to justify all withheld records, indicate whether each request had responsive records, and provide footnote or other clear reference to justification for every masking or deletion of exempt information.

NOTE: Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. The email address sending this request is a publicly-viewable mailbox. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,
Anonymous

12.08.2020Custodians20agenda.pdf
I will add:
D-3. All communications between the Mayor's Office and the Board of Supervisors (any member or office or staff member) regarding amending the Sunshine Ordinance, or SOTF openings between Dec 1 2020 and present

From: Office of the Mayor
12/15/2020
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request #SOTF 19091

Anonymous,

We are continuing our response to the request below for up to 14 additional days from the 10 day response date due to the need to consult with another department. See Cal. Gov. Code § 6253(c) and San Francisco Admin. Code § 67.25(b).

Regards,

Hank Heckel
Compliance Officer
Office of the Mayor
City and County of San Francisco

From: Office of the Mayor
12/15/2020
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request #SOTF 19091

Anonymous,

We are continuing our response to the request below for up to 14 additional days from the 10 day response date due to the need to consult with another department. See Cal. Gov. Code § 6253(c) and San Francisco Admin. Code § 67.25(b).

Regards,

Hank Heckel
Compliance Officer
Office of the Mayor
City and County of San Francisco

From: Anonymous Person
12/21/2020
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request #SOTF 19091

This is a further immediate disclosure request to Hank Heckel for:

D-4: All communications in the following thread (all replies/forwards): https://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/documents/6185180
Custodians of Records Working Group quarterly meeting, Tuesday, Dec. 8, 2 p.m.

1. Welcome and intros (David Steinberg)
2. Metadata (Hank Heckel and/or City Attorney)
3. SOTF amendment proposal (Steinberg)
4. SOTF unresolved cases (Steinberg/Marianne Thompson/Heckel)
5. Anon text requests (Heckel and/or City Attorney)
6. SOTF openings (Heckel)
7. Index of Records (Bill Barnes)

Bonus item: NextRequest (Arlene Licudine-Barker) – Arlene would like to discuss the following items with anyone willing to stay on the call, whether they’re currently using or considering using the NextRequest system for answering Sunshine requests.

- Single-sign-on on the NR sandbox portal
- NR Portal Document Retention Policy
- Rapid Review assessment
- NextRequest Customer Satisfaction Survey
- Multi-year contract to save money
**Additional Qualifications:** At all times, the Task Force shall include at least one member who shall be a member of the public who is physically handicapped. All members must have experience and/or demonstrated interest in the issues of citizen access and participation in local government.
February 24, 2021

Sent via email (arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com)

Re: Petition to Supervisor of Records

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter responds to your petition to the Supervisor of Records dated January 25, 2021, concerning a request to Supervisor Sandra Lee Fewer. The Clerk of the Board of Supervisors responded on behalf of former Supervisor Fewer.

We find that the Clerk properly applied redactions to the record at issue based on Government Code Section 6254(k) and Evidence Code Section 1041.

Very truly yours,

DENNIS J. HERRERA
City Attorney

Bradley A. Russi
Deputy City Attorney
Please see attached response to your petition.

Bradley Russi  
Deputy City Attorney  
Office of City Attorney Dennis Herrera  
City Hall, Room 234  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., San Francisco, CA 94102  
www.sfcityattorney.org

From: Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org>  
Sent: Wednesday, February 24, 2021 3:30 PM  
To: arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com  
Cc: Supervisor Records (CAT) <supervisor.records@SFCITYATTY.ORG>  
Subject: RE: Petition - RE: Sandra Fewer - Immediate Disclosure Request for one email of yours

To Whom It May Concern,

Thank you for providing reference to SOTF File No. 19120. Our office has circled back with the City Attorney’s office, and they have confirmed that they indeed previously disclosed a version of the requested document(s). Per amended guidance by the City Attorney’s office, our office is hereby amending our response and disclosing the attached records responsive to your request below. All redactions have been made pursuant to CA Evidence Code Section 1041 in coordination with the City Attorney’s office and are consistent with the records previously disclosed.

Sincerely,

___  
Wilson L. Ng  
Deputy Director of Operations  
San Francisco Board of Supervisors  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Web: www.sfbos.org

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form

Disclosures: Personal information that is provided in communications to the Clerk of 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.

From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 25, 2021 11:38 AM
To: Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org>
Cc: Records, Supervisor (CAT) <Supervisor.records@sfcityatty.org>
Subject: Petition - RE: Sandra Fewer – Immediate Disclosure Request for one email of yours

Supervisor of Records,

This is a 67.21(d) petition for a written determination and order for the disclosure of the below mentioned email to former Sup Fewer now in the custody of the Clerk of the Board.

Evid Code 1041 protects only the "identity of a person who has furnished information .... purporting to disclose a violation entity of a law". But one can disclose the rest of the email without disclosing the From name/email and the ending signature (thus protecting the identity but not the content), and the City is required to do so under SF Admin Code 67.26 to keep withholding to a minimum.

Furthermore, this email has been partially disclosed publicly by the Office of the City Attorney (see SOTF File 19120 Anonymous v Herrera), for over 1 year. Therefore, under Gov Code 6254.5, it cannot now be withheld in entirety.

NOTE: 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,
Anonymous

Sent from ProtonMail Mobile

On Mon, Jan 25, 2021 at 9:51 AM, Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org> wrote:

To Whom It May Concern,

Thank you for your patience.

As per the Office of the Clerk of the Board’s inquiry and follow up to the City Attorney’s office, the records identified as potentially responsive to your request have been reviewed. Your original request is attached for reference. It has been determined by the City Attorney’s office that the identified records are subject to withholding in their entirety in accordance with CA Evidence Code 1041.
If you have questions regarding the authority for withholding or require further determination, you may petition to the City Attorney’s Office, Supervisor of Records at Supervisor.Records@sfcityatty.org in accordance with San Francisco Administrative Code, Sec. 67.21d.

Our office was not able to identify any other records subject to disclosure.

Sincerely,

—

Wilson L. Ng
Deputy Director of Operations

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Web: www.sfbos.org

**PLEASE NOTE: I will be on leave from February 1 through February 12, 2021.**

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form

**Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Clerk of 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
Thank you for your follow up. On behalf of the Office of the Clerk of the Board, I am confirming receipt and handling of your request to Supervisor Fewer’s office. Our office is following up with the City Attorney’s office and will provide you with records on a rolling basis as they are reviewed and available to us. I will keep you apprised.

—

Wilson L. Ng

Deputy Director of Operations

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

Web: www.sfbos.org

**PLEASE NOTE: I will be on leave from February 1 through February 12, 2021.**

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form
Disclosures: Personal information that is provided in communications to the Clerk of 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.

---

From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Friday, January 22, 2021 11:27 AM
To: Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org>
Cc: FewerStaff (BOS) <fewerstaff@sfgov.org>; Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>; Records, Supervisor (CAT) <Supervisor.records@sfcityatty.org>
Subject: RE: Sandra Fewer - Immediate Disclosure Request for one email of yours

How’s this going? Your total CPRA time of 24 days is expired.

NOTE: Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the government all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

------- Original Message -------

On Friday, January 8th, 2021 at 10:20 AM, Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org> wrote:

To Whom it May Concern:
To provide you with an update, as per our inquiry with the City Attorney’s office, their office will require additional time to review potentially responsive records. I anticipate providing you with an update or response by January 15, 2021 close of business, and will keep you apprised.

Sincerely,

—

Wilson L. Ng

Deputy Director of Operations

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

Phone: (415) 554-7725

Web: www.sfbos.org

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form

Disclosures: Personal information that is provided in communications to the Clerk of 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.
To Whom it May Concern:

On behalf of the Office of the Clerk of the Board, this is to confirm receipt of your inquiry and follow up.

Our office, in coordination with the Office of Supervisor Fewer has identified records potentially responsive request, and is currently in consultation with the City Attorney's office to review.

I will follow up and provide you with an update by close of business tomorrow.

Thank you for your patience.

Sincerely,

Wilson L. Ng
Deputy Director of Operations
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

Phone: (415) 554-7725

Web: www.sfbos.org

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form

Disclosures: Personal information that is provided in communications to the Clerk of 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.

From:Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, January 7, 2021 9:23 AM

To: FewerStaff (BOS) <fewerstaff@sfgov.org>; Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>; Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org>; Records, Supervisor (CAT) <Supervisor.records@sfcityatty.org>

Subject: Re: Sandra Fewer - Immediate Disclosure Request for one email of yours
Supervisor of Records Dennis Herrera,

This is a 67.21(d) petition that the below request has not been complied with, a written determination that the record or any parts thereof are public, and an order for their disclosure.

Sent from ProtonMail mobile

-------- Original Message --------

On Jan 6, 2021, 1:02 PM, Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:

Hi Sup. Fewer staff,

You were going to update me on this request by Jan. 2 - any progress? It's a single email that I requested.

NOTE: Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the government all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,
Anonymous

------ Original Message ------

On Thursday, December 24th, 2020 at 12:53 PM, Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:

Thanks - just so you know this is an email from a member of the public to Sup Fewer and the CAO. It is not an email between Fewer and the CAO as atty/client privileged. Please do know that after a request has been made, the record cannot be destroyed regardless of whether Sup Fewer leaves office.

NOTE: Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the government all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

Sent from ProtonMail Mobile
On Thu, Dec 24, 2020 at 12:45 PM, FewerStaff (BOS) <fewerstaff@sfgov.org> wrote:

Hello,

Thank you for your inquiry. On behalf of the Office of Supervisor Sandra Lee Fewer, I am confirming receipt of your request.

Please note that in accordance with the second and fifth supplementals to the Mayor’s proclamation of local emergency, immediate disclosure request and public records production deadlines under San Francisco Administrative Code, Chapter 67 (Sunshine Ordinance), have been suspended for the duration of the COVID-19 state of emergency.

However, our office endeavors to respond to records requests within the normal deadlines as feasible.

As our office will require additional time to review potentially responsive records for privilege, we intend to provide you with an update or response by January 2, 2021 close of business, and will keep you apprised if additional time is required.
Thanks,

Angelina

From: Anonymous  
<arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>  
Sent: Wednesday, December 23, 2020  
3:03 PM  
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS)  
<sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>; FewerStaff (BOS) <fewerstaff@sfgov.org>; Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org>  
Subject: Sandra Fewer - Immediate Disclosure Request for one email of yours

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

Supervisor Fewer,

Please produce the single email received by you at your official email address, with all attachments, on August 18, 2019 with a subject starting with "Code Enforcement Request:". You must minimally redact the record with citations as needed.

As of receipt of this request, you remain a public official subject to CPRA and Sunshine Ordinance.
Enjoy your soon-departure from being subject to public records requests =) and have a happy holiday.

NOTE: Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the government all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous
To Whom It May Concern,

Thank you for providing reference to SOTF File No. 19120. Our office has circled back with the City Attorney’s office, and they have confirmed that they indeed previously disclosed a version of the requested document(s). Per amended guidance by the City Attorney’s office, our office is hereby amending our response and disclosing the attached records responsive to your request below. All redactions have been made pursuant to CA Evidence Code Section 1041 in coordination with the City Attorney’s office and are consistent with the records previously disclosed.

Sincerely,

___

Wilson L. Ng
Deputy Director of Operations
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Web: www.sfbos.org

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form

Disclosures: Personal information that is provided in communications to the Clerk of 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.

From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 25, 2021 11:38 AM
To: Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org>
Cc: Records, Supervisor (CAT) <Supervisor.records@sfcityatty.org>
Subject: Petition - RE: Sandra Fewer - Immediate Disclosure Request for one email of yours

Supervisor of Records,
This is a 67.21(d) petition for a written determination and order for the disclosure of the below mentioned email to former Sup Fewer now in the custody of the Clerk of the Board.

Evid Code 1041 protects only the "identity of a person who has furnished information .... purporting to disclose a violation entity of a law". But one can disclose the rest of the email without disclosing the From name/email and the ending signature (thus protecting the identity but not the content), and the City is required to do so under SF Admin Code 67.26 to keep withholding to a minimum.

Furthermore, this email has been partially disclosed publicly by the Office of the City Attorney (see SOTF File 19120 Anonymous v Herrera), for over 1 year. Therefore, under Gov Code 6254.5, it cannot now be withheld in entirety.

NOTE: 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

Sent from ProtonMail Mobile

On Mon, Jan 25, 2021 at 9:51 AM, Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org> wrote:

To Whom It May Concern,

Thank you for your patience.

As per the Office of the Clerk of the Board’s inquiry and follow up to the City Attorney’s office, the records identified as potentially responsive to your request have been reviewed. Your original request is attached for reference. It has been determined by the City Attorney’s office that the identified records are subject to withholding in their entirety in accordance with CA Evidence Code 1041.

If you have questions regarding the authority for withholding or require further determination, you may petition to the City Attorney’s Office, Supervisor of Records at Supervisor.Records@sfcityatty.org in accordance with San Francisco Administrative Code, Sec. 67.21d.

Our office was not able to identify any other records subject to disclosure.
Sincerely,

___

Wilson L. Ng
Deputy Director of Operations

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

Web: www.sfbos.org

PLEASE NOTE: I will be on leave from February 1 through February 12, 2021.

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form

Disclosures: Personal information that is provided in communications to the Clerk of 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.

From: Ng, Wilson (BOS)
Sent: Friday, January 22, 2021 12:27 PM
To: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Cc: Records, Supervisor (CAT) <Supervisor.records@sfcityatty.org>
Subject: RE: Sandra Fewer - Immediate Disclosure Request for one email of yours
Thank you for your follow up. On behalf of the Office of the Clerk of the Board, I am confirming receipt and handling of your request to Supervisor Fewer’s office. Our office is following up with the City Attorney’s office and will provide you with records on a rolling basis as they are reviewed and available to us. I will keep you apprised.

—

Wilson L. Ng
Deputy Director of Operations

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Web: www.sfbos.org

PLEASE NOTE: I will be on leave from February 1 through February 12, 2021.

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form

Disclosures: Personal information that is provided in communications to the Clerk of 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.

From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Friday, January 22, 2021 11:27 AM
To: Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org>
Cc: FewerStaff (BOS) <fewerstaff@sfgov.org>; Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>; Records,
How's this going? Your total CPRA time of 24 days is expired.

NOTE: Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the government all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

------ Original Message ------

On Friday, January 8th, 2021 at 10:20 AM, Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org> wrote:

To Whom it May Concern:

To provide you with an update, as per our inquiry with the City Attorney’s office, their office will require additional time to review potentially responsive records. I anticipate providing you with an update or response by January 15, 2021 close of business, and will keep you apprised.

Sincerely,

―

Wilson L. Ng
Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form

Disclosures: Personal information that is provided in communications to the Clerk of 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.
To Whom it May Concern:

On behalf of the Office of the Clerk of the Board, this is to confirm receipt of your inquiry and follow up.

Our office, in coordination with the Office of Supervisor Fewer has identified records potentially responsive request, and is currently in consultation with the City Attorney’s office to review.

I will follow up and provide you with an update by close of business tomorrow.

Thank you for your patience.

Sincerely,

—

Wilson L. Ng
Deputy Director of Operations

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Phone: (415) 554-7725
Web: www.sfbos.org

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.
Disclosures: Personal information that is provided in communications to the Clerk of 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.

From: Anonymous <recordsrequestor@protonmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, January 7, 2021 9:23 AM

To: FewerStaff (BOS) <fewerstaff@sfgov.org>; Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>; Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org>; Records, Supervisor (CAT) <Supervisor.records@sfcityatty.org>

Subject: Re: Sandra Fewer - Immediate Disclosure Request for one email of yours

Supervisor of Records Dennis Herrera,

This is a 67.21(d) petition that the below request has not been complied with, a written determination that the record or any parts thereof are public, and an order for their disclosure.

Sent from ProtonMail mobile
On Jan 6, 2021, 1:02 PM, Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:

Hi Sup. Fewer staff,

You were going to update me on this request by Jan. 2 - any progress? It's a single email that I requested.

NOTE: Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the government all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

---- Original Message ------

On Thursday, December 24th, 2020 at 12:53 PM, Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:
Thanks - just so you know this is an email from a member of the public to Sup Fewer and the CAO. It is not an email between Fewer and the CAO as atty/client privileged. Please do know that after a request has been made, the record cannot be destroyed regardless of whether Sup Fewer leaves office.

NOTE: Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the government all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

Sent from ProtonMail Mobile

On Thu, Dec 24, 2020 at 12:45 PM, FewerStaff (BOS) <fewerstaff@sfgov.org> wrote:

Hello,
Thank you for your inquiry. On behalf of the Office of Supervisor Sandra Lee Fewer, I am confirming receipt of your request.

Please note that in accordance with the second and fifth supplementals to the Mayor’s proclamation of local emergency, immediate disclosure request and public records production deadlines under San Francisco Administrative Code, Chapter 67 (Sunshine Ordinance), have been suspended for the duration of the COVID-19 state of emergency.

However, our office endeavors to respond to records requests within the normal deadlines as feasible.

As our office will require additional time to review potentially responsive records for privilege, we intend to provide you with an update or response by January 2, 2021 close of business, and will keep you apprised if additional time is required.

Thanks,

Angelina
From: Anonymous
<arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 23, 2020
3:03 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS)
<sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>; FewerStaff (BOS) <fewerstaff@sfgov.org>; Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org>
Subject: Sandra Fewer - Immediate Disclosure Request for one email of yours

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

Supervisor Fewer,

Please produce the single email received by you at your official email address, with all attachments, on August 18, 2019 with a subject starting with "Code Enforcement Request:". You must minimally redact the record with citations as needed.
As of receipt of this request, you remain a public official subject to CPRA and Sunshine Ordinance.

Enjoy your soon-departure from being subject to public records requests =) and have a happy holiday.

NOTE: Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the government all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous
3. Possible Identity Theft: A young man (who is housesitting the property while [redacted] is in 30-days of rehab) last week disposed of mail from her unit which included several pieces of mail from financial institutions (Wells Fargo, Card Services, etc.) addressed to Brian Carmody at [redacted]. This is the same journalist who was involved with investigating the Jeff Adachi case. Our neighbors alerted Mr. Carmody to the strange mail in case somebody is trying to open credit in his name.
The Honorable Dennis Herrera  
City Attorney of San Francisco  
City Hall, Room 234  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Email: cityattorney@sfcityatty.org  
Tel: (415) 554-4700
3. Possible Identify Theft: A young man (who is housesitting the property while [redacted] is in 30-days of rehab) last week disposed of mail from her unit which included several pieces of mail from financial institutions (Wells Fargo, Card Services, etc.) addressed to Brian Carmody at [redacted]. This is the same journalist who was involved with investigating the Jeff Adachi case. Our neighbors alerted Mr. Carmody to the strange mail in case somebody is trying to open credit in his name.
The Honorable Dennis Herrera
City Attorney of San Francisco
City Hall, Room 234
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA 94102
Email: cityattorney@sfcityatty.org
Tel: (415) 554-4700

[Redacted text]

[Redacted text]

[Redacted text]
On Sun, Aug 18, 2019 at 2:59 PM [Name Redacted] wrote:
The Honorable Dennis Herrera
City Attorney of San Francisco
City Hall, Room 234
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA 94102
Email: cityattorney@sfcityatty.org
Tel: (415) 554-4700
3. Possible Identity Theft: A young man (who is housesitting the property while [redacted] is in 30-days of rehab) last week disposed of mail from her unit which included several pieces of mail from financial institutions (Wells Fargo, Card Services, etc.) addressed to Brian Carmody at [redacted]. This is the same journalist who was involved with investigating the Jeff Adachi case. Our neighbors alerted Mr. Carmody to the strange mail in case somebody is trying to open credit in his name.
Supervisor of Records,

This is a 67.21(d) petition for a written determination and order for the disclosure of the below mentioned email to former Sup Fewer now in the custody of the Clerk of the Board.

Evid Code 1041 protects only the "identity of a person who has furnished information .... purporting to disclose a violation entity of a law". But one can disclose the rest of the email without disclosing the From name/email and the ending signature (thus protecting the identity but not the content), and the City is required to do so under SF Admin Code 67.26 to keep withholding to a minimum.

Furthermore, this email has been partially disclosed publicly by the Office of the City Attorney (see SOTF File 19120 Anonymous v Herrera), for over 1 year. Therefore, under Gov Code 6254.5, it cannot now be withheld in entirety.

NOTE: 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

Sent from ProtonMail Mobile

On Mon, Jan 25, 2021 at 9:51 AM, Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org> wrote:

    To Whom It May Concern,

    Thank you for your patience.

    As per the Office of the Clerk of the Board’s inquiry and follow up to the City Attorney’s office, the records identified as potentially responsive to your request have been reviewed. Your original request is attached for reference. It has been determined by the City Attorney’s office that the identified records are subject to withholding in their entirety in accordance with CA Evidence Code 1041.
If you have questions regarding the authority for withholding or require further determination, you may petition to the City Attorney’s Office, Supervisor of Records at Supervisor.Records@sfcityatty.org in accordance with San Francisco Administrative Code, Sec. 67.21d.

Our office was not able to identify any other records subject to disclosure.

Sincerely,

—

Wilson L. Ng
Deputy Director of Operations

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Web: www.sfbos.org

**PLEASE NOTE: I will be on leave from February 1 through February 12, 2021.**

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

anine Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form

**Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Clerk of 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.
Thank you for your follow up. On behalf of the Office of the Clerk of the Board, I am confirming receipt and handling of your request to Supervisor Fewer’s office. Our office is following up with the City Attorney’s office and will provide you with records on a rolling basis as they are reviewed and available to us. I will keep you apprised.

—

Wilson L. Ng

Deputy Director of Operations

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

Web: www.sfbos.org

PLEASE NOTE: I will be on leave from February 1 through February 12, 2021.

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

Disclosures: Personal information that is provided in communications to the Clerk of 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.

From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Friday, January 22, 2021 11:27 AM
To: Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org>
Cc: FewerStaff (BOS) <fewerstaff@sfgov.org>; Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>; Records, Supervisor (CAT) <Supervisor.records@sfcityatty.org>
Subject: RE: Sandra Fewer - Immediate Disclosure Request for one email of yours

How's this going? Your total CPRA time of 24 days is expired.

NOTE: Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the government all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

------- Original Message -------

On Friday, January 8th, 2021 at 10:20 AM, Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org> wrote:

To Whom it May Concern:

To provide you with an update, as per our inquiry with the City Attorney’s office, their office will require additional time to review potentially responsive records. I anticipate
providing you with an update or response by January 15, 2021 close of business, and will keep you apprised.

Sincerely,

—

Wilson L. Ng
Deputy Director of Operations

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

Phone: (415) 554-7725

Web: www.sfbos.org

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form

Disclosures: Personal information that is provided in communications to the Clerk of 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.

From: Ng, Wilson (BOS)
To Whom it May Concern:

On behalf of the Office of the Clerk of the Board, this is to confirm receipt of your inquiry and follow up.

Our office, in coordination with the Office of Supervisor Fewer has identified records potentially responsive request, and is currently in consultation with the City Attorney’s office to review.

I will follow up and provide you with an update by close of business tomorrow.

Thank you for your patience.

Sincerely,

—

Wilson L. Ng

Deputy Director of Operations

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102
Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form

Disclosures: Personal information that is provided in communications to the Clerk of 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.

From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, January 7, 2021 9:23 AM

To: FewerStaff (BOS) <fewerstaff@sfgov.org>; Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>; Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org>; Records, Supervisor (CAT) <Supervisor.records@sfcityatty.org>

Subject: Re: Sandra Fewer - Immediate Disclosure Request for one email of yours

 Supervisor of Records Dennis Herrera,
This is a 67.21(d) petition that the below request has not been complied with, a written determination that the record or any parts thereof are public, and an order for their disclosure.

Sent from ProtonMail mobile

-------- Original Message --------

On Jan 6, 2021, 1:02 PM, Anonymous < arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:

Hi Sup. Fewer staff,

You were going to update me on this request by Jan. 2 - any progress? It's a single email that I requested.

NOTE: Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the government all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous
On Thursday, December 24th, 2020 at 12:53 PM, Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:

Thanks - just so you know this is an email from a member of the public to Sup Fewer and the CAO. It is not an email between Fewer and the CAO as atty/client privileged. Please do know that after a request has been made, the record cannot be destroyed regardless of whether Sup Fewer leaves office.

NOTE: Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the government all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

Sent from ProtonMail Mobile
Hello,

Thank you for your inquiry. On behalf of the Office of Supervisor Sandra Lee Fewer, I am confirming receipt of your request.

Please note that in accordance with the second and fifth supplementals to the Mayor’s proclamation of local emergency, immediate disclosure request and public records production deadlines under San Francisco Administrative Code, Chapter 67 (Sunshine Ordinance), have been suspended for the duration of the COVID-19 state of emergency.

However, our office endeavors to respond to records requests within the normal deadlines as feasible.

As our office will require additional time to review potentially responsive records for privilege, we intend to provide you with an update or response by January 2, 2021 close of business, and will keep you apprised if additional time is required.
Thanks,

Angelina

From: Anonymous  
<arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>  
Sent: Wednesday, December 23, 2020 3:03 PM  
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS)  
<sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>; FewerStaff (BOS) <fewerstaff@sfgov.org>; Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org>  
Subject: Sandra Fewer - Immediate Disclosure Request for one email of yours

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

Supervisor Fewer,

Please produce the single email received by you at your official email address, with all attachments, on August 18, 2019 with a subject starting with "Code Enforcement Request:". You must minimally redact the record with citations as needed.

As of receipt of this request, you remain a public official subject to CPRA and Sunshine Ordinance.

Enjoy your soon-departure from being subject to public records requests =) and have a happy holiday.
NOTE: Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the government all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous
Mr. Pariser -

We have reached out to the department again, and they indicate they are not withholding records in response to your requests. They have indicated they are still working to respond to some of your requests and need clarification from you on others. Under the Sunshine Ordinance, the Supervisor of Records has jurisdiction to determine “whether the record requested, or any part of the record requested, is public.” (Admin. Code § 67.21(d)). Where a department has withheld or redacted a record based on a legal exemption, we evaluate whether the department has properly invoked the exemption. Other issues, such as the timeliness of the department’s response or the adequacy of its search for records are beyond our jurisdiction.

If the department ultimately withholds or redacts records in response to your request, feel free to contact us again and we will look into the question. Thank you.

Bradley Russi
Deputy City Attorney
Office of City Attorney Dennis Herrera
City Hall, Room 234
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., San Francisco, CA 94102 www.sfcityattorney.org

-----Original Message-----
From: Harry S. Pariser <Personal Info.>
Sent: Friday, February 5, 2021 6:06 PM
To: Supervisor Records (CAT) <supervisor.records@SFCITYATTY.ORG>
Subject: RE: Sunshine Requests

Mr. Russi:

That is not incorrect, and I had already informed them of that! (No response from them; I did, once more, tell them that the request was through the date of retrieval.).

I don't understand why a request for documents from Jan. 2018 to the date of retrieval (e.g. if that date is Feb. 1, 2021, then all documents through that date.

They sent — after months and months — only a few documents for 2018. No 2019, 2020 or 2021 documents were included.

They had not sent any documents whatsoever before I contacted you recently.

There are also two other searches outstanding, and it does not appear that they have done any work whatsoever on them.

Please see attachments.
Thank you.

Harry S. Pariser

On Fri, 5 Feb 2021 23:24:43 +0000, "Supervisor Records (CAT)" <supervisor.records@SFCITYATTY.ORG> wrote:

We are informed that Rec Park has produced all documents in its possession responsive to your requests. Thank you.

Bradley Russi  
Deputy City Attorney  
Office of City Attorney Dennis Herrera  
(415) 554-4645 Direct  
City Hall, Room 234  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., San Francisco, CA 94102 www.sfcityattorney.org

-----Original Message-----
From: Harry S. Pariser  
Sent: Friday, February 5, 2021 11:52 AM  
To: Supervisor Records (CAT)  
Subject: Sunshine Requests

Staff:

I have made a number of requests to Tiffany at RPD from last May.

One request, which asked from emails from Andrea Jadwin through the date the records were retrieved (e.g. 2018, 2019, 2020) was answered, finally, but only with a small number of documents since 2018.

What can be done to have RPD fill my requests?

Thank you.

Harry S. Pariser  
(land line)
Mr. Russi:

That is not incorrect, and I had already informed them of that! (No response from them; I did, once more, tell them that the request was through the date of retrieval.).

I don't understand why a request for documents from Jan. 2018 to the date of retrieval (e.g. if that date is Feb. 1, 2021, then all documents through that date.

They sent — after months and months — only a few documents for 2018. No 2019, 2020 or 2021 documents were included.

They had not sent any documents whatsoever before I contacted you recently.

There are also two other searches outstanding, and it does not appear that they have done any work whatsoever on them.

Please see attachments.

Thank you.

Harry S. Pariser
Staff:

I have made a number of requests to Tiffany at RPD from last May.

One request, which asked for emails from Andrea Jadwin through the date the records were retrieved (e.g. 2018, 2019, 2020) was answered, finally, but only with a small number of documents since 2018.

What can be done to have RPD fill my requests?

Thank you.

Harry S. Pariser
Request #20-3353

Please supply all departmental communications, including all attachments and e-mails and all other documents (including grants and contracts) which include the keyword "Andrea Jadwin" from January 2018 though the date these documents are retrieved.
Thank you.

Received August 27, 2020 via web

Departments Recreation and Parks

Requester Harry S. Pariser

Personal Info.

(land line)
Please supply all departmental communications, including all attachments and e-mails and all other documents (including grants and contracts) which include the keyword "Skystar"*, from January 2018 though the date these documents are retrieved.

Recommended steps

* Or "Observation Wheel." Please choose either "Skystar" or the complete phrase "Observation Wheel", depending on which one obtains more results. (E.g. if there are more results for "Skystar," use Skystar. Otherwise

Read more

Received: August 27, 2020 via web

Departments: Recreation and Parks

Requester: Harry S. Pariser

Documents

Public: (none)
Hi there

A message was sent to you regarding record request #20-3353:

Hi Mr. Pariser,

For the keywords "Andrea Jadwin" and "entrance", from January 2018 to 9/8/2020, there are 264 documents. Is there another keyword you can add to this search? Or perhaps narrow the time frame? This would help me in getting the documents as quickly as possible, as I will need to go through each email individually and redact if necessary.

Thank you

http://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/requests/20-3353
Hi there
A message was sent to you regarding record request #20-3354:

Hi Mr. Pariser,

For the keywords "Skystar" and "Parks Alliance", from January 2018 to 9/8/2020, there are 1082 documents. The search recognizes "Parks Alliance" as anything that includes the words "Parks", "Alliance", or "Parks Alliance". Is there another keyword you can add to this search? Or perhaps narrow the time frame? This would help me in getting the documents as quickly as possible, as I will need to go through each email individually and redact if necessary.

Thank you
February 19, 2021

Sent via email (arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com)

Re: Petition to Supervisor of Records

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter responds to your petition to the Supervisor of Records dated February 9, 2021, concerning a request to the Mayor’s Office. You contend that the Mayor’s Office unlawfully redacted information from a document produced in response to your request.

We find that Mayor’s Office properly redacted information constituting a draft recommendation of the author. See Administrative Code Sec. 67.24(a)(1); Government Code Sec. 6254(a).

Very truly yours,

DENNIS J. HERRERA
City Attorney

Bradley A. Russi
Deputy City Attorney
Buta, Odaya (CAT)

From: Russi, Brad (CAT) on behalf of Supervisor Records (CAT)
Sent: Friday, February 19, 2021 6:54 PM
To: 'Anonymous'
Subject: RE: RE: Mayor response for 20033?
Attachments: Ltr. to Anonymous 2.19.2021 (Mayor).pdf

Please see the attached response to your petition.

Bradley Russi
Deputy City Attorney
Office of City Attorney Dennis Herrera
City Hall, Room 234
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., San Francisco, CA 94102
www.sfcityattorney.org

From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 9, 2021 10:53 PM
To: Supervisor Records (CAT) <supervisor.records@SFCITYATTY.ORG>
Subject: Fwd: RE: Mayor response for 20033?

Supervisor of Records Herrera:

This is a 67.21(d) petition that the so-called "draft recommendations" redactions on the attached 10.28.2019 record are public and an order for their disclosure against the Office of the Mayor. This document is not a "draft" at all, and thus cannot be exempt under 67.24(a)(1).

NOTE: 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

Sent from ProtonMail Mobile

-------- Forwarded message --------
From: Heckel, Hank (MYR)<hank.heckel@sfgov.org>
Date: On Tue, Feb 9, 2021 at 10:46 PM
Subject: Fwd: RE: Mayor response for 20033?
To: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Cc: MayorSunshineRequests, MYR (MYR) <mayorsunshinerequests@sfgov.org>
Anonymous,

Please see the attached records responsive to your request below. Please note that certain personal contact information has been redacted to protect personal privacy. See California Constitution, Art. I, Sec. 1; Cal. Govt. Code Secs. 6254(c). Additionally, certain material has been redacted because it constitutes the draft recommendation of the author of the document. See Admin Code 67.24(a)(1). The bases for the redactions are keyed on the documents themselves.

Regards,

Hank Heckel

Compliance Officer

Office of the Mayor

City and County of San Francisco

From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 15, 2020 11:50 AM
To: Heckel, Hank (MYR) <hank.heckel@sfgov.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Cc: Leger, Cheryl (BOS) <cheryl.leger@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: Mayor response for 20033?

Mayor Breed and Office of the Mayor:

This is an immediate disclosure request for all scheduling communications (such as via the scheduling office email list or Selina Sun), pre-meeting prep notes or presentations of any kind, and during- or post-meeting minutes or notes of any kind, prepared by or for anyone in the Office of the Mayor reflecting the following six meetings:
NOTE: Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the government all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

------- Original Message -------
On Thursday, December 10th, 2020 at 2:46 PM, Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:

Mayor Breed,
I offered all the other respondents a compromise that I’m happy to offer you as well:

OFFER OF COMPROMISE:

1. The Respondent official London Breed provides corrected calendar entries that fully comply with SFAC 67.29-5 for all examples in the complaint. I will review for completeness.
2. The Respondent official personally signs the following on official letterhead, addressed to myself (as “Anonymous arecordrequestor@protonmail.com”) and to SOTF, and publishes the letter for as long as they remain subject to SFAC 67.29-5 on their public records webpage (or if no such page exists, from their main official website), with a hyperlink titled “SF Admin Code 67.29-5 Daily (Proposition G) Calendar Public Records Consent Agreement” and of no less prominence than the remainder of the webpage body.

   I, London Breed, admit that I violated SF Admin Code 67.29-5 in SOTF 20033 Anonymous v. Mayor London Breed by failing to record and disclose the statement of issues discussed at one or more meetings. Attached to this letter are corrected entries for all meetings at issue in the complaint. I represent that the attached entries constitute an accurate accounting of all of those meetings in compliance with all requirements of SF Admin Code 67.29-5. I agree that I will hereafter comply with all requirements of SF Admin Code 67.29-5, including but not limited to recording a general statement of issues discussed at every meeting not publicly recorded, and I understand this agreement may be used in a future complaint as evidence of willful violation of the Sunshine Ordinance, and that I may be personally held responsible before the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, Ethics Commission, and/or Superior Court if I fail to comply. This agreement shall be published on my official website as long as I remain subject to SF Admin Code 67.29-5.
3. If (1) and (2) are completed to my satisfaction, I will move to dismiss this SOTF case (but I do not waive any other rights, including but not limited to other SOTF cases against the same respondent).

NOTE: Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include
any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the government all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

Sent from ProtonMail Mobile

On Thu, Dec 10, 2020 at 1:06 PM, Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:

SOTF,

My reply is:

A "general statement of issues discussed" is required if the meeting is not publicly recorded.

The PropG, Mayor calendar (i.e. the backward-looking Prop G calendar) contains the following:

"Meeting with Superintendent Matthews" is not a general statement of issues discussed.
"Meeting Re: Policy" is not a general statement of issues discussed.
"Senior Staff Check In" is not a general statement of issues discussed (this meeting occurs periodically, and surely the *issues discussed* change each time, which is why I focus on this meeting particularly).
"Meeting with Mayor Seinberg" is not a general statement of issues discussed.

Here are some "issues" that could be "discussed":
- COVID-19 stay-at-home orders, immigration policy, homelessness, corruption, hiring, budget for DPW, public records, a particular ordinance, etc.

I am not asking for detail, but Breed must record one or more *issues* that were *discussed*. And not all the ones that *could* be discussed, but the actual ones that *were* discussed.
It is their responsibility to record the general statement of issues discussed.

NOTE: Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the government all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

------ Original Message ------

On Thursday, December 10th, 2020 at 12:55 PM, Heckel, Hank (MYR) <hank.heckel@sfgov.org> wrote:

> To SOTF:
> 
> The response of the Office of the Mayor in complaint 20033 re the Mayor’s Prop G calendar is as follows:
> 
> - The Office of the Mayor fully supports the requirements of Prop G calendars for elected officials and it is our practice to faithfully keep such a calendar with the requisite information of date, time, place, attendees and subject matter.
> - Anonymous has not identified any significant gaps or absences in these elements.
> - We believe the provided descriptions are accurate and sufficient. They provide information from which a member of the public can discern the general subject matter of the meeting.
> - Full agendas are not required for the meetings listed.
> - We can always work with Anonymous to fill in any gaps and provide more information where it may have been missed due to an oversight.
> 
> Regards,
> 
> Hank Heckel
> 
> Sent from my iPhone
> 
> On Dec 9, 2020, at 7:35 PM, Anonymous arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com wrote:
> 
> This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open
Supervisor of Records Herrera:

This is a 67.21(d) petition that the so-called "draft recommendations" redactions on the attached 10.28.2019 record are public and an order for their disclosure against the Office of the Mayor. This document is not a "draft" at all, and thus cannot be exempt under 67.24(a)(1).

NOTE: 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

Sent from ProtonMail Mobile

-------- Forwarded message --------
From: Heckel, Hank (MYR)<hank.heckel@sfgov.org>
Date: On Tue, Feb 9, 2021 at 10:46 PM
Subject: Fwd: RE: Mayor response for 20033?
To: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Cc: MayorSunshineRequests, MYR (MYR) <mayorsunshinerequests@sfgov.org>

Anonymous,

Please see the attached records responsive to your request below. Please note that certain personal contact information has been redacted to protect personal privacy. See California Constitution, Art. I, Sec. 1; Cal. Govt. Code Secs. 6254(c). Additionally, certain material has been redacted because it constitutes the draft recommendation of the author of the document. See Admin Code 67.24(a)(1). The bases for the redactions are keyed on the documents themselves.

Regards,
Mayor Breed and Office of the Mayor:

This is an immediate disclosure request for all scheduling communications (such as via the scheduling office email list or Selina Sun), pre-meeting prep notes or presentations of any kind, and during- or post-meeting minutes or notes of any kind, prepared by or for anyone in the Office of the Mayor reflecting the following six meetings:
NOTE: Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the government all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

-------- Original Message --------
On Thursday, December 10th, 2020 at 2:46 PM, Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:

    Mayor Breed,
I offered all the other respondents a compromise that I'm happy to offer you as well:

OFFER OF COMPROMISE:

1. The Respondent official London Breed provides corrected calendar entries that fully comply with SFAC 67.29-5 for all examples in the complaint. I will review for completeness.
2. The Respondent official personally signs the following on official letterhead, addressed to myself (as “Anonymous arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com”) and to SOTF, and publishes the letter for as long as they remain subject to SFAC 67.29-5 on their public records webpage (or if no such page exists, from their main official website), with a hyperlink titled “SF Admin Code 67.29-5 Daily (Proposition G) Calendar Public Records Consent Agreement” and of no less prominence than the remainder of the webpage body.

I, London Breed, admit that I violated SF Admin Code 67.29-5 in SOTF 20033 Anonymous v. Mayor London Breed by failing to record and disclose the statement of issues discussed at one or more meetings. Attached to this letter are corrected entries for all meetings at issue in the complaint. I represent that the attached entries constitute an accurate accounting of all of those meetings in compliance with all requirements of SF Admin Code 67.29-5. I agree that I will hereafter comply with all requirements of SF Admin Code 67.29-5, including but not limited to recording a general statement of issues discussed at every meeting not publicly recorded, and I understand this agreement may be used in a future complaint as evidence of willful violation of the Sunshine Ordinance, and that I may be personally held responsible before the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, Ethics Commission, and/or Superior Court if I fail to comply. This agreement shall be published on my official website as long as I remain subject to SF Admin Code 67.29-5.

3. If (1) and (2) are completed to my satisfaction, I will move to dismiss this SOTF case (but I do not waive any other rights, including but not limited to other SOTF cases against the same respondent).

NOTE: Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include
any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the government all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

Sent from ProtonMail Mobile

On Thu, Dec 10, 2020 at 1:06 PM, Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:

SOTF,

My reply is:

A "general statement of issues discussed" is required if the meeting is not publicly recorded.

The PropG, Mayor calendar (i.e. the backward-looking Prop G calendar) contains the following:

"Meeting with Superintendent Matthews" is not a general statement of issues discussed.
"Meeting Re: Policy" is not a general statement of issues discussed.
"Senior Staff Check In" is not a general statement of issues discussed (this meeting occurs periodically, and surely the *issues discussed* change each time, which is why I focus on this meeting particularly).
"Meeting with Mayor Seinberg" is not a general statement of issues discussed.

Here are some "issues" that could be "discussed":
- COVID-19 stay-at-home orders, immigration policy, homelessness, corruption, hiring, budget for DPW, public records, a particular ordinance, etc.

I am not asking for detail, but Breed must record one or more *issues* that were *discussed*. And not all the ones that *could* be discussed, but the actual ones that *were* discussed.
It is their responsibility to record the general statement of issues discussed.

NOTE: Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the government all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

-------- Original Message --------

On Thursday, December 10th, 2020 at 12:55 PM, Heckel, Hank (MYR) <hank.heckel@sfgov.org> wrote:

> To SOTF:
> 
> The response of the Office of the Mayor in complaint 20033 re the Mayor’s Prop G calendar is as follows:
> 
> - The Office of the Mayor fully supports the requirements of Prop G calendars for elected officials and it is our practice to faithfully keep such a calendar with the requisite information of date, time, place, attendees and subject matter.
> - Anonymous has not identified any significant gaps or absences in these elements.
> - We believe the provided descriptions are accurate and sufficient. They provide information from which a member of the public can discern the general subject matter of the meeting.
> - Full agendas are not required for the meetings listed.
> - We can always work with Anonymous to fill in any gaps and provide more information where it may have been missed due to an oversight.
>
> Regards,
>
> Hank Heckel
>
> Sent from my iPhone

>> On Dec 9, 2020, at 7:35 PM, Anonymous arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com wrote:
>>
>> This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open
Subject: Meeting Re: Policy
Location: City Hall, Room 200, Mayor's Office
Start: Mon 10/21/2019 1:10 PM
End: Mon 10/21/2019 1:36 PM
Meeting: Superintendent Vince Matthews

Date: Monday, October 21, 2019

AGENDA

1. California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress
2. Arts 135 Debrief
3. Teacher Stipend Update
4. Our Children, Our Families Council
   a. October 22 Meeting
   b. Council goals and outcomes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Subject:</strong></th>
<th>Senior Staff Check In</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
<td>Remote Conference Call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Start:</strong></td>
<td>Wed 11/13/2019 9:05 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End:</strong></td>
<td>Wed 11/13/2019 9:12 AM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
December 23, 2019
Monday

9:00 AM - 9:30 AM
Meeting Re: Senior Staff Check In -- Remote Conference Call
Attendees:
• Mayor's Office Staff

12:44 PM - 1:17 PM
Meeting with Mayor Steinberg -- City Hall, Room 200, Mayor's Office
Attendees:
• Darrell Steinberg, Mayor, City and County of Sacramento
• Mayor's Office Staff
Subject: Courtesy Call with Mayor of Heidelberg, Germany
Location: City Hall, Room 200, Mayor's Office
Start: Mon 10/28/2019 2:06 PM
End: Mon 10/28/2019 2:39 PM
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Subject:</strong></th>
<th>Meeting with Superintendent Matthews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
<td>City Hall, Room 200, Mayor's Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Start:</strong></td>
<td>Mon 10/21/2019 2:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End:</strong></td>
<td>Mon 10/21/2019 2:23 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEETING OVERVIEW

MEETING: “Courtesy Call” with Mayor of Heidelberg, Germany
MEETING DATE: Monday, October 28, 2019
STAFF ADVANCE/CELL #: Natalie Waugh
NOTES PREPARED BY: Natalie Waugh
LOCATION: Mayor’s Office and Room 201
START/END: 2:00 – 2:30 PM
MLB START/END: 2:00 – 2:30 PM
ATTACHMENTS: HCI San Francisco Meeting Presentation; Transatlantic Cooperation Agreement

MAYOR’S ROLE:
1. “COURTESY CALL” WITH HEIDELBERG MAYOR ECKART WÜRZNER;
2. MEET AND GREET WITH HEIDELBERG CLUB

Madam Mayor: You will meet one-on-one for fifteen minutes (the event is officially called a “courtesy call” but is an in-person meeting) with Professor Doctor Eckart Würzner ["EK-hart VER-zz-ner"], the Mayor of Heidelberg, Germany and President of the Heidelberg Club International (HCI). HCI is an international organization that promotes the City of Heidelberg to the world.

(Note: Although he has many titles, you should refer to him as Mayor Würzner.)

You met Mayor Würzner in June 2019, when you both attended the In-person session for the Bloomberg Harvard City Leadership Initiative in New York. Your chief of staff met Mayor Würzner’s chief of staff in July 2019.

Mayor Würzner will be in San Francisco in his capacity as President of HCI, meeting with members of the San Francisco Chapter of HCI. Your chief of staff offered conference room meeting space at City Hall for this meeting.

Following your one-on-one meeting, you will then greet Heidelberg City Director Nicole Huber and 11 members of the San Francisco Chapter of HCI in Room 201. This is an informal meeting with no speaking program.

Mayor Würzner will likely ask you to join the HCI. The HCI has invited each of the last four Mayors of San Francisco to join. They have not accepted.

On the morning of Friday, October 25, 2019, staff received the attached document from Mayor Würzner’s office. It is entitled “Transatlantic Cooperation Agreement Heidelberg – San Francisco.” The agreement reads: “The City of San Francisco, United States and the City of Heidelberg, Germany recognize and agree upon the significance of international cooperation regarding
environmental protection. This goal-oriented memorandum of understanding represents a transatlantic endeavor to sustain an accelerate commitment of addressing environmental challenges.” Among other text, the MOU commits both cities to “bilateral support one another through exchange of environmentally relevant data. Included in this exchange are experiences, individually defined goals, development opportunities and challenges. Fields of interest include energy efficiency, traffic and transportation, natural resource protection and waste reduction with sustainable growth.”

Draft Recommendation

Staff has communicated to Mayor Würzner’s staff that you do not intend to sign the document during the meeting on Monday.

ATTENDEES

Eckart Würzner, Mayor of the City of Heidelberg and President of the Heidelberg Club International
Nicole Huber, City Director of Heidelberg, Chief of Staff to Mayor Würzner, and General Manager of the Heidelberg Club International
Christine Linnenbach, Chairwoman of the San Francisco Chapter of the Heidelberg Club International
P.K. Agarwal, Board Member of the San Francisco Chapter of the Heidelberg Club International and Co-founder of Manufacturing Institutes
Doctor Siegfried J. W. Ruppert, Board Member of the San Francisco Chapter of the Heidelberg Club International and Partner at Taylor English Duma LLP
Dr. Karl J. Kaussen, Active Member of the San Francisco Chapter of the Heidelberg Club International and Principal at Biotext, LLC
Patricia Kaussen, wife of Karl J. Kaussen
Peter Kohler, Active Member of the San Francisco Chapter of the Heidelberg Club International and General Manager of the InterContinental Hotel San Francisco
Michael E. Willis, Active Member of the San Francisco Chapter of the Heidelberg Club International
Dr. Wolfgang Linnenbach, Alumnus of the San Francisco Chapter of the Heidelberg Club International and Associate Clinical Professor (ret.)
Georgia H. Meagher, Alumna of the San Francisco Chapter of the Heidelberg Club International and Attorney at Law (ret.)
Nataly Funk, New Admittant to the San Francisco Chapter of the Heidelberg Club International and Office Manager and Accountant at GACC West
BACKGROUND

About Heidelberg Club International (HCI)
In their own words, the mission of HCI is to draw into its international Chapters colleagues from the senior ranks of a number of disciplines (i.e., science, industry, culture, academia, politics, and creative industries), and to extend a spirit of cooperation and friendship through projects, initiatives, and public events around the world, with an overall aim to develop an awareness of the City of Heidelberg its attributes and values, and to improve international cooperation with Germany.

Heidelberg approaches the HCI mission above by first identifying its own competencies of international significance: sciences and humanities; environmental strategies and management; sustainable tourism; and modern service-oriented municipal administration. The city is also well known for its high standards in music, the visual arts, creative writing, and communications media. Heidelberg endeavors to share its expertise by way of joint projects and international collaboration with its HCI Chapters and their members.

The Club’s Officers include Mayor Würzner, as President, and the Chief of Staff of the Mayor’s Office, Nicole Huber, as General Manager. The Officers of the HCI strive to serve the interests of its members while maintaining the standards of the organization in the pursuit of its goals.

Membership in HCI is selective and restrictive so that the benefits of membership may be maintained in a timely fashion and with the utmost standards of quality. Membership is at the discretion of the officers of HCI and includes distinguished individuals who support the basic objectives of the organization. It is the personal privilege of the President to welcome honorary members. When a member retires, he/she becomes an alumnus/a.

Chapters
The Heidelberg Club International comprises twelve Chapters: two in Europe (Heidelberg and London), four in the USA (New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, and San Francisco), and six in Asia (Seoul, Tokyo, Osaka, Beijing, Shanghai, and New Delhi). Each Chapter is presided over by a Chairman, supported by a Board of Directors. Once a year, each chapter holds an official meeting in the presence of the President and Mayor of Heidelberg. Further meetings are encouraged. The yearly Bulletin, a newsletter, and the website, connect the HCI members worldwide and keep them up to date on what is going on in the various chapters and in Heidelberg.
The San Francisco HCI Chapter meeting on October 28 at City Hall will focus on Heidelberg’s sustainability efforts, such as improving energy efficiency; expanding green transit options like city bicycles, public transit, and ridesharing; and sharing best practices in green construction. The presentation for their meeting is attached.

About Heidelberg, Germany

The first settlement of the area of present-day Heidelberg can be traced back to Roman and Celtic times. First mentioned in 1196, Heidelberg was planned and built, together with the castle, in the 13th century. Heidelberg’s heyday as the capital of the Electoral Palatinate began not least with the foundation of the university – the oldest in Germany – in 1386.

Towards the end of the 17th century, during the War of the Palatinate Succession, the city and the castle were destroyed by the French. The city retained its medieval ground plan, but was rebuilt in the Baroque style. In 1803 Heidelberg passed to Baden and became an important university town and a popular tourist destination – also for poets and philosophers, such as Friedrich Hölderlin, Clemens Brentano, and Joseph von Eichendorff, who made Heidelberg the “City of Romanticism”.

In 1945 during World War II, Heidelberg was taken by American forces without major destruction and subsequently became the headquarters of the U.S. Army in Europe and of NATO. The building of the university campus at "Neuenheimer Feld" in 1951 finally sealed its claim to being a city of science. It was only logical that this was followed by the establishment of a technology park in 1984. Around 80 companies and research establishments make this science campus one of the world’s foremost biotechnology centers.

In the last few years, a new district has taken shape near the city center on the site of the old freight station: hence its name Bahnstadt which means “Railway City”. Bahnstadt was built with the intention of providing an ideal space for thousands of people to live, work and do their research there in the near future. Many projects are in the process of implementation. Some, like the Zollhofgarten day-care center, have been realized already. Others are just about to begin. The conversion areas of the U.S. Army, for example, provide unique opportunities for housing, cultural events or the resettlement of companies.
Heidelberg takes great pride in its development as an advanced bio-tech center. Heidelberg University campus hosts a Technology Park that hosts over 90 companies and research bodies with a total of 2,800 staff that conduct important work and collaborate with many international bodies including the European Molecular Biology Laboratory.

About German-Americans
In the 1670s, the first significant groups of German immigrants arrived in the British colonies, settling primarily in Pennsylvania, New York, and Virginia. Immigration continued in very large numbers during the 19th century, with 8 million arrivals from Germany. Between 1820 and 1870, over 7.5 million German immigrants came to the United States. By 2010, their population grew to 49.8 million German Americans, reflecting a jump of 6 million people since 2000.

There is a "German belt" that extends all the way across the United States, from eastern Pennsylvania to the Oregon coast. Pennsylvania has the largest population of German-Americans in the U.S. and is home to one of the group's original settlements, Germantown (Philadelphia), founded in 1683 and the birthplace of the American antislavery movement in 1688, as well as the revolutionary Battle of Germantown. The state of Pennsylvania has 3.5 million people of German ancestry.

From 1840 to 1880, they were the largest group of immigrants. Following the Revolutions of 1848 in the German states, a wave of political refugees fled to America, who became known as Forty-Eighters. They included professionals, journalists, and politicians. Prominent Forty-Eighters included Carl Schurz and Henry Villard.

Texas attracted many Germans who entered through Galveston and Indianola, both those who came to farm, and later immigrants who more rapidly took industrial jobs in cities such as Houston. As in Milwaukee, Germans in Houston built the brewing industry. By the 1920s, the first generation of college-educated German Americans were moving into the chemical and oil industries.

Texas had about 20,000 German Americans in the 1850s. They did not form a uniform bloc, but were highly diverse and drew from geographic areas and all sectors of European society, except that very few aristocrats or upper middle-class businessmen arrived. In this regard, Texas Germania was a microcosm of the Germania nationwide.

Between 1931 and 1940, 114,000 Germans moved to the United States, many of whom—including Nobel Prize winner Albert Einstein and author Erich Maria Remarque—were Jewish Germans or anti-Nazis fleeing government oppression. President Franklin D. Roosevelt sought out Americans of German ancestry for top war jobs, including General Dwight D. Eisenhower, Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, and USAAF General Carl Andrew Spaatz. He appointed Republican Wendell Willkie (who ironically ran against Roosevelt in the 1940 presidential election) as...
personal representative. German Americans who had fluent German language skills were an important asset to wartime intelligence, and they served as translators and as spies for the United States. The war evoked strong pro-American patriotic sentiments among German Americans, few of whom by then had contacts with distant relatives in the old country.

Today, German Americans who immigrated after World War II share the same characteristics as any other Western European immigrant group in the U.S. They are mostly professionals and academics who have come for professional reasons. Since the collapse of the Soviet Union and reunification, Germany has become a preferred destination for immigrants rather than a source of migrating peoples. In the 1990 U.S. Census, 58 million Americans claimed to be solely or partially of German descent. According to the 2005 American Community Survey, 50 million Americans have German ancestry. German Americans represent 17% of the total U.S. population and 26% of the non-Hispanic white population.

About German Culture in the United States
Germans have contributed to a vast number of areas in American culture and technology. Baron von Steuben, a former Prussian officer, led the reorganization of the U.S. Army during the War for Independence and helped make the victory against British troops possible. The Steinway & Sons piano manufacturing firm was founded by immigrant Henry E. Steinway in 1853. German settlers brought the Christmas tree custom and other German Christmas traditions to the United States. Carl Schurz, a refugee from the unsuccessful first German democratic revolution of 1848 became an influential politician first in the Republican then in the Democratic party, and served as U.S. Secretary of the Interior.

German Americans established the first kindergartens in the United States, introduced the Christmas tree tradition, and introduced popular foods such as hot dogs and hamburgers to America.

After World War II, Wernher von Braun, and most of the leading engineers from the former German V-2 rocket base at Peenemünde, were brought to the U.S. They contributed decisively to the development of U.S. military rockets, as well as rockets for the NASA space program and the initiation of the Apollo program to land on the Moon.

The influence of German cuisine is seen in the cuisine of the United States throughout the country, especially regarding pastries, meats and sausages, and above all, beer. Frankfurters (or “wiener”, originating from Frankfurt and Vienna, respectively), hamburgers, bratwurst, sauerkraut, and strudel are common dishes. German bakers introduced the pretzel, which is popular across the United States. Germans introduced America to lager, the most-produced beer style in the United States, and have been the dominant ethnic group in the beer industry since 1850.
The oldest extant brewery in the United States is D. G. Yuengling & Son of Pottsville, Pennsylvania founded in 1829 by an immigrant from Aldingen in what is today Baden-Württemberg; the brewery's flagship product remains a 19th-century German-style amber lager. By the late 19th century, Milwaukee, with a large population of German origin, was once the home to four of the world's largest breweries owned by ethnic Germans (Schlitz, Blatz, Pabst, and Miller) and was the number one beer producing city in the world for many years. Almost half of all current beer sales in the United States can be attributed to German immigrants, Capt. A. Pabst, Eberhard Anheuser, and Adolphus Busch, who founded Anheuser-Busch in St. Louis in 1860. Later German immigrants figured prominently in the rebirth of craft brews following Prohibition, culminating in the microbrew movement that swept the U.S. beginning in the late 1980s.

German and German-American celebrations, such as Oktoberfest, Rhenish Carnival, German-American Day and Von Steuben Day are held regularly throughout the country. One of the largest is the German-American Steuben Parade in New York City, held every third Saturday in September. There are also major annual events in Chicago's Lincoln Square neighborhood, a traditional center of the city's German population, in Cincinnati, where its annual Oktoberfest Zinzinnati is the largest Oktoberfest outside of Germany and in Milwaukee, which celebrates its German heritage with an annual German Fest.

Skat, the most popular card game in Germany, is also played in areas of the United States with large German American populations, such as Wisconsin and Texas.

One of the most popular news channels (Der Konservative by TWA media) on social media in Germany and Austria is entirely being produced by German Americans in Oakland, California.

Delicious German cuisine is featured at notable San Francisco restaurants Suppenküche, Walzwerk, Leopold’s, and Willkommen.

**German Culture in San Francisco**

In the 2010 census, it was reported that 8.2% of San Franciscans claim German ancestry. Curiously, only 4,215 people of the entire population of San Francisco (or 0.53%) speak German.

**“Lest We Forget” Photo Exhibit at San Francisco Civic Center Plaza**

May 2019 marked 74 years since the end of the Holocaust, and to remind those of its horrors — and its survivors — Lest We Forget, an installation by German artist Luigi Toscano, was hosted at Civic Center Plaza from April 17 through May 19, 2019. Comprised of 68 portraits of Holocaust survivors, including both local survivors and those from across the United States, Germany, Israel, Russia, and Ukraine, the portraits were meant to provide voice and visibility to these...
survivors. Each portrait stood over seven feet tall, and lined Civic Center plaza in such a way that allowed for visitors to walk among them. (You spoke about the exhibit at the Yom HaShoah (Holocaust Remembrance Day) event in the South Light Court in City Hall on May 2, 2019.)

**San Francisco-Kiel Sister City**

Established in September 2017 by Mayor Ed Lee and then-Supervisor Mark Farrell, the San Francisco-Kiel Sister City connects people and organizations through economics, education, technology and culture. Hanna Fleck is the San Francisco-Kiel Sister City Committee volunteer chair. The committee supports the development of networking that will increase cross cultural dialogue and understanding.

Since it was formed, delegations from Kiel have visited senior officials at the SFPUC to discuss how San Francisco could learn from Kiel’s international leadership in producing wind energy (through wind turbines alone, Kiel’s German province produces over 100% of the energy consumed by all of its residents), met with local university and high school representatives to discuss establishing student exchanges; and met with senior SFMTA officials to discuss the rollout of new Muni trains produced by Siemens in Germany.

Both cities have much in common, ranging from our coastal locations to our strong sailing communities. Germany is one of San Francisco’s largest overseas markets for tourism, and an important trade and investment partner.

**About the Goethe-Institut**

The Goethe-Institut is a nonprofit German cultural association operational worldwide, with 159 institutes. It promotes the study of the German language abroad and encourages international cultural exchange and relations. Around 246,000 people take part in these German courses per year. The San Francisco chapter was established in 1967.

The Goethe-Institut fosters knowledge about Germany by providing information on German culture, society, and politics. This includes the exchange of films, music, theater, and literature. Goethe cultural societies, reading rooms, and exam and language centers have played a role in the cultural and educational policies of Germany for more than 60 years.

It is named after German poet and statesman Johann Wolfgang von Goethe. The Goethe-Institut is autonomous and politically independent.

From October 2018 until the end of 2019, the Goethe-Institut is celebrating Germany and its deep ties to the U.S. in its campaign Wunderbar Together ("Deutschlandjahr USA"/The Year of German-American Friendship). A collection of events and exhibits revolving around business and industry, politics, education, culture, and science are traveling across the U.S. to highlight the unique importance of transatlantic relations.
Professor Doctor Eckart Würzner, Mayor of Heidelberg, Germany, and President of Heidelberg Club International

After attending high school in Frankfurt and Düsseldorf, Dr. Würzner studied geography in Mannheim and Heidelberg with geology and law as secondary subjects.

Dr. Würzner obtained a doctorate from the State of Baden-Wuerttemberg; his dissertation is entitled “Comparative influence of atmospheric environmental toxins on mortality rates in urban agglomerations”; (1988 – 1993; PhD awarded summa cum laude).

In 1988, Dr. Würzner began his professional career as environmental consultant to the administration of the City of Heidelberg. In addition to developing and directing the city’s environmental office, he was a founding member and managing director of the regional energy agency, and involved in setting up the Environmental Working Group of the German Association of Cities.

Dr. Würzner was involved in developing environmental and energy management in Rio de Janeiro and Curitiba (Brazil) for the Carl-Duisberg Gesellschaft, and he helped implement environmental seminars in Riyadh, Jeddah and Dhahran (Saudi Arabia) on behalf of the German Foreign Office. Dr. Würzner collaborated in an OECD working group that published a report on “Urban Energy Management”.

In 1996, Dr. Würzner assumed residence in the U.S. as a German Marshall Fund Fellow, preparing a study on American cities’ climate protection strategies for the Center for Clean Air Policy in Washington, with periods of residence in Washington, Minneapois, Chicago, Los Angeles, San Diego, Denver and visits to the Rocky Mountain Institute, the U.S. Department of Energy, and the EPA.

After six years as deputy mayor of the city of Heidelberg, Dr. Würzner’s portfolio included environment issues. In 2006, Dr. Würzner was elected mayor and re-elected in October 2014.

Dr. Würzner served as chairman of the supervisory boards of Stadtwerke Heidelberg and Heidelberg Marketing GmbH, the Technology Park, chairman of the administrative board of the Sparkasse Heidelberg, and regional chairman of the Climate Protection and Energy Advisory Agency.

Dr. Würzner is a member of the board and executive committee of the Association of German Cities, of the Baden-Württemberg Association of Cities, of the Regional Advisory Body for Sustainable Development, Baden-Württemberg, and of Zukunft Metropolregion Rhein-Neckar. He is also a member

Dr. Würzner’s additional associations include:
- Patronage of the International Weeks against Racism
- President of the European “Energy Cities” network
- President of Heidelberg Club International
- Member of the European Covenant of Mayors Board
- President of the Rhein-Neckar/Heidelberg branch of the German Red Cross.

Dr. Würzner is married to Janine Würzner; they have four children.

Nicole Huber, City Director of Heidelberg and General Manager of Heidelberg Club International
Ms. Huber is the driving force behind Heidelberg’s smart city development. She is an expert on the topic of digitalization of local governments. Ms. Huber successfully leads the city through national and international competitions on how to create a better tomorrow.

Bios and photos are not available for the remaining attendees:
Christine Linnenbach
P.K. Agarwal
Doctor Siegfried J. W. Ruppert
Dr. Karl J. Kaussen
Patricia Kaussen
Peter Kohler
Michael E. Willis
Dr. Wolfgang Linnenbach
Nataly Funk
Jens Weitzel

STAFF: Natalie Waugh, California Const.
Mr. Goodrich –

I understand that the District Attorney’s Office has now responded to your request below. If you believe they have unlawfully withheld or redacted records pursuant to an exemption to the Public Records Act, please let us know. Otherwise, we consider your petition closed. Thank you.

Bradley Russi  
Deputy City Attorney  
Office of City Attorney Dennis Herrera  
City Hall, Room 234  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., San Francisco, CA 94102  
www.sfcityattorney.org

From: jeremy goodrich < >  
Sent: Tuesday, February 16, 2021 9:31 AM  
To: Supervisor Records (CAT) <supervisor.records@sfcityatty.org>  
Subject: Re: IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE REQUEST FOR PUBLIC RECORDS “Milan Ward” Case # 21000962 charging and release documents

Hello,

I have yet to receive any of the public records I had requested from the district attorney. I would like to follow up with you.

Jeremy

On Feb 10, 2021, at 6:45 PM, jeremy goodrich < > wrote:

Thank you. Is there no time limit for them to send this information?

Jeremy

On Feb 10, 2021, at 6:37 PM, Supervisor Records (CAT) <supervisor.records@sfcityatty.org> wrote:

Thank you. Under the Sunshine Ordinance, the Supervisor of Records has jurisdiction to determine “whether the record requested, or any part of the
record requested, is public.” (Admin. Code § 67.21(d)). Where a department has withheld or redacted a record based on a legal exemption, we evaluate whether the department has properly invoked the exemption. Other issues, such as the timeliness of the department’s response or the adequacy of its search for records are beyond our jurisdiction.

Here, the department has not yet responded to your request. If the department ultimately withholds or redacts records in response to your request, feel free to contact us again and we will look into the question. Thank you.

Bradley Russi
Deputy City Attorney
Office of City Attorney Dennis Herrera
City Hall, Room 234
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., San Francisco, CA 94102
www.sfcityattorney.org

From: jeremy goodrich
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2021 6:32 PM
To: Supervisor Records (CAT) <supervisor.records@SFCITYATTY.ORG>
Subject: Fwd: IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE REQUEST FOR PUBLIC RECORDS “Milan Ward” Case # 21000962 charging and release documents

Attached is all of the emails for the request. Please note; I put in multiple requests and they only made this reply to ONE.

Jeremy

Begin forwarded message:

From: SFDA Public Records <SFDA.PublicRecords@sfgov.org>
Date: February 5, 2021 at 3:54:26 PM PST
To: jeremy goodrich
Subject: RE: IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE REQUEST FOR PUBLIC RECORDS “Milan Ward” Case # 21000962 charging and release documents

Thank you for checking in. I have requests in for all the files to see what responsive records exist. With COVID and working from home, everything takes longer than it should. I hope to have a response for all your requests by mid-week next week.

-----Original Message-----
From: jeremy goodrich
Sent: Friday, February 5, 2021 11:54 AM
To: SFDA Public Records <SFDA.PublicRecords@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE REQUEST FOR PUBLIC RECORDS “Milan Ward” Case # 21000962 charging and release documents

Hello,

I would like to check up on all of the record requests I have sent last
Friday?

Thank you,

Jeremy

On Jan 29, 2021, at 3:21 PM, SFDA Public Records <SFDA.PublicRecords@sfgov.org> wrote:

Thank you for your request. We cite Mayor London Breed’s March 30, 2020 Temporary Modification of Public Records Law During COVID-19 Local Emergency for additional time to respond in light of the pandemic. Our estimate is that we will respond within seven additional days, but this may change. We will keep you informed and encourage you to check in.

Best,

SFDA Public Records

-----Original Message-----

From: jeremy goodrich

Sent: Friday, January 29, 2021 3:03 PM

To: SFDA Public Records <SFDA.PublicRecords@sfgov.org>

Subject: IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE REQUEST FOR PUBLIC RECORDS “Milan Ward” Case # 21000962 charging and release documents

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

Please provide me with all records in your files that pertain to this case [Milan Ward Case #21000962], whether stored electronically or on hard copy files, that are subject to disclosure under the Sunshine Ordinance and the Public Records Act, including, without limitation:

1. The Complaint and any related charging filings
2. The Public Safety Assessment report and any related
documents 3. Any police reports 4. Any other records relating to his release on ankle monitor.
5. Any documents related to the lowering, amending or dropping of his initial charges 6. Any documents showing his prior arrests, offenses or warrant history.
7. Any records made to monitor his movements while he was placed on the ankle bracelet program.
8. Any records of court appearances and court dates, including missed appointments 9. Any records of warrant history

THESE DOCUMENTS ARE TO BE PRODUCED IMMEDIATELY PER APPLICABLE GOVERNMENT CODE AND SUNSHINE ORDINANCE

Thank you,

Jeremy
Buta, Odaya (CAT)

From: jeremy goodrich <Personal Info.>
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2021 10:05 AM
To: Supervisor Records (CAT)
Subject: SUNSHINE APPEAL:

City Department: San Francisco District Attorney

Records Requested: IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE REQUEST FOR PUBLIC RECORDS REGARDING CERTAIN COURT #'s.

Date of Request: 1/29/2021

I believe the decision to withhold these public records is unlawful because is it our right to see these records, as they are public records. It is important we know what is going on in our legal justice system as well.

Most District Attorney’s provide this information ASAP, but SFDA has used covid as an excuse. I would like these documents ASAP, per Sf Public Record Laws.

Contact info:

Thank you,
Jeremy
March 9, 2021

Sent via email (101873-82886409@requests.muckrock.com
101881-59039007@requests.muckrock
101880-62496108@requests.muckrock.com
arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com)

Re: Petition to Supervisor of Records

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter responds to the following petitions to the Supervisor of Records concerning prospective calendars of certain public officials:

1. A petition against the San Francisco Police Department (“SFPD”) dated September 16, 2020, from 101873-82886409@requests.muckrock.com, alleging SFPD unlawfully withheld parts of the prospective calendar of the Chief of Police

2. A petition against the City Attorney’s Office dated October 1, 2020, from 101881-59039007@requests.muckrock.com, alleging the City Attorney’s Office unlawfully withheld parts of the City Attorney’s prospective calendar

3. A petition against the Mayor’s Office, dated October 1, 2020, from 101880-62496108@requests.muckrock.com, alleging the Mayor’s Office unlawfully withheld parts of the Mayor’s prospective calendar

4. A petition against the City Attorney’s Office dated December 14, 2020, from arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com, alleging the City Attorney’s Office unlawfully withheld parts of the City Attorney’s prospective calendar

5. A petition against the City Attorney’s Office dated December 17, 2020, from arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com, which we understand contests the withholding of recurrence information concerning the City Attorney’s meetings

6. A petition against the Mayor’s Office, dated December 29, 2020, from arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com, alleging the Mayor’s Office unlawfully withheld parts of the Mayor’s prospective calendar

7. A petition dated February 12, 2021, from arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com that the requester states concerns the following requests for prospective calendars to several departments:
We previously determined that the Mayor and the Chief of Police may withhold prospective calendar entries to protect their personal safety, and we have also withheld the City Attorney’s prospective calendar on this basis. After further consideration of this issue, we have now concluded that these officials may safely and legally disclose certain information about future meetings, including the subject matter of the meeting and the attendees, if that information is recorded in their calendars, and the week during which the meeting will occur. Due to security concerns, the departments may continue to withhold the location, time, and specific date of each meeting. See Gov’t Code Sec. 6254(f), (k), Evid. Code Sec. 1040; Times Mirror Company v. Superior Court, 53 Cal.3d 1325 (1991); County of Los Angeles v. Superior Court, 82 Cal. App. 4th 819, 834-35 (2000).
Accordingly, we understand that the departments will respond to your requests consistent with this determination if they have not done so already. This response resolves the petitions above and we now consider them closed.

Very truly yours,

DENNIS J. HERRERA  
City Attorney

Bradley A. Russi  
Deputy City Attorney
Please see the attached response to your petition.

Bradley Russi  
Deputy City Attorney  
Office of City Attorney Dennis Herrera  
City Hall, Room 234  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., San Francisco, CA 94102  
www.sfcityattorney.org

Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>  
Sent: Friday, February 12, 2021 10:09 AM  
To: Dennis Herrera (City Attorney, SF) <dennis.herrera@sfgov.org>; Feitelberg, Brittany (CAT) <brittany.feitelberg@sfcityatty.org>; Supervisor Records (CAT) <supervisor.records@sfcityatty.org>; Miyamoto, Paul (SHF) <paul.miyamoto@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; Cox, Andrew (POL) <r.andrew.cox@sfgov.org>; Elsbernd, Sean (MYR) <sean.elsbernd@sfgov.org>; Bruss, Andrea (MYR) <andrea.bruss@sfgov.org>; Heckel, Hank (MYR) <hank.heckel@sfgov.org>; Lambert, Alison (SHF) <alison.lambert@sfgov.org>

Subject: New future and non-Prop G and ICS and personal calendar petitions - 67.21(d)

Supervisor of Records Herrera,

This constitutes a new distinct petition under SFAC 67.21(d) for each request listed below for a written determination that some or all of the records (or parts thereof) withheld in the following requests are public and orders for their disclosure. I am challenging all the withholdings - including the complete withholding of all future calendar info; and also of the date and time and recurrence information of all meetings; and also of the location of those future meetings not protected by SFPD or SFSD, and thus where the location is not a security procedure of a local police agency and thus not exempt under Gov Code 6254(f); and also of the non-Prop G calendar entries; and also of the ICS calendar metadata; and also of the failure to search personal accounts holding meeting information about the conduct of public business.

1. 81242-04060798@requests.muckrock.com Oct 4, 2019 request to Mayor Breed and her Office for the Mayor's Oct 21-28 future calendar entries
2. 81411-90616367@requests.muckrock.com Dec 8, 2019 request to City Attorney Herrera and his Office for the Dec 18-26 Herrera future calendar entries
3. 81411-90616367@requests.muckrock.com Oct 8, 2019 request to City Attorney Herrera and his Office for the Oct 21-28 Herrera future calendar entries
4. the entirety of requests numbered 1, 2, and 7 of my Jan 23, 2020 email from this email address to City Attorney Herrera for his future calendars and past ICS calendars titled "New Immediate Disclosure Request - Preserve All Records - WAS: Re: New Complaint - Alteration of Public Records - City Attorney" which were provided only partially or not at all
5. 81412-71801448@requests.muckrock.com Oct 8, 2019 request to Chief Scott and SFPD for the Oct 21-28 Scott future calendar entries AND for a San Jose search

6. 81412-71801448@requests.muckrock.com Sept 29, 2020 request to Chief Scott and SFPD for the Oct 1-14 Scott future calendar entries

7. 84168-39742724@requests.muckrock.com Nov 6, 2020 request to Sheriff Miyamoto and SFSD for the Feb 14-28, 2021 Miyamoto future calendar entries

8. 84161-98819586@requests.muckrock.com Dec 7, 2019 request to the Controller for his calendar entries which redacted the future recurrence information

9. All requests from this email address on Dec 29, 2020 to Mayor Breed and her Office for various future calendar entries

10. All requests from 82814-07144940@requests.muckrock.com to Mayor Breed and her Office for various future calendar entries AND for non-Prop G calendar entries (future and past) AND for ICS calendar entries AND for San Jose personal calendar searches, all of which are for Breed AND for certain subordinates including Elsbernd and Bruss; requests dated Nov 2, 2019; Nov 8, 2019; Nov 16, 2019; Nov 21, 2019; Nov 27, 2019; Dec 7, 2019; Dec 13, 2019; Dec 19, 2019; Dec 27, 2019; Jan 3, 2020; Jan 13, 2020; Jan 24, 2020; Jan 31, 2020; Feb 8, 2020; Feb 18, 2020; Feb 21, 2020; March 2, 2020; March 7, 2020; March 16, 2020; April 6, 2020; May 5, 2020; and May 20, 2020. I suspect that at least for Elsbernd and Bruss, the records were not retained at the time I made the request and may now be destroyed, which is itself unlawful per your Good Government Guide as they may be impossible to produce even though they existed when I requested them.

You also have numerous other future calendar petitions still pending (at least MuckRock #s 101880, 101881, and more). All of them must receive a written determination.

Also note that Russi sending me an email purporting to simply close out my petitions and refuse to issue a determination is not a determination pursuant to SF Admin Code 67.21(d) - because unlike the petition letters such emails are not responses under Dennis Herrera's name. Only Dennis Herrera is the Supervisor of Records, not DCA Russi. The Ethics Commission was sued (and lost) for refusing to rule on Sunshine matters as the law requires. Don't refuse to respond to my petitions just because the City is perpetually wrong. SOTF might not be willing to force you to do your job, but a court can. I will get my petition responses and the City's unlawful behavior will be recorded permanently in the Supervisor of Records annual report.

Since your prior, wrong, rulings on these matters:

- SOTF has ordered disclosed the Chief of Police's future calendars and the Mayor's future calendars in redacted form and the Mayor's ICS calendars.
- You, as City Attorney, changed your mind and your office stated the following regarding your own future calendars:

> In light of recent discussions at the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force regarding public officials’ disclosure of their future calendars, we have re-evaluated the legal question and consulted with the Police Department about security risks. Following that evaluation, we have concluded that in most circumstances the City Attorney may safely and legally disclose certain information about his future meetings, including the subject matter of the meeting and the attendees, if that information is recorded in his calendar, and the week during which the meeting will occur. Due to security concerns, we will continue to withhold the location, time, and specific date of each meeting. There may be circumstances in the future where information about the subject matter or attendees of a meeting should be withheld.
based on fact-specific security concerns or other legal grounds, but your current request does not raise those concerns.

- The Mayor has produced some portion of her future calendars and some ICS calendars and some non-Prop G calendars in other requests.

Therefore, all of your prior determinations regarding these types of matters were legally wrong.

My arguments below apply to all of the petitions herein.

A. Non-Prop G and personally-held business-related calendar entries - Nothing exempts this information and the fact that information is not mentioned in SFAC 67.29-5 does not exclude it from the CPRA term "public record." See your own responses and the Orders in SOTF 19047 and 19112 and their associated Sup of Records petitions and City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017).

B. ICS calendar metadata - The Mayor's Office has produced these in one request, but not the other requests. They have now admitted the information is public and disclosable and must produce it. For pre-March 2020 requests, that is enough. For post-March 2020 requests under the Mayor's purported COVID orders (which we do not concede are valid), the Dept of Technology has a system to help produce the metadata automatically, and thus there is no extraordinary effort required to produce them, and Gov Code 6255 is inapplicable.

C. Future calendar entries

- Gov Code 6254(f) applies solely to security procedures of a local police agency. The specific portions of a calendar entry that constitute security procedures of a police agency (not procedures of the official, but procedures of SFPD or SFSD) may be redacted and the remainder of the record produced.
- A department head or elected official cannot logically acquire their own calendar in confidence, and thus Evidence Code 1040 cannot apply in any form. Regardless, even if it did, there is no harm to the interest of justice and no state or federal law prohibiting disclosure is cited, thus EC 1040 still does not apply. The only exception would be, for example, a meeting with a confidential informant or whistleblower, for which the name (under Evid Code 1041) and the confidential portions of the complaint (under Evid Code 1040) may be properly exempt.
- For requests prior to the March 2020 COVID orders, Times Mirror v. Superior Court (1991) cannot apply in any form to requests in San Francisco because the Court relies, solely, on the prohibited catch-all Gov Code 6255 (due to SFAC 67.34(g,i)).
- Even if Times Mirror did apply in San Francisco, it applies solely to the Governor's past calendars because such knowledge would allow inference of future patterns of the Governor. No one here is the Governor, and past calendars are already explicitly public in SF due to SF Admin Code 67.29-5. Thus the threat described in Times Mirror does not apply here since the future pattern information is already available in the past calendars. Pursuant to Proposition 59, the Constitution does not allow broadening the construction of a court ruling that exempts information, and the Court never ruled on local officials or future calendars.
- Furthermore, Times Mirror discusses both a security interest and a deliberative process interest. Therefore, even for post-COVID requests (though we do not concede that the Mayor's emergency orders are valid nevertheless), the deliberative process interest is not one that is protected in SF. The fact that controversial topics or attendees might be discouraged by pre-decision making transparency is NOT a cognizable exemption in San Francisco (SF Admin Code 67.24(h)).
- For post-COVID order requests: The public interest in disclosing the subject matter, attendees, body, or attachments of future meetings is NOT clearly outweighed by the public interest in non-disclosure because disclosure furthers the people's constitutional rights: namely, the First Amendment right to petition the government is strengthened by allowing the people to know what their officials are up to;
and by petitioning the government prior to the meeting that they oppose, potentially preventing the government from taking that objectionable meeting. Due to Admin Code 67.26, the City would have to show that every portion of the record should be withheld under the balancing test. But there is no public interest in withholding non-security information whatsoever - the interest, if any, in not disclosing that information is a private interest of the politicians and other attendees involved.

NOTE: 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

Sent from ProtonMail Mobile
Supervisor of Records Herrera,

This constitutes a new distinct petition under SFAC 67.21(d) for each request listed below for a written determination that some or all of the records (or parts thereof) withheld in the following requests are public and orders for their disclosure. I am challenging all the withholdings - including the complete withholding of all future calendar info; and also of the date and time and recurrence information of all meetings; and also of the location of those future meetings not protected by SFPD or SFSD, and thus where the location is not a security procedure of a local police agency and thus not exempt under Gov Code 6254(f); and also of the non-Prop G calendar entries; and also of the ICS calendar metadata; and also of the failure to search personal accounts holding meeting information about the conduct of public business.

1. 81242-04060798@requests.muckrock.com Oct 4, 2019 request to Mayor Breed and her Office for the Mayor's Oct 21-28 future calendar entries

2. 81411-90616367@requests.muckrock.com Dec 8, 2019 request to City Attorney Herrera and his Office for the Dec 18-26 Herrera future calendar entries

3. 81411-90616367@requests.muckrock.com Oct 8, 2019 request to City Attorney Herrera and his Office for the Oct 21-28 Herrera future calendar entries

4. the entirety of requests numbered 1, 2, and 7 of my Jan 23, 2020 email from this email address to City Attorney Herrera for his future calendars and past ICS calendars titled "New Immediate Disclosure Request - Preserve All Records - WAS: Re: New Complaint - Alteration of Public Records - City Attorney" which were provided only partially or not at all

5. 81412-71801448@requests.muckrock.com Oct 8, 2019 request to Chief Scott and SFPD for the Oct 21-28 Scott future calendar entries AND for a San Jose search

6. 81412-71801448@requests.muckrock.com Sept 29, 2020 request to Chief Scott and SFPD for the Oct 1-14 Scott future calendar entries

7. 84168-39742724@requests.muckrock.com Nov 6, 2020 request to Sheriff Miyamoto and SFSD for the Feb 14-28, 2021 Miyamoto future calendar entries

8. 84161-98819586@requests.muckrock.com Dec 7, 2019 request to the Controller for his calendar entries which redacted the future recurrence information

9. All requests from this email address on Dec 29, 2020 to Mayor Breed and her Office for various future calendar entries
10. All requests from 82814-07144940@requests.muckrock.com to Mayor Breed and her Office for various future calendar entries AND for non-Prop G calendar entries (future and past) AND for ICS calendar entries AND for San Jose personal calendar searches, all of which are for Breed AND for certain subordinates including Elsbernd and Bruss; requests dated Nov 2, 2019; Nov 8, 2019; Nov 16, 2019; Nov 21, 2019; Nov 27, 2019; Dec 7, 2019; Dec 13, 2019; Dec 19, 2019; Dec 27, 2019; Jan 3, 2020; Jan 13, 2020; Jan 24, 2020; Jan 31, 2020; Feb 8, 2020; Feb 18, 2020; Feb 21, 2020; March 2, 2020; March 7, 2020; March 16, 2020; April 6, 2020; May 5, 2020; and May 20, 2020. I suspect that at least for Elsbernd and Bruss, the records were not retained at the time I made the request and may now be destroyed, which is itself unlawful per your Good Government Guide as they may be impossible to produce even though they existed when I requested them.

You also have numerous other future calendar petitions still pending (at least MuckRock #s 101880, 101881, and more). All of them must receive a written determination.

Also note that Russi sending me an email purporting to simply close out my petitions and refuse to issue a determination is not a determination pursuant to SF Admin Code 67.21(d) - because unlike the petition letters such emails are not responses under Dennis Herrera's name. Only Dennis Herrera is the Supervisor of Records, not DCA Russi. The Ethics Commission was sued (and lost) for refusing to rule on Sunshine matters as the law requires. Don't refuse to respond to my petitions just because the City is perpetually wrong. SOTF might not be willing to force you to do your job, but a court can. I will get my petition responses and the City's unlawful behavior will be recorded permanently in the Supervisor of Records annual report.

Since your prior, wrong, rulings on these matters:

- SOTF has ordered disclosed the Chief of Police's future calendars and the Mayor's future calendars in redacted form and the Mayor's ICS calendars.
- You, as City Attorney, changed your mind and your office stated the following regarding your own future calendars:
  > In light of recent discussions at the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force regarding public officials’ disclosure of their future calendars, we have re-evaluated the legal question and consulted with the Police Department about security risks. Following that evaluation, we have concluded that in most circumstances the City Attorney may safely and legally disclose certain information about his future meetings, including the subject matter of the meeting and the attendees, if that information is recorded in his calendar, and the week during which the meeting will occur. Due to security concerns, we will continue to withhold the location, time, and specific date of each meeting. There may be circumstances in the future where information about the subject matter or attendees of a meeting should be withheld based on fact-specific security concerns or other legal grounds, but your current request does not raise those concerns.
- The Mayor has produced some portion of her future calendars and some ICS calendars and some non-Prop G calendars in other requests.

Therefore, all of your prior determinations regarding these types of matters were legally wrong.

My arguments below apply to all of the petitions herein.

A. Non-Prop G and personally-held business-related calendar entries - Nothing exempts this information and the fact that information is not mentioned in SFAC 67.29-5 does not exclude it from the CPRA term "public record." See your own responses and the Orders in SOTF 19047 and 19112 and their associated Sup of Records petitions and City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017).
B. ICS calendar metadata - The Mayor's Office has produced these in one request, but not the other requests. They have now admitted the information is public and disclosable and must produce it. For pre-March 2020 requests, that is enough. For post-March 2020 requests under the Mayor's purported COVID orders (which we do not concede are valid), the Dept of Technology has a system to help produce the metadata automatically, and thus there is no extraordinary effort required to produce them, and Gov Code 6255 is inapplicable.

C. Future calendar entries

- Gov Code 6254(f) applies solely to security procedures of a local police agency. The specific portions of a calendar entry that constitute security procedures of a police agency (not procedures of the official, but procedures of SFPD or SFSD) may be redacted and the remainder of the record produced.
- A department head or elected official cannot logically acquire their own calendar in confidence, and thus Evidence Code 1040 cannot apply in any form. Regardless, even if it did, there is no harm to the interest of justice and no state or federal law prohibiting disclosure is cited, thus EC 1040 still does not apply. The only exception would be, for example, a meeting with a confidential informant or whistleblower, for which the name (under Evid Code 1041) and the confidential portions of the complaint (under Evid Code 1040) may be properly exempt.
- For requests prior to the March 2020 COVID orders, Times Mirror v. Superior Court (1991) cannot apply in any form to requests in San Francisco because the Court relies, solely, on the prohibited catch-all Gov Code 6255 (due to SFAC 67.34(g,i)).
- Even if Times Mirror did apply in San Francisco, it applies solely to the Governor's past calendars because such knowledge would allow inference of future patterns of the Governor. No one here is the Governor, and past calendars are already explicitly public in SF due to SF Admin Code 67.29-5. Thus the threat described in Times Mirror does not apply here since the future pattern information is already available in the past calendars. Pursuant to Proposition 59, the Constitution does not allow broadening the construction of a court ruling that exempts information, and the Court never ruled on local officials or future calendars.
- Furthermore, Times Mirror discusses both a security interest and a deliberative process interest. Therefore, even for post-COVID requests (though we do not concede that the Mayor's emergency orders are valid nevertheless), the deliberative process interest is not one that is protected in SF. The fact that controversial topics or attendees might be discouraged by pre-decision making transparency is NOT a cognizable exemption in San Francisco (SF Admin Code 67.24(h)).
- For post-COVID order requests: The public interest in disclosing the subject matter, attendees, body, or attachments of future meetings is NOT clearly outweighed by the public interest in non-disclosure because disclosure furthers the people's constitutional rights: namely, the First Amendment right to petition the government is strengthened by allowing the people to know what their officials are up to; and by petitioning the government prior to the meeting that they oppose, potentially preventing the government from taking that objectionable meeting. Due to Admin Code 67.26, the City would have to show that every portion of the record should be withheld under the balancing test. But there is no public interest in withholding non-security information whatsoever - the interest, if any, in not disclosing that information is a private interest of the politicians and other attendees involved.

NOTE: 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.
Sincerely,

Anonymous

Sent from ProtonMail Mobile
RE: FW: 19047 - Compliance Committee Hearing

From: Hank Heckel (Compliance Officer, Mayor Office, SF) <hank.heckel@sfgov.org>
To: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
CC: Cheryl Leger (Administrator, SOTF, SF) <cheryl.leger@sfgov.org>
     SOTF (SF) <sotf@sfgov.org>
     MayorSunshineRequests, MYR (MYR) <mayorsunshinerequests@sfgov.org>

Date: Wednesday, February 3rd, 2021 at 7:38 PM

Anonymous,

Please see the attached records responsive to your original request underlying the referenced complaint and compliance hearing, specifically comprising the Prop G and non-Prop G calendar entries for April 28, 2019 to May 4, 2019, with the requested metadata, with the exception of certain redacted material. The redactions are keyed with justifications in the attached files. Also included is an additional calendar entry and associated metadata for December 9, 2020, responsive to your more recent December 17 request for such information.

All redactions are to withhold information that potentially poses a cyber-security risk to the City’s computers and networks and licensed and proprietary systems pursuant to Cal. Gov. Code 6254.19 and 6253.9(f), as well as on the basis of the public interest balancing test of Cal. Gov. Code 6255, with the exception of a few redactions made to protect the privacy of personal contact information pursuant to Gov Code § 6254(c), California Constitution, Art. I, Sec. 1. Those latter redactions have been labeled as “California Constitution” redactions in the attached files.

This information has been vetted in consultation with the Department of Technology to identify the cyber-security sensitive information based on their current “green list” for metadata and the redactions have been applied using their pilot redaction tool currently under review.

We believe we have now provided the full extent of the requested material, minus properly justified redactions, and in compliance with the Order of Determination in this matter and your agreed upon terms below, as discussed at the recent compliance hearing. Accordingly, we consider the request resolved and hope that we can take down the follow-up compliance hearing. We consider your December 17, 2020 request now closed as well. If you do have remaining concerns or questions, please let us know and we can work through them.

Regards,

Hank Heckel
From: Heckel, Hank (MYR)  
Sent: Friday, January 22, 2021 9:13 PM  
To: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>  
Cc: Leger, Cheryl (BOS) <cheryl.leger@sfgov.org>; SOTF, (BOS) <sotf@sfgov.org>  
Subject: RE: FW: 19047 - Compliance Committee Hearing

Yes, this is on behalf of myself, the Office and the Mayor.

From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>  
Sent: Friday, January 22, 2021 7:57 PM  
To: Heckel, Hank (MYR) <hank.heckel@sfgov.org>  
Cc: Leger, Cheryl (BOS) <cheryl.leger@sfgov.org>; SOTF, (BOS) <sotf@sfgov.org>  
Subject: RE: FW: 19047 - Compliance Committee Hearing

Actually - Order 19047 runs against Mayor Breed, Hank Heckel, and Office of the Mayor – Mr. Heckel, please confirm in writing that you and the Mayor - not just the Office - also are agreeing to the terms. (Which are:

- That Mayor London Breed, Hank Heckel, and the Office of the Mayor (violating respondents in this case) produce the requested ICS files in SOTF 19047 (using DT's metadata redaction software pilot, if they so wish) from both the Prop G and non-Prop G Mayoral calendars, with minimal redaction, on a rolling basis over the next 60 days (similar to DPW in SOTF 19097).
- That Respondents, in producing such records, provide a redaction key for any redactions that are not under Gov Code 6254.19 (info sec risk), pursuant to SFAC 67.26. (We need to understand exactly what MYR considers not to be a public record or exempt under some other exemption.)
- To keep the matter with the committee, and continue the matter to the March 2021 Compliance meeting.

)
NOTE: 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

----- Original Message ----- 

On Friday, January 22nd, 2021 at 7:48 PM, Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:

"

Excellent - I'll follow up shortly on your email complaint as well.

NOTE: 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

----- Original Message ----- 

On Friday, January 22nd, 2021 at 7:21 PM, Heckel, Hank (MYR) <hank.heckel@sfgov.org> wrote:

"
Anonymous, Members of the Task Force,

The Office of the Mayor agrees to the terms below regarding production of the additional redacted .ics files and will provide those files within 60 days on a rolling basis with redaction bases specifically identified as noted.

With that, we also agree to a continuance of the hearing.

Thank you,

Hank Heckel
Legal Compliance Officer
Office of the Mayor
City and County of San Francisco

**From:** Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>

**Sent:** Wednesday, January 20, 2021 9:16 PM

**To:** Heckel, Hank (MYR) <hank.heckel@sfgov.org>

**Cc:** Leger, Cheryl (BOS) <cheryl.leger@sfgov.org>; SOTF, (BOS) <sotf@sfgov.org>

**Subject:** Re: FW: 19047 - Compliance Committee Hearing

Ms. Leger - please include this as my cover letter in 19047. I have needed to exceed the 5pm deadline because MYR also did so.

First, thank you to the Mayor’s Office for providing one ICS entry in apparently minimum redacted form though I haven’t had a chance to go over it in detail to review every line. Note however that this is not a record at issue in this complaint, and I still await any production of ICS in 19047 itself. Note how almost *nothing* was actually redacted under Gov Code 6254.19 - it is also likely that DT will agree with me that the final few remanding redactions are not required either (but I don’t care to argue that here - Ms. Gerull appears to have a process to consider my requests to change the metadata Allowlist and that’s a lot easier than arguing with dozens of departments)
**Exec Summary:** MYR invites you to do nothing further on this case, however at this time MYR has not actually complied with SOTF 19047. I would ask that your Committee move as follows if (and only if) respondents are willing to commit without an additional order by the full SOTF to follow this plan:

- Request that Mayor London Breed, Hank Heckel, and the Office of the Mayor (violating respondents in this case) produce the requested ICS files in SOTF 19047 (using DT’s metadata redaction software pilot, if they so wish) from **both** the Prop G and non-Prop G Mayoral calendars, with minimal redaction, on a rolling basis over the next 60 days (similar to DPW in SOTF 19097).
- Request that Respondents, in producing such records, provide a redaction key for any redactions that are **not** under Gov Code 6254.19 (info sec risk), pursuant to SFAC 67.26. (We need to understand **exactly** what MYR considers not to be a public record or exempt under some other exemption.)
- To keep the matter with the committee, and continue the matter to the March 2021 Compliance meeting.

If Respondents are willing to commit to this plan of action, there is no need to - at this time - refer the matter for willful violation or further Orders by the full task force, and I am happy to work with them to see what further disputes exist (if any). But **commitments** are required. If Respondents will not agree, then you should refer the matter to full SOTF for further ODs and/or willful violation.

**Mr. Heckel: Do the Respondents commit to the above plan regarding this complaint?**

(Aside: Although it is not within the scope of 19047 (which is about calendars), if the Mayor's Office also agrees in writing to do the same as above for the email metadata complaint pending against them (SOTF 20006, which was the email metadata split off from SOTF 19091), I can dismiss that complaint.)

**MYR legal arguments:**

I will repeat below my rebuttals to the CAO's memo in 19044, which MYR has referenced in 19047 as well. **However, this is not a reconsideration hearing, for either this request or for the entire concept of metadata, so I don't have to re-argue my case and "win."** That being said...

Citation to Gov Code 6255: CAO/MYR should remind itself that the Mayor's Sunshine suspension orders - even if they are valid - are at least **supposedly** only for the period of COVID emergency. They won't help CAO/MYR withhold metadata after COVID. Also, this argument is likely invalid now that software exists to do the redaction automatically and thus any argument about time is not valid.

Claim that information is not a public record. CAO/MYR's citation to *City of San Jose* leaves out important context. *City of San Jose* alters the earlier test from *San Gabriel Tribune*, etc. (which excludes “only purely personal” communications “totally void of reference to governmental activities” from the definition of public records) for records on personal devices, in order to balance employee privacy with disclosure. I've copied the full footnote below. But where the record itself is a public record, **the metadata is part and parcel of the record.** The record is the actual data structure retained by the government. Knowing who communicated when to whom and how they did so is in fact the conduct of public business. And CAO's examples about envelopes and model numbers of cabinets are actually wrong: what equipment is purchased by the City and what label was placed on a file are matters of public business. It is also wrong that metadata is not used by the City Attorney's Office (or the Mayor's Office) - it may not be used by most employees, but it is used by the agency as a whole to route email to the right person. Finally, the public record definition requires evidence only of one of the requirements (prepared, owned, used, or retained) not all of them. This info is retained, otherwise they would be unable to produce it.
NEW: MYR adds arguments (to CAO's) about whether or not information is intelligible to most employees. But that has no relevance, and no citation to court case. The only issue is whether the email is a writing (which San Gabriel Tribune describes as "This definition is intended to cover every conceivable kind of record that is involved in the governmental process and will pertain to any new form of record-keeping instrument as it is developed."). This is extraordinarily broad in scope.). Furthermore, metadata does concern the conduct of public business - the City's email servers, the times City officials send/read email, which official sends an email on behalf of their boss, whether or not the City considers something spam, etc. is all public business, not private in any form. MYR (and CAO) do not appear to cite specifically which parts of the metadata are not public records, and if they want to make such an argument they need to be specific. We are not here to litigate all metadata.

Citation to Evid Code 1040. EC 1040 requires a harm to the interests of justice. It is possible that on occasion some metadata would harm justice - namely if it identified a person communicating confidentially with the city attorney or something similar. It's unclear what EC 1040 has to do with metadata generally however.

City of San Jose ruling's footnote on alteration of the scope of public records:

We recognize that this test departs from the notion that “[o]nly purely personal” communications “totally void of reference to governmental activities” are excluded from CPRA’s definition of public records. (Assem. Statewide Information Policy Com., Final Rep. (Mar. 1970) 1 Assem. J. (1970 Reg. Sess.) appen. p. 9; see San Gabriel Tribune v. Superior Court, supra, 143 Cal.App.3d at p. 774.) While this conception may yield correct results in some circumstances, it may sweep too broadly in others, particularly when applied to electronic communications sent through personal accounts.

NOTE: 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

------- Original Message -------

On Wednesday, January 20th, 2021 at 7:50 PM, Heckel, Hank (MYR) <hank.heckel@sfgov.org> wrote:
Dear Cheryl,

Please see below our response and the attachments for the Compliance Committee Hearing for 19047. I apologize for the delay and hope that this can be included in the file. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Regards,

Hank Heckel
Legal Compliance Officer
Office of the Mayor
City and County of San Francisco

---

From: Heckel, Hank (MYR)
Sent: Wednesday, January 20, 2021 7:49 PM
To: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>; Leger, Cheryl (BOS) <cheryl.leger@sfgov.org>
Cc: MayorSunshineRequests, MYR (MYR) <mayorsunshinerequests@sfgov.org>; SOTF, (BOS) <sotf@sfgov.org>
Subject: RE: 19047 - Compliance Committee Hearing

Dear Anonymous,

Please see the attached response and supplemental production relating to your request for a Compliance Committee Hearing in SOTF File 19047, scheduled for January 26. We have no objection to going forward on that day and we hope that our response addresses your concerns.

Regards,
Hank Heckel
Compliance Officer
Office of the Mayor
City and County of San Francisco

CC: Members of the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force

**From:** Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>

**Sent:** Wednesday, January 20, 2021 4:57 PM

**To:** Heckel, Hank (MYR) <hank.heckel@sfgov.org>; Leger, Cheryl (BOS) <cheryl.leger@sfgov.org>

**Cc:** MayorSunshineRequests, MYR (MYR) <mayorsunshinerequests@sfgov.org>; SOTF, (BOS) <sotf@sfgov.org>

**Subject:** RE: 19047 - Calendar redaction automation

I am happy to wait slightly past 5pm tonight if SOTF will accept your supplement and also my immediate reply to your supplement.

**Ms. Leger is this ok?**

I am not ok postponing this hearing however.

**NOTE:** 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous
Ms. Gerull informs me she has the initial testing version of the software to automate metadata redactions and looking for departments to try it out.

Anonymous,

We will be providing a supplemental redacted production today relating to the metadata issue and we are assembling that now. Please stand by.

Regards,

Hank Heckel
Compliance Officer
Office of the Mayor
City and County of San Francisco

From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, January 20, 2021 11:34 AM

To: Heckel, Hank (MYR) <hank.heckel@sfgov.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; MayorSunshineRequests, MYR (MYR) <mayorsunshinerequests@sfgov.org>; Elsbernd, Sean (MYR) <sean.elsbernd@sfgov.org>; Bruss, Andrea (MYR) <andrea.bruss@sfgov.org>; Leger, Cheryl (BOS) <cheryl.leger@sfgov.org>; Sun, Selina (MYR) <selina.sun@sfgov.org>; Lee, Mason (MYR) <mason.lee@sfgov.org>

Cc: SOTF, (BOS) <sotf@sfgov.org>; Lila LaHood <lilalahood.sotf@gmail.com>; Bruce Wolfe (Chair, SOTF, SF) <sotf@brucewolf.net>

Subject: 19047 - Calendar redaction automation

Ms. Gerull informs me she has the initial testing version of the software to automate metadata redactions and looking for departments to try it out.
You could send some of these ICS’s from 19047 through her software and reply to me/SOTF before 5 pm with the redacted documents...

----- Original Message ------
On Tuesday, January 19th, 2021 at 1:53 PM, Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:
,
Ping the Mayor’s Office once again to produce records for 19047. Apparently you have until tomorrow 5pm.

----- Original Message ------
On Sunday, January 10th, 2021 at 2:46 PM, Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:
,
Same thing here Ms. Leger - please let me know if you have received anything from the City on 19047 since the ruling in Oct 2019. They're just ignoring me.

----- Original Message ------
On Saturday, January 9th, 2021 at 2:09 PM, Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:
,

**Hank Heckel, London Breed, Office of the Mayor:**

I will ask you one more time - Please provide a compliant response to me, not just to SOTF, before the SOTF document production deadline prior to the Jan 26 compliance hearing.

**SOTF:**

Your Order in this case is over 440 days old. It is a pre-pandemic October 2019 order that they had 5 days to comply with.

- No ICS calendars for this request were ever produced, let alone minimally redacted.
- While the Mayor did initially produce non-Prop G calendars - the ones Heckel lied to SOTF about not existing - they have also stopped producing non-Prop G calendars, and only produce the Prop G calendars. (As a reminder, the Mayor has two separate Outlook calendars, both used for business purpose - called "Calendar, Mayor" and "PropG, Mayor")

These Respondents are incorrigible scofflaws, and SOTF should use every legal mechanism at its fingertips to hold them responsible, including referring Respondents to Ethics Commission, DA, AG, and Presiding Judge of Superior Court.
Attached is an example of DT's compliant ICS calendars - note how almost nothing is actually an IT risk (of the 6 words redacted in the entire record, DT later agreed in writing that 2 of them should not be redacted - leaving a total of 4 words for Respondents to redact).

Respondents will plead with you for yet more time so that they and Herrera can continue to indefinitely scheme. Reject their request. It is completely unreasonable to produce no new records in 440 days. As your members pointed out in the original hearing, if Respondents had given some ICS record redacted how they wished, then SOTF could judge it. But they didn't then and still haven't.

NOTE: Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the government all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous
Police Chief William "Bill" Scott (Staff: Sean Elsebe)

SUMMARY:
en-us: Police Chief William "Bill" Scott (Staff: Sean Elsebe)

TRANSLATION:

22nd Annual SOR Report
APPENDIX - Page 300
Anonymous,

Following the determination in SOTF File No. 19103 regarding the Mayor’s future calendar entries, we have consulted internally and with the City Attorney’s Office and we have devised a method to provide some of the information for those entries with minimal withholding to protect security-sensitive information consistent with Admin. Code 67.26 and 67.27.

In particular, we have concluded that generally, the Office of the Mayor may safely disclose certain information about upcoming meetings, including the subject matter of the meeting and the attendees as they are recorded in the Mayor’s calendar entries, and the week in which a meeting will occur. In light of the unique security concerns associated with future non-publicly announced meetings for the Mayor which are safeguarded by an SFPD detail, we will continue to withhold the location, time and specific date of such meetings, as well as any recurrence information that would reveal future dates and times. This is in consideration of the SFPD’s procedures and practices in providing security at such meetings and for the Mayor’s personal safety. We also reserve our right to object to certain requests for future calendar entries where the subject matter of the meeting itself or the invited attendees could raise fact-specific security concerns or other bases for withholding, but your current request does not raise those concerns.

Also, in responding to requests for future entries, we plan to provide the Mayor’s calendars in week-long blocks showing all of the meetings for that week without revealing the date or time of an individual meeting. Accordingly, in response to your request below, please see calendar entries for Mayor Breed’s Prop G calendar account as well as her general scheduling calendar account for the week of April 5 to 9, 2021. We previously responded to the request below and informed you that responsive records existed and would be provided in due course pursuant to Cal. Gov. Code 6253(c) (see attached email).

All of the redactions in the attached responsive files are due to the security concerns discussed above and specifically based on Government Code section 6254(f), Evidence Code section 1040, and Times Mirror Company v. Superior Court, 53 Cal.3d 1325 (1991), with the exception of the redactions of personal contact information to protect privacy or of dial-information to protect official information, which are clearly marked as pursuant to California Constitution, Art. I, Sec. 1; Cal. Govt. Code Secs. 6254(c) and Evidence Code 1040 respectively.
Given our agreement to this practice are you willing to withdraw your various other requests from December 3 and December 29 to January 17 for calendar entries of the Mayor that were future entries at the time of the request? We are not challenging disclosure of those entries beyond the location, date, time and recurrence information discussed above.

Regards,

Hank Heckel
Compliance Officer
Office of the Mayor
City and County of San Francisco

From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 29, 2020 9:00 PM
To: Elsbernd, Sean (MYR) <sean.elsbernd@sfgov.org>; Heckel, Hank (MYR) <hank.heckel@sfgov.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; MayorSunshineRequests, MYR (MYR) <mayorsunshinerequests@sfgov.org>; SOTF, (BOS) <sotf@sfgov.org>
Subject: SOTF 19103 Enforcement - Req 6 - Immediate Disclosure Request

Sean Elsbernd, London Breed, Hank Heckel, Office of the Mayor:

This is a new immediate disclosure request for the detailed prospective/scheduled Outlook entries, one per calendar entry, for the **Apr 1 - Apr 15, 2021** dates for London Breed on every calendar (whether Prop G or non-Prop G, and including but not limited to PropG, Mayor (MYR), and Calendar, Mayor (MYR) and all personal calendars) about the conduct of public business, with minimal redactions, and a key for the redactions. Your determination of disclosable public records and legal justification is due on January 11, or after extension, on January 25, 2021 (CPRA Gov Code 6253(c)).

Recall the SOTF 19103 ruling for Breed's future calendars
- [https://sfgov.org/sunshine/sites/default/files/SOTF_120220_minutes.pdf](https://sfgov.org/sunshine/sites/default/files/SOTF_120220_minutes.pdf)

Moved by Member LaHood, seconded by Member Hinze to find that Mayor London Breed, Hank Heckel, and the Mayor’s Office violated Administrative Code, Sections 67.26 for failing to keep withholding to a minimum, 67.27 for justification of withholding and to refer the matter to the Compliance and Amendments Committee to ensure that properly redacted records are provided to the Petitioner.
The motion PASSED by the following vote: Ayes: 7 - LaHood, Hinze, Yankee, Wong, Schmidt, Hyland, Wolfe; Noes: 0 - None; Absent: 0 - None

NOTE: Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the government all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous
RE: Future calendars - revisited - Immediate disclosure request

From: City Attorney's Office (City Attorney, SF) <cityattorney@SFCITYATTY.ORG>
To: Anonymous <arecordrequestor@protonmail.com>
CC: City Attorney's Office (City Attorney, SF) <cityattorney@SFCITYATTY.ORG>
Date: Monday, February 1st, 2021 at 4:57 PM

Dear requester,

We write in response to your January 22, 2021 request for the City Attorney’s calendar entries during the period between May 1, 2021 and May 14, 2021. In light of recent discussions at the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force regarding public officials’ disclosure of their future calendars, we have re-evaluated the legal question and consulted with the Police Department about security risks. Following that evaluation, we have concluded that in most circumstances the City Attorney may safely and legally disclose certain information about his future meetings, including the subject matter of the meeting and the attendees, if that information is recorded in his calendar, and the week during which the meeting will occur. Due to security concerns, we will continue to withhold the location, time, and specific date of each meeting. There may be circumstances in the future where information about the subject matter or attendees of a meeting should be withheld based on fact-specific security concerns or other legal grounds, but your current request does not raise those concerns.

Going forward, in response to requests for the City Attorney’s future calendar, we will provide the City Attorney’s calendar entries in weekly batches, showing the scheduled meetings for a full week without specifying the date or time of each particular meeting. Consistent with that approach, we are attaching two documents—one reflecting the City Attorney’s scheduled meetings for the week beginning May 1, 2021 and ending May 7, 2021, and another reflecting his scheduled meetings for the week beginning May 8, 2021 and ending May 14, 2021. In this instance, as you will see, the City Attorney currently has only one meeting scheduled for each of those weeks. All redactions in the attached document are based on Government Code section 6254(f), Evidence Code section 1040, and Times Mirror Company v. Superior Court, 53 Cal.3d 1325 (1991).

Please send replies to cityattorney@sfcityatty.org

Best,

Elizabeth A. Coolbrith
Paralegal
Office of City Attorney Dennis Herrera
From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 21, 2021 10:01 PM
To: CityAttorney (CAT) <cityattorney@SFCITYATTY.ORG>; Dennis Herrera (City Attorney, SF) <dennis.herrera@sfgov.org>
Subject: Future calendars - revisited - Immediate disclosure request

See attached SOTF Order 19103 Anonymous v Breed. The Mayor's Office claims they will comply and provide future calendar entries with the security info redacted (they have yet to actually comply, though).

Your department head has a prior complaint for the same issue. Are you willing to provide these records now? It is highly unlikely Herrera can claim somehow higher security requirements than the Mayor.

Dennis Herrera:

This is an immediate disclosure request for every individual calendar entry (not a daily/weekly/monthly summary view) on all of your calendars (govt or personal about the conduct of public business) for the dates of May 1, 2021 through May 14, 2021. ICS calendars are not required at this time, but you are welcome to produce them if it is faster than detailed PDF "Memo Style" entries. These dates are specifically selected so that delaying production until the event dates would constitute an unreasonable delay, with or without COVID.

NOTE: 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous
ORDER OF DETERMINATION
October 24, 2019

DATE DECISION ISSUED
October 2, 2019

CASE TITLE – Anonymous v. Mayor London Breed, Hank Heckel and the Office of the Mayor
File No. 19047

FACTS OF THE CASE

The following petition/complaint was filed with the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force (SOTF):

Complaint filed by Anonymous against Mayor London Breed, Hank Heckel and the Office of the Mayor for allegedly violating Administrative Code, (Sunshine Ordinance) Sections 67.21 and 67.26 and 67.27 and Government Code (CPRA) 6253.9, 6253, and 6255, by failing to respond to a request for public records in a timely and/or complete manner.

HEARING ON THE COMPLAINT

On August 20, 2019, the Complaint Committee acting in its capacity to hear petitions/complaints heard the matter.

Anonymous (Petitioner) provided a summary of the complaint and requested the Committee to find a violation. Anonymous stated that he requested the Mayor’s calendar including the metadata. Anonymous stated that the Mayor’s calendar is considered a public record which should have been provided. Anonymous stated that the City Attorney memo disputed what kind format of the calendar is in. Anonymous stated that metadata and headers are important to the works of an investigative journalist. Anonymous stated that he wants to know who actually invited the Mayor to meetings and events and that information can be provided in metadata.

Hank Heckel (Mayor’s Office) (Respondent), provided a summary of the department’s position. Mr. Heckel stated that the Mayor’s office received the IDR on May 8 and responded on May 9. Mr. Heckel stated that the Mayor’s Office provided their Prop G calendar which included event times, general attendees and the nature of the event. Mr. Heckel stated that all information was provided in pdf format to avoid compromising the integrity of the record. Mr. Heckel stated
that those records did not provide email addresses of invitees, conference call numbers and dial information which is subject to privilege. Mr. Heckel stated that the Mayor’s Office relies on advices provided by the Information Technology Department and the City Attorney’s Office regarding metadata. Mr. Heckel stated that there are security risks associated with providing this information.

The Committee found that the SOTF has jurisdiction, find that the requested records are public and referred the matter to the SOTF for hearing.

On October 20, 2019, the SOTF held a hearing to review the recommendation from Committee and/or to review the merits of the petition/complaint.

Anonymous (Petitioner) provided a summary of the complaint and requested the Committee to find a violation. Anonymous provided an overview of the submitted presentation. Anonymous stated that the Office of the Mayor refused to provide documents in the requested format and metadata, objected to the redactions to the calendar and stated that the ICS version of the calendar was not provided. Anonymous stated that the Office of the Mayor did not provide the Mayor’s non-Prop G or 2nd calendar account until months later, and those non-Prop G calendars are public records.

Hank Heckel (Mayor’s Office) and Michael Makstman (Chief Information Security Officer) (Respondent), provided a summary of the department’s position. Mr. Heckel referenced California Government Code, Sections 6252.9(f) and 6254.19, and Sunshine Ordinance, Section 67.21(l). Mr. Heckel stated that the format requested is not easily generated and would also create a security risk. Mr. Makstman provided information regard metadata and possible security risks.

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSION OF LAW

Based on the testimony and evidence presented, the SOTF found that Mayor London Breed, Hank Heckel and the Office of the Mayor violated Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Section(s) 67.21, 67.26 and 67.27.
DECISION AND ORDER OF DETERMINATIONS

On October 2, 2019, Member Yankee, seconded by Member Cate, moved to find that Mayor London Breed, Hank Heckel and the Office of the Mayor violated Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.21, 67.26 and 67.27, by failing to provide records in a timely and/or complete manner, keep withholdings to a minimum, and justify the withholding of records.

The motion PASSED by the following vote:

Ayes: 7 - Yankee, Martin, LaHood, Cate, Hyland, J. Wolf, B. Wolfe
Noes: 0 - None
Absent: 2 - Cannata, Chopra
Excused: 2 - Tesfai, Hinze

Bruce Wolfe, Chair
Sunshine Ordinance Task Force

cc. Anonymous (Petitioner/Complainant)
Hank Heckel, Office of the Mayor (Respondent)
DATE DECISION ISSUED
December 2, 2020

CASE TITLE – Anonymous v. Mayor London Breed, Hank Heckel and the Office of the Mayor.
File No. 19103

FACTS OF THE CASE

The following petition/complaint was filed with the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force (SOTF):

File No. 19103: Complaint filed by Anonymous against Mayor London Breed, Hank Heckel and the Office of the Mayor for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.21, 67.25 and 67.26, by failing to respond to an Immediate Disclosure Request in a timely and/or complete manner.

HEARING ON THE COMPLAINT

On November 26, 2019, the Compliance and Amendments Committee acting in its capacity to hear petitions/complaints heard the matter.

Anonymous (Petitioner) provided a summary of the complaint and requested the Committee to find a violation. Anonymous stated that he submitted a records request for the Mayor's future calendar based on Government Code 6254(f) was withheld due to rule of reason analysis. Anonymous stated that he filed a calendar request to the Supervisor of Records which also was denied on the basis of Supreme Court case *Times Mirror Company v. Superior Court*. Anonymous stated that the Mayor’s office did provide her press calendar but withheld her outlook entries. Anonymous stated that the SOTF heard a case against the District Attorney’s Office wherein the DA’s future calendar was not provided and the SOTF opined that the records were public.

Hank Heckel (Office of the Mayor) (Respondent), provided a summary of the department’s position. Mr. Heckel stated that his office received the Immediate Disclosure Request and responded the following day in a timely manner. Mr. Heckel stated that based on Government Code 6254(f), the rule of reason analysis and security interests of the Mayor’s meetings, the future calendar was withheld from disclosure. Mr. Heckel stated that the Mayor’s Press calendar was
provided. Mr. Heckel stated that Anonymous requested specific times and locations of meetings. Mr. Heckel stated the Police Department consults with the Mayor’s Office and provides security at all internal and external meetings and to reveal this information would undermine security. Mr. Heckel stated that the Supervisor of Records stated there is a process in place so that the Police Department can plan and provide security. Mr. Heckel stated that to provide the Mayor’s future calendar to Anonymous would impact security procedures.

Action: Moved by Member Wolfe, seconded by Member Hinze, to find that the SOTF has jurisdiction, find that the requested records are public and to refer the matter to the SOTF for hearing.

On December 2, 2020, the SOTF held a hearing to review the recommendation from Committee and/or to review the merits of the petition/complaint.

Anonymous (Petitioner) provided a summary of the complaint and requested the Committee to find a violation. Anonymous stated that On October 4, 2019, he submitted an Immediate Disclosure Request for the Mayor’s future calendar. Anonymous said the Mayor’s future meeting information is not entirely exempt due to security issues and should be provided with redactions for those security procedures under Gov Code 6254(f). Anonymous stated that the Times Mirror v. Superior Court 1991 53 Cal.3d 1546 case is now bad law due to Prop 59. Anonymous stated in a later case Governor Schwarzenegger was sued and did eventually turn over his past calendars. Anonymous noted that the Mayor’s future calendars were not originally provided, that the Petitioner had to make a second request and then it was provided after the dates were no longer in the future.

Hank Heckel (Mayor’s Office) (Respondent), provided a summary of the department’s position. Mr. Heckel stated that the Mayor’s Office’s original position was that the Mayor’s future calendars could not be disclosed. Mr. Heckel stated that disclosure of any information of Mayor’s office jeopardizes the security of the Mayor. Mr. Heckel cited California Public Records Act 6254(f) and Times Mirror v. Superior Court 1991 53 Cal.3d 1546 regarding his argument that calendar and scheduling information for future calendars of the Mayor should be withheld for security reasons. Mr. Heckel noted that this provision does not obligate the police department who provides security to the Mayor. Mr. Heckel opined that this information could create a security risk if disclosed.

Chair Wolfe asked what part of a calendar entry is protected?

Mr. Heckel stated that the purpose is to protect the Mayor and so there is a limit to producing future calendar meetings. Mr. Heckel again cited 6254(f) noting that future meetings should not be disclosed. Mr. Heckel stated that once a meeting has occurred, that would become a Prop G calendar, however the Mayor’s Office will not disclose future meetings due to security concerns.
FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSION OF LAW

Based on the testimony and evidence presented, the SOTF found that Mayor London Breed, Hank Heckel, and the Mayor’s Office violated Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.26 by failing to keep withholding to a minimum and 67.27 by failing to provide justification of withholding.

DECISION AND ORDER OF DETERMINATIONS

Action: Moved by Member LaHood, seconded by Member Hinze, to find that Mayor London Breed, Hank Heckel, and the Mayor’s Office violated Administrative Code, Sections 67.26 by failing to keep withholding to a minimum and 67.27 by failing to provide justification of withholding. In addition, the SOTF referred the matter to the Compliance and Amendments Committee to ensure that properly redacted records are provided to the Petitioner.

The motion PASSED by the following vote:

Ayes: 7 - LaHood, Hinze, Yankee, Wong, Schmidt, Hyland, Wolfe
Noes: 0 - None

Bruce Wolfe, Chair
Sunshine Ordinance Task Force

cc. Anonymous (Petitioner/Complainant)
    Mayor London Breed, Hank Heckel, and the Mayor’s Office (Respondent)
ORDER OF DETERMINATION
September 29, 2020

DATE DECISION ISSUED
September 2, 2020

CASE TITLE – Anonymous v. Chief William Scott, Lt R. Andrew Cox and the Police Department
(File No. 19112)

FACTS OF THE CASE

The following petition/complaint was filed with the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force (SOTF):

Complaint filed by Anonymous against Chief William Scott, Lt. R. Andrew Cox and the Police Department for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.25, 67.26, 67.27, by failing to respond to an Immediate Disclosure Request in a timely and/or complete manner, failing to respond to a public records request in a timely and/or complete manner; failing to justify withholding of records and failing to maintain a Proposition G calendar.

HEARING ON THE COMPLAINT

On December 17, 2019, the Complaint Committee acting in its capacity to hear petitions/complaints heard the matter.

Anonymous (Petitioner) provided a summary of the complaint and requested the Committee to find a violation. Anonymous stated that he made an Immediate Disclosure Request for Police Chief Scott’s Proposition G and Non-Proposition G calendars. Anonymous stated that only the Proposition G calendar provided was in an incomplete and untimely manner. Anonymous stated that many calendar entries were redacted without legal citations.

Lt. Andrew Cox (Police Department) (Respondent), provided a summary of the department’s position. Lt Cox stated that there was a miscommunication and acknowledged that the responses were late. Lt Cox stated that the Police Department has provided Chief Scott’s Proposition G calendar with redactions.

Action: Moved by Member Yankee, seconded by Chair Martin, to find that the SOTF has jurisdiction, find that the requested records are public and to refer the matter to the SOTF for hearing.
On September 2, 2020, the SOTF held a hearing to review the recommendation from Committee and/or to review the merits of the petition/complaint.

Anonymous (Petitioner) provided a summary of the complaint and requested the Committee to find a violation. Anonymous stated that on October 8, 2020, he sent an Immediate Disclosure Request to the Police Department for Prop G and non-Prop G past and future calendars. Anonymous stated that on October 23, 2019, he was told that he would not be provided future Prop G calendars. However, the calendars were provided long after the events listed on the calendars had taken place. Anonymous stated that he received only two weeks of calendar entries after his complaint was filed and that the response was not timely.

Lt. Andrew Cox (Police Department) (Respondent), provided a summary of the department’s position. Lt. Cox stated that the Police Department takes full responsibility for not providing the records in a timely manner. Lt. Cox stated that Anonymous refused to use the Police Department’s records request portal. Lt. Cox stated that when the request came in it was auto sorted into a file that became an archivable request. Lt. Cox stated that this IDR was not simple and got in touch with the Petitioner to request an additional 10 days to respond. On March 27, 2020, the Petitioner was sent an updated version of his requested records.

Member LaHood noted that the initial request was funneled to an email not regularly monitored and because this was an Immediate Disclosure Request there is a timeliness issue.

Lt Cox stated that his department did develop a different email account and will closely monitor emails so that they do not go through auto sort. Lt Cox also noted that there was no request for future calendars. However, his department provided the requested records.

Anonymous stated that on October 23, 2019, he was told that he would not be provided future calendars. However, they were provided long after the calendars were no longer in the future.

Action: Moved by Member Yankee, seconded by Chair B. Wolfe, to find that Chief William Scott, Lt. R. Andrew Cox and the Police Department violated Administrative Code, (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.25, by failing to provide the requested records in a complete and timely manner, 67.26, for withholding all future calendars instead of providing them with minimal redactions, and 67.27 for incorrectly citing 67.29-5 for withholding non Prop G calendars.
FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSION OF LAW

Based on the testimony and evidence presented, the SOTF found that Chief William Scott, Lt. R. Andrew Cox and the Police Department violated Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.25 for failing to provide the requested records in a complete and timely manner, 67.26 for withholding all future calendars instead of providing them with minimal redactions and 67.27 for incorrectly citing 67.29-5 for withholding non Prop G calendars.

DECISION AND ORDER OF DETERMINATIONS

On September 2, 2020, Member Yankee, seconded by Chair Wolfe moved to find that Chief William Scott, Lt. R. Andrew Cox and the Police Department violated Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.25 for failing to provide the requested records in a complete and timely manner, 67.26 for withholding all future calendars instead of providing them with minimal redactions and 67.27 for incorrectly citing 67.29-5 for withholding non Prop G calendars.

The motion PASSED by the following vote:

Noes: 0 - None

Bruce Wolfe, Chair
Sunshine Ordinance Task Force

cc. Anonymous (Petitioner/Complainant)
Chief William Scott, Lt. R. Andrew Cox, Police Department (Respondents)
February 19, 2021

Sent via email (arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com)

Re: Petition to Supervisor of Records

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter responds to your petition to the Supervisor of Records dated February 12, 2021, concerning a request to the Office of Economic and Workforce Development ("OEWD"). You contend that OEWD unlawfully redacted information from a document produced in response to your request.

We find that OEWD properly redacted information constituting a draft recommendation of the author. See Administrative Code Sec. 67.24(a)(1); Government Code Sec. 6254(a).

Very truly yours,

DENNIS J. HERRERA
City Attorney

Bradley A. Russi
Deputy City Attorney
Please see the attached response to your petition.

Bradley Russi  
Deputy City Attorney  
Office of City Attorney Dennis Herrera  
City Hall, Room 234  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., San Francisco, CA 94102  
www.sfcityattorney.org

From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>  
Sent: Friday, February 12, 2021 9:02 PM  
To: Supervisor Records (CAT) <supervisor.records@SFCITYATTY.ORG>  
Subject: 67.21(d) petition - FW: Immediate Disclosure Request - Mayor texts

Sup of Records Herrera: This is a petition under 67.21(d) for the determination that the redacted message in JQ 6 Redact or parts thereof are public.

Only the draft recommendation of Powers as author may be withheld.  
- Any portion of the message that is factual must be disclosed - 67.24(a)(1)  
- Any portion of that messages that is not a recommendation of Powers (but say of some other City employee or Breed) is not a recommendation of the author and thus is not exempt. 67.24(a)(1)

NOTE: 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,  
Anonymous

-------- Original Message --------
On Friday, February 12th, 2021 at 8:52 PM, Heckel, Hank (MYR) <hank.heckel@sfgov.org> wrote:

Anonymous,
On behalf of OWED, please see the attached texts of Mr. Torres responsive to your request below. Please note that certain material has been redacted because it constitutes the draft recommendation of the author of the document. See Admin Code 67.24(a)(1); Cal. Gov. Code 6254(a).

Regards,

Hank Heckel
Legal Compliance Officer
Office of the Mayor
City and County of San Francisco

From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 2, 2021 4:22 PM
To: Torres, Joaquin (ECN) <joaquin.torres@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: Immediate Disclosure Request - Mayor texts

Apologies - correction:

This is an immediate disclosure request for all text messages, chat messages, or instant messages of any kind or app between you and any member of the Office of the Mayor (including Mayor Breed), dated Dec 2, 2020 to present, in a rolling fashion.

NOTE: 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2.
Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

------ Original Message ------

On Tuesday, February 2nd, 2021 at 4:16 PM, Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:

Mr. Torres:

This is an immediate disclosure request for all text messages, chat messages, or instant messages of any kind or app between you and any member of the Office of the Mayor (including Mayor Breed), dated Dec 2, 2021 to present, in a rolling fashion.

NOTE: 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous
February 19, 2021

Sent via email (105657-45010588@requests.muckrock.com)

Re: Petition to Supervisor of Records

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter responds to your petition to the Supervisor of Records dated February 17, 2021, concerning a request to Supervisor Myrna Melgar. You contend that Supervisor Melgar unlawfully redacted information from a document produced in response to your request.

We find that Supervisor Melgar properly redacted information unrelated to City business and thus not a public record.

Very truly yours,

DENNIS J. HERRERA
City Attorney

Bradley A. Russi
Deputy City Attorney
Please see the attached response to your petition.

Bradley Russi  
Deputy City Attorney  
Office of City Attorney Dennis Herrera  
City Hall, Room 234  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., San Francisco, CA 94102  
www.sfcityattorney.org

From: 105657-45010588@requests.muckrock.com <105657-45010588@requests.muckrock.com>  
Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2021 10:41 AM  
To: Supervisor Records (CAT) <supervisor.records@SFCITYATTY.ORG>  
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (BoS)

San Francisco County Board of Supervisors  
PRA Office  
Room 244  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, CA 94102

February 17, 2021

This is a follow up to a previous request:

Supervisor of Records Herrera,

This is a 67.21(d) petition to determine in writing that the redacted message or part of it on attached page 5 is public and an order against Sup Melgar and her Office for its disclosure. The message - in context - appears to be about some sort of fundraising or expenditure of funds and/or how the Mayor's lending of her name/position to some activity helps raise funds. The Mayor lending her name/position to support something and the relationship of her support to another party raising funds off her is not "purely personal" (San Gabriel Triune v Superior Court (1983)) and must be disclosed.

--Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com  
E-mail (Preferred): 105657-45010588@requests.muckrock.com  
Upload documents directly:
For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 105657
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.

---

On Feb. 17, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act SUNSHINE REQUEST: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (BoS)
To Whom It May Concern,

Please see the attached records responsive to your request, as per the Office of the Clerk of the Board’s inquiry and coordination with Supervisor Melgar’s office. This completes our response as our office was not able to identify additional responsive records.

Sincerely,
___
Wilson L. Ng
Deputy Director of Operations
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Web: www.sfbos.org

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

Disclosures: Personal information that is provided in communications to the Clerk of 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.

---

On Feb. 12, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act SUNSHINE REQUEST: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (BoS)
To Whom It May Concern,

Thank you for your patience. Please be advised that we are assisting Supervisors Melgar’s office to produce records responsive to your request. We anticipate providing you with any responsive documents early next week.

Regards,

Jackie Hickey
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

---

On Feb. 4, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (BoS)
To SUP. MELGAR and her Office:

** DO NOT DESTROY ANY RESPONSIVE RECORDS. YOU MUST PRESERVE AND ORDER YOUR EMPLOYEES TO PRESERVE ALL RECORDS DURING THE PENDENCY OF ALL APPEALS. WE MAY APPEAL EVERY REDACTION OR WITHHOLDING. **
Immedite Disclosure Request.

The following are THREE separate records requests to you and your office. You must indicate for each request whether or not there are responsive records, whether they are disclosable, and an explanation (Gov Code 6253).

REQUEST ONE. This is an immediate disclosure request for ALL text, chat, or instant messages between MYRNA MELGAR and either Sean Elsbernd, Andrea Bruss, London Breed, Harlan Kelly, Jr., Naomi Kelly, Hank Heckel, Mason Lee, Sophia Kittler, or Walter Wong, including all group messages, and all messages in threads, in any form and any app (including, but not limited to, SMS, MMS, text, iMessage, Teams (including the SFGOV Teams chats), Discord, WeChat, QQ, Signal, Telegram, WhatsApp, Facebook, Facebook Messenger, Twitter, Instagram, Hangouts, Meet, Slack, Skype, Viber, Snapchat, Line, Kik, FaceTime, Wickr Me, Chatroulette, Threema, KakaoTalk, Duo, GroupMe, Wire, Voxer, Allo, Tango, Bumble, Grindr, Tinder, Olive, Taimi, but NOT including email), on any GOVERNMENT accounts/devices, including all participant names, message text, images, attachments, audio files, video files, dates, and times, including any in trash or deleted folders or similar (see Good Government Guide - if the records have not been permanently deleted as of the time you receive this request, you must retrieve them from the so-called trash folders and provide them). Provide rolling responses. Provide exact copies including all metadata. There is no limitation by subject or date AND YOU MUST INCLUDE ANY RECORDS PRIOR TO YOUR ELECTION AS WELL. If the total pages to produce numbers over 500, inform me of the rough dates, employees involved, and subject matter, and I may be willing to narrow the initial production, AS LONG AS YOU PRESERVE ALL THE RECORDS.
REQUEST TWO. This is an immediate disclosure request for ALL text, chat, or instant messages between MYRNA MELGAR and either Sean Elsbernd, Andrea Bruss, London Breed, Harlan Kelly, Jr., Naomi Kelly, Hank Heckel, Mason Lee, Sophia Kittler, or Walter Wong, including all group messages, and all messages in threads, in any form and any app (including, but not limited to, SMS, MMS, text, iMessage, Teams (including the SFGOV Teams chats), Discord, WeChat, QQ, Signal, Telegram, WhatsApp, Facebook, Facebook Messenger, Twitter, Instagram, Hangouts, Meet, Slack, Skype, Viber, Snapchat, Line, Kik, FaceTime, Wickr Me, Chatroulette, Threema, KakaoTalk, Duo, GroupMe, Wire, Voxer, Allo, Tango, Bumble, Grindr, Tinder, Olive, Taimi, but NOT including email), on any PERSONAL accounts or devices, including all participant names, message text, images, attachments, audio files, video files, dates, and times, including any in trash or deleted folders or similar (see Good Government Guide - if the records have not been permanently deleted as of the time you receive this request, you must retrieve them from the so-called trash folders and provide them). Provide rolling responses. Provide exact copies including all metadata. There is no limitation by subject or date AND YOU MUST INCLUDE ANY RECORDS PRIOR TO YOUR ELECTION AS WELL. If the total pages to produce numbers over 500, inform me of the rough dates, employees involved, and subject matter, and I may be willing to narrow the initial production, AS LONG AS YOU PRESERVE ALL THE RECORDS.

REQUEST THREE. This is an immediate disclosure request for ALL text, chat, or instant messages between any MYRNA MELGAR STAFF MEMBER OR INTERN and either Sean Elsbernd, Andrea Bruss, London Breed, Harlan Kelly, Jr., Naomi Kelly, Hank Heckel, Mason Lee, Sophia Kittler, or Walter Wong, including all group messages, and all messages in threads, in any form and any app (including, but not limited to, SMS, MMS, text, iMessage, Teams (including the SFGOV Teams chats), Discord, WeChat, QQ, Signal, Telegram, WhatsApp, Facebook, Facebook Messenger, Twitter, Instagram, Hangouts, Meet, Slack, Skype, Viber, Snapchat, Line, Kik, FaceTime, Wickr Me, Chatroulette, Threema, KakaoTalk, Duo, GroupMe, Wire, Voxer, Allo, Tango, Bumble, Grindr, Tinder, Olive, Taimi, but NOT including email), on any government accounts/devices or on personal accounts or devices, including all participant names, message text, images, attachments, audio files, video files, dates, and times, including any in trash or deleted folders or similar (see Good Government Guide - if the records have not been permanently deleted as of the time you receive this request, you must retrieve them from the so-called trash folders and provide them). Provide rolling responses. Provide exact copies including all metadata. There is no limitation by subject or date AND YOU MUST INCLUDE ANY RECORDS PRIOR TO YOUR ELECTION AS WELL. If the total pages to produce numbers over 500, inform me of the rough dates, employees involved, and subject matter, and I may be willing to narrow the initial production, AS LONG AS YOU PRESERVE ALL THE RECORDS.

Please provide only those copies of records available without any fees. If you determine certain records would require fees, please instead provide the required notice of which of those records are available and non-exempt for inspection in-person if we so choose.

We have no duty to, and we will not again, remind the City of its obligations. Instead, we will file complaints for every Sunshine Ordinance or CPRA violation. We will continue to file complaints until the City's procedures are modified to fully comply with the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA, without caveat or exception. See attached 12 rulings against the City and in my favor.

Your non-exhaustive obligations:
- All withholding of any information must be justified in writing by specific statutory authority (SFAC 67.27).
- Every redaction must be keyed by footnote or by other clear reference to the specific justification for that redaction, and only the minimal exempt portion of any record may be withheld (SFAC 67.26).
- You must respond to emailed requests (SFAC 67.21(b)).
- You must notify us of whether or not responsive records exist and/or were withheld for each above request (Gov Code 6253(c), 6255(b)).
- You must state the name and title of each person responsible for withholding any information (Gov Code 6253(d)).
- Do not impose any end-user restrictions upon me (Santa Clara Co. vs Superior Ct, 170 Cal.App 4th 1301); so if you use a third-party website to publish records, please make them completely public without any login or sign-in.

Your agency must do all of the above things in your response, and you cannot wait until we file complaints. See prior SOTF Orders and rulings in my favor.
The Mayor's Office appears to have destroyed their copies of certain text messages. I'd be happy to get them from her, if she preserved every record. Alas she does not keep her texts, therefore we must now conduct a universal search of the City. You cannot refer me to another department unless you search and determine that you have no copies in your department. Tell your Mayor to stop destroying her public records. Senior officials must preserve and maintain all correspondence in a professional and businesslike manner (SFAC 67.29-7(a)) and also separately must comply with retention policies (SFAC 67.29-1). Note that if your retention policies do not retain text messages, I will argue before the SOTF and court that this is a failure to maintain **all correspondence** in a professional and businesslike manner.

You must search personal accounts and devices pursuant to City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017).

Note there are many anonymous requesters using MuckRock - I am just one of them. If you previously produced some subset of these records to a MuckRock email address, please reference that prior response so you do not duplicate work. If I am unable to get the prior MuckRock response because it is someone else's and they have marked it private, you will however need to provide me a copy here as well.

I look forward to your lawful response.

NOTE: THE EMAIL ADDRESS SENDING THIS REQUEST IS A PUBLICLY-VIEWABLE MAILBOX. Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

---

On Jan. 8, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (BoS)
Thank you Sup. Ronen for your attention to this matter, we have no further issues on this request. Thank you also for at least partially complying with SOTF's many decisions regarding email headers, which I mentioned at public comment today.

I will note that your staff appear to misunderstand the Mayor's COVID orders by the way. While the Mayor purports to suspend the 1-day IDR deadline - the Mayor did not, and cannot, suspend the state law 10-day CPRA deadline. Please consult with your DCAs on this matter and educate your staff.

I would also encourage you and your staff to consider the public records system used by many other City departments to track deadlines, consistently redact records, and more, called NextRequest. It may improve your compliance with the law.

Sincerely,
Anonymous

---
On Jan. 8, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (BoS)
Thank you. And also thank you for producing email metadata in at least one of those emails. I'm glad word has gotten around about SOTF's decisions.

You seem to misunderstand the Mayor's COVID orders btw. While the Mayor purports to suspend the 1-day IDR deadline - the Mayor did not, and cannot, suspend the state law 10-day deadline, which was violated in this case. Please consult with your DCAs on this matter.

---

On Dec. 8, 2020:
Subject: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (BoS)
To the Board of Supervisors and HILLARY RONEN:

** DO NOT DESTROY ANY RESPONSIVE RECORDS. YOU MUST PRESERVE AND ORDER YOUR EMPLOYEES TO PRESERVE RECORDS DURING THE PENDENCY OF ALL APPEALS. WE WILL APPEAL ALL REDACTIONS OR WITHHOLDINGS. **
Immediate Disclosure Request.

Relevant precedent: SOTF 19098 - Anonymous v SFPD. Unanimous finding of violation for unlawfully withholding text message metadata (including the to/from/etc. - note SFPD had provided the dates and times, and you must as well), and also for unlawfully printing and scanning electronic records which does not constitute a "copy" of an electronic record.

See also prior rulings in my favor in SOTF 19044, 19047, 19091, 19098, 19103, 19108, 19112 which ruled against the City for email, text messages, past and future calendar entries, meeting details, electronic metadata, and attachments.

The Mayor's Office appears to have destroyed their copies of certain text messages. I'd be happy to get them from her, if she preserved every record. Alas she did not, therefore we must now conduct a universal search of the City. You cannot refer me to another department unless you search and determine that you have no copies in your department. Ask your Mayor to stop destroying her public records. Senior officials must preserve and maintain all correspondence in a professional and businesslike manner (SFAC 67.29-7(a)) and also separately must comply with retention policies (SFAC 67.29-1). Note that if your retention policies do not retain text messages, I will argue before the SOTF and court that this is a failure to maintain **all correspondence** in a professional and businesslike manner.

You must search personal accounts and devices pursuant to City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017).

Note there are many anonymous requesters using MuckRock - I am just one of them. If you previously produced some subset of these records to a MuckRock email address, please reference that prior response so you do not duplicate work. If I am unable to get the prior MuckRock response because it is someone else's and they have marked it private, you will however need to provide me a copy here as well.

1. This is an immediate disclosure request for text, chat, or instant messages between HILLARY RONEN and either Sean Elbernd, Andrea Bruss, London Breed, Harlan Kelly, Jr., Naomi Kelly, Hank Heckel, or Walter Wong, including all group messages, and all messages in threads, in any form and any app (including, but not limited to, SMS, MMS, text, iMessage, Teams, Discord, WeChat, QQ, Signal, Telegram, WhatsApp, Facebook, Facebook Messenger, Twitter, Instagram, Hangouts, Meet, Slack, Skype, Viber, Snapchat, Line, Kik, FaceTime, Wickr Me, Chatroulette, Threema, KakaoTalk, Duo, GroupMe, Wire, Voxer, Allo, Tango, Bumble, Grindr, Tinder, Olive, Taimi, but NOT including email), on any government accounts/devices or on personal accounts or devices regarding the conduct of public business, including all participant names, message text, images, attachments, dates, and times, including any in trash or deleted folders or similar (see Good Government Guide - if the records have not been permanently deleted as of the time you receive this request, you must retrieve them from the so-called trash folders and provide them). Provide rolling responses. Provide
exact copies including all metadata. There is no limitation by subject or date. If the total pages to produce numbers over 500, inform me of the rough dates, employees involved, and subject matter, and I may be willing to narrow the initial production, AS LONG AS YOU PRESERVE ALL THE RECORDS.

2. This is a regular records request for text, chat, or instant messages between any HILLARY RONEN STAFF MEMBER OR INTERN and either Sean Elsbernd, Andrea Bruss, London Breed, Harlan Kelly, Jr., Naomi Kelly, Hank Heckel, or Walter Wong, including all group messages, and all messages in threads, in any form and any app (including, but not limited to, SMS, MMS, text, iMessage, Teams, Discord, WeChat, QQ, Signal, Telegram, WhatsApp, Facebook, Facebook Messenger, Twitter, Instagram, Hangouts, Meet, Slack, Skype, Viber, Snapchat, Line, Kik, FaceTime, Wickr Me, Chatroulette, Threema, KakaoTalk, Duo, GroupMe, Wire, Voxer, Allo, Tango, Bumble, Grindr, Tinder, Olive, Taimi, but NOT including email), on any government accounts/devices or on personal accounts or devices regarding the conduct of public business, including all participant names, message text, images, attachments, dates, and times, including any in trash or deleted folders or similar (see Good Government Guide - if the records have not been permanently deleted as of the time you receive this request, you must retrieve them from the so-called trash folders and provide them). Provide rolling responses. Provide exact copies including all metadata. There is no limitation by subject or date. If the total pages to produce numbers over 500, inform me of the rough dates, employees involved, and subject matter, and I may be willing to narrow the initial production, AS LONG AS YOU PRESERVE ALL THE RECORDS.

Please provide only those copies of records available without any fees. If you determine certain records would require fees, please instead provide the required notice of which of those records are available and non-exempt for inspection in-person if we so choose.

Your non-exhaustive obligations:
- All withholding of any information must be justified in writing by specific statutory authority (SFAC 67.27).
- Every redaction must be keyed by footnote or by other clear reference to the specific justification for that redaction, and only the minimal exempt portion of any record may be withheld (SFAC 67.26).
- You must respond to emailed requests (SFAC 67.21(b)).
- You must notify us of whether or not responsive records exist and/or were withheld for each above request (Gov Code 6253(c), 6255(b)).
- You must state the name and title of each person responsible for withholding any information (Gov Code 6253(d)).
- Do not impose any end-user restrictions upon me (Santa Clara Co. vs Superior Ct, 170 Cal.App 4th 1301); so if you use a third-party website to publish records, please make them completely public without any login or sign-in.

Your agency must do all of the above things in your response, and you cannot wait until we file complaints.

***** We have no duty to, and we will not again, remind the City of its obligations. Instead, we will file complaints for every Sunshine Ordinance or CPRA violation. We will continue to file complaints until the City's procedures are modified to fully comply with the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA, without caveat or exception. *****

I look forward to your lawful response.

NOTE: THE EMAIL ADDRESS SENDING THIS REQUEST IS A PUBLICLY-VIEWABLE MAILBOX. Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,
Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 105657-45010588@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:
%3Fnext%3D%252Fagency%252Flogin%252Fsan-francisco-county-clerk-6701%252Ftext-and-chat-messages-
immediate-disclosure-request-san-francisco-universal-search-bos-
105657%252F%252Femail%252540sfcityatty.org&url_auth_token=AAA7tP8nvUjT9U4taJ8jvW
4kW4%3A1ICRl6%3AYdhv-3ZG0YPosxQ0dlwMLzqWAyv4
Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 105657
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.
From: 105657-45010588@requests.muckrock.com
Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2021 10:41 AM
To: Supervisor Records (CAT)
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (BoS)
Attachments: D7_Melgar.pdf

San Francisco County Board of Supervisors
PRA Office
Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

February 17, 2021

This is a follow up to a previous request:

Supervisor of Records Herrera,

This is a 67.21(d) petition to determine in writing that the redacted message or part of it on attached page 5 is public and an order against Sup Melgar and her Office for its disclosure. The message - in context - appears to be about some sort of fundraising or expenditure of funds and/or how the Mayor’s lending of her name/position to some activity helps raise funds. The Mayor lending her name/position to support something and the relationship of her support to another party raising funds off her is not "purely personal" (San Gabriel Triune v Superior Court (1983)) and must be disclosed.

---Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 105657-45010588@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:
%3Fnext%3D%2F252Faccounts%2F252Fagency_252Fclient-252Fsf-county-clerk-252Ftext-and-chat-messages-
immediate-disclosure-request-san-francisco-universal-search-bos-
105657%2F252Femail%253Dsupervisor.records%252Fsfcityatty.org&url_auth_token=AAA7tP8nvUjT9U4taJ8jW
4kW4%3A1Ir6%3AYdvh-3ZG0YPoxgQ0dlWMLzqWAv4
Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 105657
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.
---

On Feb. 17, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act SUNSHINE REQUEST: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (BoS)
To Whom It May Concern,

Please see the attached records responsive to your request, as per the Office of the Clerk of the Board’s inquiry and coordination with Supervisor Melgar’s office. This completes our response as our office was not able to identify additional responsive records.

Sincerely,

__

Wilson L. Ng
Deputy Director of Operations
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Web: www.sfbos.org

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

Disclosures: Personal information that is provided in communications to the Clerk of 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.

---

On Feb. 12, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act SUNSHINE REQUEST: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (BoS)
To Whom It May Concern,

Thank you for your patience. Please be advised that we are assisting Supervisors Melgar’s office to produce records responsive to your request. We anticipate providing you with any responsive documents early next week.

Regards,

Jackie Hickey
Board of Supervisors
On Feb. 4, 2021:
To SUP. MELGAR and her Office:

** DO NOT DESTROY ANY RESPONSIVE RECORDS. YOU MUST PRESERVE AND ORDER YOUR EMPLOYEES TO PRESERVE ALL RECORDS DURING THE PENDENCY OF ALL APPEALS. WE MAY APPEAL EVERY REDACTION OR WITHHOLDING. **

Immediate Disclosure Request.

The following are THREE separate records requests to you and your office. You must indicate for each request whether or not there are responsive records, whether they are disclosable, and an explanation (Gov Code 6253).

REQUEST ONE. This is an immediate disclosure request for ALL text, chat, or instant messages between MYRNA MELGAR and either Sean Elsbernd, Andrea Bruss, London Breed, Harlan Kelly, Jr., Naomi Kelly, Hank Heckel, Mason Lee, Sophia Kittler, or Walter Wong, including all group messages, and all messages in threads, in any form and any app (including, but not limited to, SMS, MMS, text, iMessage, Teams (including the SFGOV Teams chats), Discord, WeChat, QQ, Signal, Telegram, WhatsApp, Facebook, Facebook Messenger, Twitter, Instagram, Hangouts, Meet, Slack, Skype, Viber, Snapchat, Line, Kik, FaceTime, Wickr Me, Chatroulette, Threema, KakaoTalk, Duo, GroupMe, Wire, Voxer, Allo, Tango, Bumble, Grindr, Tinder, Olive, Taimi, but NOT including email), on any GOVERNMENT accounts/devices, including all participant names, message text, images, attachments, audio files, video files, dates, and times, including any in trash or deleted folders or similar (see Good Government Guide - if the records have not been permanently deleted as of the time you receive this request, you must retrieve them from the so-called trash folders and provide them). Provide rolling responses. Provide exact copies including all metadata. There is no limitation by subject or date AND YOU MUST INCLUDE ANY RECORDS PRIOR TO YOUR ELECTION AS WELL. If the total pages to produce numbers over 500, inform me of the rough dates, employees involved, and subject matter, and I may be willing to narrow the initial production, AS LONG AS YOU PRESERVE ALL THE RECORDS.

REQUEST TWO. This is an immediate disclosure request for ALL text, chat, or instant messages between MYRNA MELGAR and either Sean Elsbernd, Andrea Bruss, London Breed, Harlan Kelly, Jr., Naomi Kelly, Hank Heckel, Mason Lee, Sophia Kittler, or Walter Wong, including all group messages, and all messages in threads, in any form and any app (including, but not limited to, SMS, MMS, text, iMessage, Teams (including the SFGOV Teams chats), Discord, WeChat, QQ, Signal, Telegram, WhatsApp, Facebook, Facebook Messenger, Twitter, Instagram, Hangouts, Meet, Slack, Skype, Viber, Snapchat, Line, Kik, FaceTime, Wickr Me, Chatroulette, Threema, KakaoTalk, Duo, GroupMe, Wire, Voxer, Allo, Tango, Bumble, Grindr, Tinder, Olive, Taimi, but NOT including email), on any PERSONAL accounts or devices, including all participant names, message text, images, attachments, audio files, video files, dates, and times, including any in trash or deleted folders or similar (see Good Government Guide - if the records have not been permanently deleted as of the time you receive this request, you must retrieve them from the so-called trash folders and provide them). Provide rolling responses. Provide exact copies including all metadata. There is no limitation by subject or date AND YOU MUST INCLUDE ANY RECORDS PRIOR TO YOUR ELECTION AS WELL. If the total pages to produce numbers over 500, inform me of the rough dates, employees involved, and subject matter, and I may be willing to narrow the initial production, AS LONG AS YOU PRESERVE ALL THE RECORDS.

REQUEST THREE. This is an immediate disclosure request for ALL text, chat, or instant messages between any MYRNA MELGAR STAFF MEMBER OR INTERN and either Sean Elsbernd, Andrea Bruss, London Breed, Harlan Kelly, Jr., Naomi Kelly, Hank Heckel, Mason Lee, Sophia Kittler, or Walter Wong, including all group messages, and all messages in
threads, in any form and any app (including, but not limited to, SMS, MMS, text, iMessage, Teams (including the SFGOV Teams chats), Discord, WeChat, QQ, Signal, Telegram, WhatsApp, Facebook, Facebook Messenger, Twitter, Instagram, Hangouts, Meet, Slack, Skype, Viber, Snapchat, Line, Kik, FaceTime, Wickr Me, Chatroulette, Threema, KakaoTalk, Duo, GroupMe, Wire, Voxer, Allo, Tango, Bumble, Grindr, Tinder, Olive, Taimi, but NOT including email), on any government accounts/devices or on personal accounts or devices, including all participant names, message text, images, attachments, audio files, video files, dates, and times, including any in trash or deleted folders or similar (see Good Government Guide - if the records have not been permanently deleted as of the time you receive this request, you must retrieve them from the so-called trash folders and provide them). Provide rolling responses. Provide exact copies including all metadata. There is no limitation by subject or date AND YOU MUST INCLUDE ANY RECORDS PRIOR TO YOUR ELECTION AS WELL. If the total pages to produce numbers over 500, inform me of the rough dates, employees involved, and subject matter, and I may be willing to narrow the initial production, AS LONG AS YOU PRESERVE ALL THE RECORDS.

Please provide only those copies of records available without any fees. If you determine certain records would require fees, please instead provide the required notice of which of those records are available and non-exempt for inspection in-person if we so choose.

We have no duty to, and we will not again, remind the City of its obligations. Instead, we will file complaints for every Sunshine Ordinance or CPRA violation. We will continue to file complaints until the City's procedures are modified to fully comply with the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA, without caveat or exception. See attached 12 rulings against the City and in my favor.

Your non-exhaustive obligations:
- All withholding of any information must be justified in writing by specific statutory authority (SFAC 67.27).
- Every redaction must be keyed by footnote or by other clear reference to the specific justification for that redaction, and only the minimal exempt portion of any record may be withheld (SFAC 67.26).
- You must respond to emailed requests (SFAC 67.21(b)).
- You must notify us of whether or not responsive records exist and/or were withheld for each above request (Gov Code 6253(c), 6255(b)).
- You must state the name and title of each person responsible for withholding any information (Gov Code 6253(d)).
- Do not impose any end-user restrictions upon me (Santa Clara Co. vs Superior Ct, 170 Cal.App 4th 1301); so if you use a third-party website to publish records, please make them completely public without any login or sign-in.

Your agency must do all of the above things in your response, and you cannot wait until we file complaints. See prior SOTF Orders and rulings in my favor.

The Mayor's Office appears to have destroyed their copies of certain text messages. I'd be happy to get them from her, if she preserved every record. Alas she does not keep her texts, therefore we must now conduct a universal search of the City. You cannot refer me to another department unless you search and determine that you have no copies in your department. Tell your Mayor to stop destroying her public records. Senior officials must preserve and maintain all correspondence in a professional and businesslike manner (SFAC 67.29-7(a)) and also separately must comply with retention policies (SFAC 67.29-1). Note that if your retention policies do not retain text messages, I will argue before the SOTF and court that this is a failure to maintain **all** correspondence** in a professional and businesslike manner.

You must search personal accounts and devices pursuant to City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017).

Note there are many anonymous requesters using MuckRock - I am just one of them. If you previously produced some subset of these records to a MuckRock email address, please reference that prior response so you do not duplicate work. If I am unable to get the prior MuckRock response because it is someone else's and they have marked it private, you will however need to provide me a copy here as well.

I look forward to your lawful response.
NOTE: THE EMAIL ADDRESS SENDING THIS REQUEST IS A PUBLICLY-VIEWABLE MAILBOX. Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

---

On Jan. 8, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (BoS)
Thank you Sup. Ronen for your attention to this matter, we have no further issues on this request. Thank you also for at least partially complying with SOTF's many decisions regarding email headers, which I mentioned at public comment today.

I will note that your staff appear to misunderstand the Mayor’s COVID orders by the way. While the Mayor purports to suspend the 1-day IDR deadline - the Mayor did not, and cannot, suspend the state law 10-day CPRA deadline. Please consult with your DCAs on this matter and educate your staff.

I would also encourage you and your staff to consider the public records system used by many other City departments to track deadlines, consistently redact records, and more, called NextRequest. It may improve your compliance with the law.

Sincerely,
Anonymous

---

On Jan. 8, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (BoS)
Thank you. And also thank you for producing email metadata in at least one of those emails. I'm glad word has gotten around about SOTF's decisions.

You seem to misunderstand the Mayor’s COVID orders btw. While the Mayor purports to suspend the 1-day IDR deadline - the Mayor did not, and cannot, suspend the state law 10-day deadline, which was violated in this case. Please consult with your DCAs on this matter.

---

On Dec. 8, 2020:
Subject: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (BoS)
To the Board of Supervisors and HILLARY RONEN:
** DO NOT DESTROY ANY RESPONSIVE RECORDS. YOU MUST PRESERVE AND ORDER YOUR EMPLOYEES TO PRESERVE RECORDS DURING THE PENDENCY OF ALL APPEALS. WE WILL APPEAL ALL REDACTIONS OR WITHHOLDINGS. **

Immediate Disclosure Request.

Relevant precedent: SOTF 19098 - Anonymous v SFPD. Unanimous finding of violation for unlawfully withholding text message metadata (including the to/from/etc. - note SFPD had provided the dates and times, and you must as well), and also for unlawfully printing and scanning electronic records which does not constitute a "copy" of an electronic record.

See also prior rulings in my favor in SOTF 19044, 19047, 19091, 19098, 19103, 19108, 19112 which ruled against the City for email, text messages, past and future calendar entries, meeting details, electronic metadata, and attachments.

The Mayor's Office appears to have destroyed their copies of certain text messages. I'd be happy to get them from her, if she preserved every record. Alas she did not, therefore we must now conduct a universal search of the City. You cannot refer me to another department unless you search and determine that you have no copies in your department. Ask your Mayor to stop destroying her public records. Senior officials must preserve and maintain all correspondence in a professional and businesslike manner (SFAC 67.29-7(a)) and also separately must comply with retention policies (SFAC 67.29-1). Note that if your retention policies do not retain text messages, I will argue before the SOTF and court that this is a failure to maintain **all correspondence** in a professional and businesslike manner.

You must search personal accounts and devices pursuant to City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017).

Note there are many anonymous requesters using MuckRock - I am just one of them. If you previously produced some subset of these records to a MuckRock email address, please reference that prior response so you do not duplicate work. If I am unable to get the prior MuckRock response because it is someone else's and they have marked it private, you will however need to provide me a copy here as well.

1. This is an immediate disclosure request for text, chat, or instant messages between HILLARY RONEN and either Sean Elsernd, Andrea Bruss, London Breed, Harlan Kelly, Jr., Naomi Kelly, Hank Heckel, or Walter Wong, including all group messages, and all messages in threads, in any form and any app (including, but not limited to, SMS, MMS, text, iMessage, Teams, Discord, WeChat, QQ, Signal, Telegram, WhatsApp, Facebook, Facebook Messenger, Twitter, Instagram, Hangouts, Meet, Slack, Skype, Viber, Snapchat, Line, Kik, FaceTime, Wickr Me, Chatroulette, Threema, KakaoTalk, Duo, GroupMe, Wire, Voxer, Allo, Tango, Bumble, Grindr, Tinder, Olive, Taimi, but NOT including email), on any government accounts/devices or on personal accounts or devices regarding the conduct of public business, including all participant names, message text, images, attachments, dates, and times, including any in trash or deleted folders or similar (see Good Government Guide - if the records have not been permanently deleted as of the time you receive this request, you must retrieve them from the so-called trash folders and provide them). Provide rolling responses. Provide exact copies including all metadata. There is no limitation by subject or date. If the total pages to produce numbers over 500, inform me of the rough dates, employees involved, and subject matter, and I may be willing to narrow the initial production, AS LONG AS YOU PRESERVE ALL THE RECORDS.

2. This is a regular records request for text, chat, or instant messages between any HILLARY RONEN STAFF MEMBER OR INTERN and either Sean Elsernd, Andrea Bruss, London Breed, Harlan Kelly, Jr., Naomi Kelly, Hank Heckel, or Walter Wong, including all group messages, and all messages in threads, in any form and any app (including, but not limited to, SMS, MMS, text, iMessage, Teams, Discord, WeChat, QQ, Signal, Telegram, WhatsApp, Facebook, Facebook Messenger, Twitter, Instagram, Hangouts, Meet, Slack, Skype, Viber, Snapchat, Line, Kik, FaceTime, Wickr Me, Chatroulette, Threema, KakaoTalk, Duo, GroupMe, Wire, Voxer, Allo, Tango, Bumble, Grindr, Tinder, Olive, Taimi, but NOT including email), on any government accounts/devices or on personal accounts or devices regarding the conduct of public business, including all participant names, message text, images, attachments, dates, and times, including any in trash or deleted folders or similar (see Good Government Guide - if the records have not been permanently deleted as of the time you receive this request, you must retrieve them from the so-called trash folders and provide them). Provide rolling responses. Provide exact copies including all metadata. There is no limitation by subject or date. If the total pages to
produce numbers over 500, inform me of the rough dates, employees involved, and subject matter, and I may be willing to narrow the initial production, AS LONG AS YOU PRESERVE ALL THE RECORDS.

Please provide only those copies of records available without any fees. If you determine certain records would require fees, please instead provide the required notice of which of those records are available and non-exempt for inspection in-person if we so choose.

Your non-exhaustive obligations:
- All withholding of any information must be justified in writing by specific statutory authority (SFAC 67.27).
- Every redaction must be keyed by footnote or by other clear reference to the specific justification for that redaction, and only the minimal exempt portion of any record may be withheld (SFAC 67.26).
- You must respond to emailed requests (SFAC 67.21(b)).
- You must notify us of whether or not responsive records exist and/or were withheld for each above request (Gov Code 6253(c), 6255(b)).
- You must state the name and title of each person responsible for withholding any information (Gov Code 6253(d)).
- Do not impose any end-user restrictions upon me (Santa Clara Co. vs Superior Ct, 170 Cal.App 4th 1301); so if you use a third-party website to publish records, please make them completely public without any login or sign-in.

Your agency must do all of the above things in your response, and you cannot wait until we file complaints.

****** We have no duty to, and we will not again, remind the City of its obligations. Instead, we will file complaints for every Sunshine Ordinance or CPRA violation. We will continue to file complaints until the City's procedures are modified to fully comply with the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA, without caveat or exception. ******

I look forward to your lawful response.

NOTE: THE EMAIL ADDRESS SENDING THIS REQUEST IS A PUBLICLY-VIEWABLE MAILBOX. Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 105657-45010588@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:
%3Fnext%3D%3D%25252Faccounts%25252Fagency-login%25252Fsan-francisco-county- clerk-6701%25252Ftext-and-chat-messages-
immediate-disclosure-request-san-francisco-universal-search-bos-
105657%252F252F%25252Femail%2525252Fsfcityatty.org%2525252Furl_auth_token=AAA7tP8nvUjT9U4taJ8jvW
4kW4%3A1lCRi6%3AYdvh-3ZG0YPoxgQ0dlwMlzqWAv4
Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.
Hi Myrna! This is Sophia, mayor's liaison to the BOS. Congrats on your inauguration today; this is my cell in case you need it!!

1/9/21 9:29 AM

Thank you Sophia!

1/11/21 12:40 PM

Hi Supe! We have a piece of CEQA streamlining legislation that is due to come to your committee. Who in your office should I reach out to for land use issues?

Hi Sophia that would be Jen Low. Thank you

Thank you!
Morning Supervisor, Left you a VM about an appointment the Mayor is making this morning at 11. Give me a call if you have any questions (or don't want to listen to your voicemails)

Hi Sophia I got your message. Got it and pls let MLB know that I 200% support Carmen! She is one of the smartest, most competent and kindest public servants we have. TY
Hi Supe,

This was not in the Draft I sent you

https://sf.gov/vaccinenotify

Thank you!

In a staff meeting will call u back

👍
Thank you Sophia!

On the phone will call u back

Ha I didn't realize how frequently I use that emoji
The only reason I was invited because no one will give money without me supporting this.

Of course. We need you!!! 😚

Thank you!
To Whom It May Concern –

We understand that the Public Utilities Commission has now produced the record to you and has removed the redaction you contested. We therefore close your petition as moot.

Bradley Russi  
Deputy City Attorney  
Office of City Attorney Dennis Herrera  
City Hall, Room 234  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., San Francisco, CA 94102  
www.sfcityattorney.org

From: 105587-12919977@requests.muckrock.com <105587-12919977@requests.muckrock.com>  
Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2021 7:45 PM  
To: Supervisor Records (CAT) <supervisor.records@SFCITYATTY.ORG>  
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (PUC)

Public Utilities Commission  
PRA Office  
Polk Street  
525 Golden Gate Avenue  
SF, CA 94102

February 17, 2021

This is a follow up to a previous request:

Supervisor of Records,

The 2nd redaction on the attached public record from PUC is challenged. Please determine in writing that it is public and order it disclosed pursuant to SFAC 67.21(d).

The location of a water leak worked on by PUC is by definition conduct of public business. The Mayor doesn’t have special rights to hide certain public utility work that happens to be near her. (Note that the water leak is apparently NOT the Mayor’s home address and thus is not exempt under Gov Code 6254.21 or their other citations.)

--Anonymous
On Feb. 17, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (PUC)
Search also all persons who directly reported to Harlan Kelly prior to his termination and also all persons who reported directly or indirectly to Juliet Ellis.

On Feb. 17, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (PUC)
Dear Requester,

The SFPUC has requested the Executive Management staff to search for responsive records. The responsive records are available to you at this link: https://sfpuc.sharefile.com/d-s72233ecd4fec4ba5858e17407834405c. Due to the need to continue searching and reviewing responsive records, we will produce any additional responsive records as soon as reasonably possible on an incremental or rolling basis. In order for us to continue our search, please specify which other employees, if any, you would like to search for further responsive records. Please keep in mind that the SFPUC has over 2,300 employees and the search will likely take a substantial amount of time without a narrower scope.

Finally, please be advised that we have redacted from the enclosed records the home addresses and personal phone numbers on privacy grounds. Redactions are based on California Constitution, Article I, section 1, California Government Code Section 6254(k), and California Government Code Section 6254(c). These provisions guard against disclosure of information that would invade personal privacy. Further, both the California Public Records Act (California Government Code Section 6250) and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance (San Francisco Administrative Code Section 67.1(g)) acknowledge the importance of protecting personal privacy where disclosing records in response to a public records request.

Best Regards,
SFPUC Public Records

---
On Dec. 17, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (PUC)
Provide rolling responses working backwards from the most recent records to the oldest, and prioritize the most senior employees including your department head.

Note that if you unreasonably delay any particular records that will be a violation of 67.21(a) and I will file complaints on that basis.

---

On Dec. 17, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (PUC)
Dear Requester,

We are conducting a diligent search for records, and we have determined that we may have records responsive to your request. Please note that the SFPUC reserves the right to invoke one or more exemptions to the disclosure of records, as applicable. Finally, due to the broad scope of your request, the SFPUC estimates that it will be able to provide a full response to your request on or before December 31, 2022. Please be advised that the SFPUC reserves the right to further extend this timeline due to the voluminous amount of records that might be located. This timeline may be reduced, however, if you agree to narrow your request.

Best regards,
SFPUC Public Records

---

On Dec. 7, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (PUC)
Thank you for your public records request. We are in receipt of your request dated December 7, 2020. As explained in the attached memo<https://www.sfwater.org/modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentID=15142>, per the emergency orders of the Mayor, the provisions of the Sunshine Ordinance relating to immediate disclosure requests have been temporarily suspended for the duration of the local emergency. We will provide our initial response to you on or before December 17, 2020, in accordance with those Mayoral orders and the California Public Records Act.

---

On Dec. 5, 2020:
Subject: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (PUC)
To Public Utilities Commission and its Department Head or Elected Official:

** DO NOT DESTROY ANY RESPONSIVE RECORDS. YOU MUST PRESERVE AND ORDER YOUR EMPLOYEES TO PRESERVE RECORDS DURING THE PENDENCY OF ALL APPEALS. WE WILL APPEAL ALL REDACTIONS OR WITHHOLDINGS. **
Immediate Disclosure Request.

Every department head/elected official must preserve and maintain all correspondence in a professional and businesslike manner (SFAC 67.29-7(a)) and also separately must comply with retention policies (SFAC 67.29-1). Note that if your retention policies do not retain text messages, I will argue before the SOTF and court that this is a failure to maintain **all correspondence** in a professional and businesslike manner.
Relevant precedent: SOTF 19098 - Anonymous v SFPD. Unanimous finding of violation for unlawfully withholding text message metadata (including the to/from/etc. - note SFPD had provided the dates and times, and you must as well), and also for unlawfully printing and scanning electronic records which does not constitute a "copy" of an electronic record. See also prior rulings in my favor in SOTF 19044, 19047, 19091, 19098, 19103, and 19108 which ruled against the City for email, text messages, past and future calendar entries, meeting details, electronic metadata, and attachments.

The Mayor's Office appears to have destroyed their copies of certain text messages. I'd be happy to get them from her, if she preserved every record. Alas she did not, therefore we must now conduct a universal search of the City. You cannot refer me to another department unless you search and determine that you have no copies in your department. If this is causing more work for you, ask your Mayor to stop destroying her public records.

Note there are many anonymous requesters using MuckRock - I am just one of them. If you previously produced some subset of these records to a MuckRock email address, please reference that prior response so you do not duplicate work. If I am unable to get the prior MuckRock response because it is someone else's and they have marked it private, you will however need to provide me a copy here as well.

1. This is an immediate disclosure request for text, chat, or instant messages between the department head/elected official and either Sean Elsbernd, Andrea Bruss, London Breed, Harlan Kelly, Jr., Naomi Kelly, Hank Heckel, or Walter Wong, including all group messages, and all messages in threads, in any form and any app (including, but not limited to, SMS, MMS, text, iMessage, Teams, Discord, WeChat, QQ, Signal, Telegram, WhatsApp, Facebook, Facebook Messenger, Twitter, Instagram, Hangouts, Meet, Slack, Skype, Viber, Snapchat, Line, Kik, FaceTime, Wickr Me, Chatroulette, Threema, KakaoTalk, Duo, GroupMe, Wire, Viper, Allo, Tango, Bumble, Grindr, Tinder, Olive, Taimi, but NOT including email), on any government accounts/devices or on personal accounts or devices regarding the conduct of public business, including all participant names, message text, images, attachments, dates, and times, including any in trash or deleted folders or similar (see Good Government Guide - if the records have not been permanently deleted as of the time you receive this request, you must retrieve them from the so-called trash folders and provide them). Provide rolling responses. Provide exact copies including all metadata. There is no limitation by subject or date. If the total pages to produce numbers over 500, inform me of the rough dates, employees involved, and subject matter, and I may be willing to narrow the initial production, AS LONG AS YOU PRESERVE ALL THE RECORDS.

Please provide only those copies of records available without any fees. If you determine certain records would require fees, please instead provide the required notice of which of those records are available and non-exempt for inspection in-person if we so choose.

Your non-exhaustive obligations:
- All withholding of any information must be justified in writing by specific statutory authority (SFAC 67.27).
- Every redaction must be keyed by footnote or by other clear reference to the specific justification for that redaction, and only the minimal exempt portion of any record may be withheld (SFAC 67.26).
- You must respond to emailed requests (SFAC 67.21(b)).
- You must notify us of whether or not responsive records exist and/or were withheld for each above request (Gov Code 6253(c), 6255(b)).
- You must state the name and title of each person responsible for withholding any information (Gov Code 6253(d)).
- Do not impose any end-user restrictions upon me (Santa Clara Co. vs Superior Ct, 170 Cal.App 4th 1301); so if you use a third-party website to publish records, please make them completely public without any login or sign-in.

Your agency must do all of the above things in your response, and you cannot wait until we file complaints.

****** We have no duty to, and we will not again, remind the City of its obligations. Instead, we will file complaints for every Sunshine Ordinance or CPRA violation. We will continue to file complaints until the City's procedures are modified to fully comply with the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA, without caveat or exception. ******

I look forward to your lawful response.

NOTE: THE EMAIL ADDRESS SENDING THIS REQUEST IS A PUBLICLY-VIEWABLE MAILBOX. Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 105587-12919977@requests.muckrock.com
%3Fnext%3D%2Faccounts%2Fagency_login%2Fpublic-utilities-commission-4834%2Ftext-and-chat-messages-immediate-disclosure-request-san-francisco-universal-search-puc-105587%252F252Femail%252D253Dsupervisor.records%252D2540sfcityatty.org&url_auth_token=AABcOvcgKY8Kp2249Biuij8PPBY%3A1lCaFs%3AFB5d4cw6e8DyVL_6nriZfN7bgwE
Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 105587
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.
Buta, Odaya (CAT)

From: 105587-12919977@requests.muckrock.com
Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2021 7:45 PM
To: Supervisor Records (CAT)
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (PUC)
Attachments: 20210125_100027_Redacted.pdf

Public Utilities Commission
PRA Office
Polk Street
525 Golden Gate Avenue
SF, CA 94102

February 17, 2021

This is a follow up to a previous request:

Supervisor of Records,

The 2nd redaction on the attached public record from PUC is challenged. Please determine in writing that it is public and order it disclosed pursuant to SFAC 67.21(d).

The location of a water leak worked on by PUC is by definition conduct of public business. The Mayor doesn't have special rights to hide certain public utility work that happens to be near her. (Note that the water leak is apparently NOT the Mayor's home address and thus is not exempt under Gov Code 6254.21 or their other citations.)

--Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 105587-12919977@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:

Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 105587
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the
requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.

---

On Feb. 17, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (PUC)
Search also all persons who directly reported to Harlan Kelly prior to his termination and also all persons who reported directly or indirectly to Juliet Ellis.

---

On Feb. 17, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (PUC)
Dear Requester,

The SFPUC has requested the Executive Management staff to search for responsive records. The responsive records are available to you at this link: https://sfpuc.sharefile.com/d-s72233ecd4fec4ba5858e17407834405c. Due to the need to continue searching and reviewing responsive records, we will produce any additional responsive records as soon as reasonably possible on an incremental or rolling basis. In order for us to continue our search, please specify which other employees, if any, you would like to search for further responsive records. Please keep in mind that the SFPUC has over 2,300 employees and the search will likely take a substantial amount of time without a narrower scope.

Finally, please be advised that we have redacted from the enclosed records the home addresses and personal phone numbers on privacy grounds. Redactions are based on California Constitution, Article I, section 1, California Government Code Section 6254(k), and California Government Code Section 6254(c). These provisions guard against disclosure of information that would invade personal privacy. Further, both the California Public Records Act (California Government Code Section 6250) and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance (San Francisco Administrative Code Section 67.1(g)) acknowledge the importance of protecting personal privacy where disclosing records in response to a public records request.

Best Regards,
SFPUC Public Records

---

On Dec. 17, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (PUC)
Provide rolling responses working backwards from the most recent records to the oldest, and prioritize the most senior employees including your department head.

Note that if you unreasonably delay any particular records that will be a violation of 67.21(a) and I will file complaints on that basis.

---

On Dec. 17, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (PUC)
Dear Requester,
We are conducting a diligent search for records, and we have determined that we may have records responsive to your request. Please note that the SFPUC reserves the right to invoke one or more exemptions to the disclosure of records, as applicable. Finally, due to the broad scope of your request, the SFPUC estimates that it will be able to provide a full response to your request on or before December 31, 2022. Please be advised that the SFPUC reserves the right to further extend this timeline due to the voluminous amount of records that might be located. This timeline may be reduced, however, if you agree to narrow your request.

Best regards,
SFPUC Public Records

---

On Dec. 7, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (PUC)
Thank you for your public records request. We are in receipt of your request dated December 7, 2020. As explained in the attached memo<https://www.sfwater.org/modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentID=15142>, per the emergency orders of the Mayor, the provisions of the Sunshine Ordinance relating to immediate disclosure requests have been temporarily suspended for the duration of the local emergency. We will provide our initial response to you on or before December 17, 2020, in accordance with those Mayoral orders and the California Public Records Act.

---

On Dec. 5, 2020:
Subject: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (PUC)
To Public Utilities Commission and its Department Head or Elected Official:

** DO NOT DESTROY ANY RESPONSIVE RECORDS. YOU MUST PRESERVE AND ORDER YOUR EMPLOYEES TO PRESERVE RECORDS DURING THE PENDENCY OF ALL APPEALS. WE WILL APPEAL ALL REDACTIONS OR WITHHOLDINGS. **
Immediate Disclosure Request.

Every department head/elected official must preserve and maintain all correspondence in a professional and businesslike manner (SFAC 67.29-7(a)) and also separately must comply with retention policies (SFAC 67.29-1). Note that if your retention policies do not retain text messages, I will argue before the SOTF and court that this is a failure to maintain **all correspondence** in a professional and businesslike manner.

Relevant precedent: SOTF 19098 - Anonymous v SFPD. Unanimous finding of violation for unlawfully withholding text message metadata (including the to/from/etc. - note SFPD had provided the dates and times, and you must as well), and also for unlawfully printing and scanning electronic records which does not constitute a "copy" of an electronic record. See also prior rulings in my favor in SOTF 19044, 19047, 19091, 19098, 19103, and 19108 which ruled against the City for email, text messages, past and future calendar entries, meeting details, electronic metadata, and attachments.

The Mayor's Office appears to have destroyed their copies of certain text messages. I'd be happy to get them from her, if she preserved every record. Alas she did not, therefore we must now conduct a universal search of the City. You cannot refer me to another department unless you search and determine that you have no copies in your department. If this is causing more work for you, ask your Mayor to stop destroying her public records.

Note there are many anonymous requesters using MuckRock - I am just one of them. If you previously produced some subset of these records to a MuckRock email address, please reference that prior response so you do not duplicate work. If I am unable to get the prior MuckRock response because it is someone else's and they have marked it private, you will however need to provide me a copy here as well.
1. This is an immediate disclosure request for text, chat, or instant messages between the department head/elected official and either Sean Elsbernd, Andrea Bruss, London Breed, Harlan Kelly, Jr., Naomi Kelly, Hank Heckel, or Walter Wong, including all group messages, and all messages in threads, in any form and any app (including, but not limited to, SMS, MMS, text, iMessage, Teams, Discord, WeChat, QQ, Signal, Telegram, WhatsApp, Facebook, Facebook Messenger, Twitter, Instagram, Hangouts, Meet, Slack, Skype, Viber, Snapchat, Line, Kik, FaceTime, Wickr Me, Chatroulette, Threema, KakaoTalk, Duo, GroupMe, Wire, Viber, Allo, Tango, Bumble, Grindr, Tinder, Olive, Taimi, but NOT including email), on any government accounts/devices or on personal accounts or devices regarding the conduct of public business, including all participant names, message text, images, attachments, dates, and times, including any in trash or deleted folders or similar (see Good Government Guide - if the records have not been permanently deleted as of the time you receive this request, you must retrieve them from the so-called trash folders and provide them). Provide rolling responses. Provide exact copies including all metadata. There is no limitation by subject or date. If the total pages to produce numbers over 500, inform me of the rough dates, employees involved, and subject matter, and I may be willing to narrow the initial production, AS LONG AS YOU PRESERVE ALL THE RECORDS.

2. This is a regular records request for text, chat, or instant messages between the other dept employees (not the head) and either Sean Elsbernd, Andrea Bruss, London Breed, Harlan Kelly, Jr., Naomi Kelly, Hank Heckel, or Walter Wong, including all group messages, and all messages in threads, in any form and any app (including, but not limited to, SMS, MMS, text, iMessage, Teams, Discord, WeChat, QQ, Signal, Telegram, WhatsApp, Facebook, Facebook Messenger, Twitter, Instagram, Hangouts, Meet, Slack, Skype, Viber, Snapchat, Line, Kik, FaceTime, Wickr Me, Chatroulette, Threema, KakaoTalk, Duo, GroupMe, Wire, Viber, Allo, Tango, Bumble, Grindr, Tinder, Olive, Taimi, but NOT including email), on any government accounts/devices or on personal accounts or devices regarding the conduct of public business, including all participant names, message text, images, attachments, dates, and times, including any in trash or deleted folders or similar (see Good Government Guide - if the records have not been permanently deleted as of the time you receive this request, you must retrieve them from the so-called trash folders and provide them). Provide rolling responses. Provide exact copies including all metadata. There is no limitation by subject or date. If the total pages to produce numbers over 500, inform me of the rough dates, employees involved, and subject matter, and I may be willing to narrow the initial production, AS LONG AS YOU PRESERVE ALL THE RECORDS.

Please provide only those copies of records available without any fees. If you determine certain records would require fees, please instead provide the required notice of which of those records are available and non-exempt for inspection in-person if we so choose.

Your non-exhaustive obligations:
- All withholding of any information must be justified in writing by specific statutory authority (SFAC 67.27).
- Every redaction must be keyed by footnote or by other clear reference to the specific justification for that redaction, and only the minimal exempt portion of any record may be withheld (SFAC 67.26).
- You must respond to emailed requests (SFAC 67.21(b)).
- You must notify us of whether or not responsive records exist and/or were withheld for each above request (Gov Code 6253(c), 6255(b)).
- You must state the name and title of each person responsible for withholding any information (Gov Code 6253(d)).
- Do not impose any end-user restrictions upon me (Santa Clara Co. vs Superior Ct, 170 Cal.App 4th 1301); so if you use a third-party website to publish records, please make them completely public without any login or sign-in.

Your agency must do all of the above things in your response, and you cannot wait until we file complaints.

****** We have no duty to, and we will not again, remind the City of its obligations. Instead, we will file complaints for every Sunshine Ordinance or CPRA violation. We will continue to file complaints until the City's procedures are modified to fully comply with the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA, without caveat or exception. ******

I look forward to your lawful response.
NOTE: THE EMAIL ADDRESS sending this request IS A PUBLICLY-VIEWABLE MAILBOX. Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 105587-12919977@requests.muckrock.com
Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 105587
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.
Hey Steve, it’s a water main break at [REDACTED] near the Mayor’s house. She feels that our response is slow. Can we jump on it.

Friday, Jul 5, 2019 • 8:58 PM

Any problem upcountry from the earthquake?

None that I’m aware of.

I will report back to the mayor.

Yep. Not close enough. My son in LA felt it, but no damage, just a ride.

I felt it here in Fresno. The water was splashing out of the pool.

Whee!

Sunday, Jul 28, 2019 • 6:28 PM

Sent email for check center. Brook
To Whom It May Concern –

We understand that the Library responded to the request at issue in the petition below. If you continue to contest the adequacy of the Library’s response, please let us know and we will look into it. Thank you.

Bradley Russi  
Deputy City Attorney  
Office of City Attorney David Chiu  
City Hall, Room 234  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., San Francisco, CA 94102  
www.sfcityattorney.org

From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>  
Sent: Sunday, February 21, 2021 3:40 PM  
To: Shaub, Margot (LIB) <margot.shaub@sfpl.org>; Supervisor Records (CAT) <supervisor.records@SFCITYATTY.ORG>  
Subject: RE: Immediate Disclosure Request – Emails to/from Commissioners

You are wrong Ms. Shaub. Pursuant to the CPRA, which does apply (and Mayor Breed lacks any authority to suspend it), you are still required to within 10 days of a request provide a notice of determination of disclosable public records (and an explanation if not disclosable, which would be locally a 67.27 written justification) OR a notice of a date of extension of no more than 14 additional days to make such a determination (Gov Code 6253(c)).

You have done neither and thus have failed or refused to comply with my request. Also, please produce all records on a rolling basis - which means you must provide records within one day of reviewing any records, not waiting for the entire set of all records - see Admin Code 67.25(d) which is not suspended.

Supervisor of Records Herrera - pursuant to 67.21(d) - this is a petition for written determination that the records requested are public as the Library Commission has refused, failed, or incompletely complied with my request. The CPRA deadline has passed. Please order the records disclosed.

NOTE: 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous
On Sun, Feb 21, 2021 at 3:21 PM, Shaub, Margot (LIB) <margot.shaub@sfpl.org> wrote:

Dear Anonymous,

I wanted to provide you an update on your public records request, dated 2/5/21.

The Sunshine Ordinance requires departments to respond as soon as possible or within 10 calendar days from receipt of any records requests. Please note that during the current public health emergency, the department is not required to provide copies of records by this deadline but must notify the requester whether the records exist.

Our department is identifying and currently compiling the requested information and our goal is to respond as quickly as possible to your request.

Sincerely,

Margot Shaub

Margot Shaub | Library Commission Affairs Analyst | San Francisco Public Library

(415) 557 4233 | margot.shaub@sfpl.org | sfpl.org

From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 5, 2021 10:01 AM
To: SFPL-Commission <commission.info@sfpl.org>; Lambert, Michael (LIB) <michael.lambert@sfpl.org>
Subject: Immediate Disclosure Request - Emails to/from Commissioners

This is an immediate disclosure request to Margot Shaub for the ten most recent emails sent by them to each commissioner AND 10 most recent sent to Lambert.

This is an immediate disclosure request to Mary Wardell Ghirarduzzi for the ten most recent emails sent by them to either Shaub, Lambert, or any other commissioner.
This is an immediate disclosure request to Pete Huang for the ten most recent emails sent by them to either Shaub, Lambert, or any other commissioner.

This is an immediate disclosure request to John Lee for the ten most recent emails sent by them to either Shaub, Lambert, or any other commissioner.

This is an immediate disclosure request to Eurania López for the ten most recent emails sent by them to either Shaub, Lambert, or any other commissioner.

This is an immediate disclosure request to Susan Mall for the ten most recent emails sent by them to either Shaub, Lambert, or any other commissioner.

This is an immediate disclosure request to Teresa Ono for the ten most recent emails sent by them to either Shaub, Lambert, or any other commissioner.

This is an immediate disclosure request to Connie Wolf for the ten most recent emails sent by them to either Shaub, Lambert, or any other commissioner.

This is an immediate disclosure request to Michael Lambert for the ten most recent emails sent by them to either Shaub or any other commissioner.

Please comply with all rules in the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA. I will file complaints for all violations. For example:

- you must search personal accounts and devices (see City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017)).

- every redaction must be keyed by footnote or other clear reference to legal justification (SFAC 67.26)

- every document withheld must be justified in writing (SFAC 67.27)

- email addresses, including personal ones, used to conduct public business must be disclosed (Gov Code 6254.3(b)(1))

- you must provide exact copies of all electronic records (all email addresses, To, From, Cc, Bcc tool, images, attachments, hyperlinks, dates/times, etc.). (see SOTF Orders 19097, 19098, 19121)

- do not force me to agree to any terms or end-user agreements. If you use NextRequest, therefore, please make the request completely public so I do not have to sign-in. (see Santa Clara Co. v Superior Court (2009))

**NOTE:** 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.
From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 21, 2021 3:40 PM
To: Shaub, Margot (LIB); Supervisor Records (CAT)
Subject: RE: Immediate Disclosure Request - Emails to/from Commissioners

You are wrong Ms. Shaub. Pursuant to the CPRA, which does apply (and Mayor Breed lacks any authority to suspend it), you are still required to within 10 days of a request provide a notice of determination of disclosable public records (and an explanation if not disclosable, which would be locally a 67.27 written justification) OR a notice of a date of extension of no more than 14 additional days to make such a determination (Gov Code 6253(c)).

You have done neither and thus have failed or refused to comply with my request. Also, please produce all records on a rolling basis - which means you must provide records within one day of reviewing any records, not waiting for the entire set of all records - see Admin Code 67.25(d) which is not suspended.

Supervisor of Records Herrera - pursuant to 67.21(d) - this is a petition for written determination that the records requested are public as the Library Commission has refused, failed, or incompletely complied with my request. The CPRA deadline has passed. Please order the records disclosed.

NOTE: 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

Sent from ProtonMail Mobile

On Sun, Feb 21, 2021 at 3:21 PM, Shaub, Margot (LIB) <margot.shaub@sfpl.org> wrote:

Dear Anonymous,

I wanted to provide you an update on your public records request, dated 2/5/21.

The Sunshine Ordinance requires departments to respond as soon as possible or within 10 calendar days from receipt of any records requests. Please note that during the current public health emergency, the department is not required to provide copies of records by this deadline but must notify the requester whether the records exist.
Our department is identifying and currently compiling the requested information and our goal is to respond as quickly as possible to your request.

Sincerely,

Margot Shaub

Margot Shaub | Library Commission Affairs Analyst | San Francisco Public Library

(415) 557 4233 | margot.shaub@sfpl.org | sfpl.org

From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 5, 2021 10:01 AM
To: SFPL-Commission <commission.info@sfpl.org>; Lambert, Michael (LIB) <michael.lambert@sfpl.org>
Subject: Immediate Disclosure Request - Emails to/from Commissioners

This is an immediate disclosure request to Margot Shaub for the ten most recent emails sent by them to each commissioner AND 10 most recent sent to Lambert.

This is an immediate disclosure request to Mary Wardell Ghirarduzzi for the ten most recent emails sent by them to either Shaub, Lambert, or any other commissioner.

This is an immediate disclosure request to Pete Huang for the ten most recent emails sent by them to either Shaub, Lambert, or any other commissioner.

This is an immediate disclosure request to John Lee for the ten most recent emails sent by them to either Shaub, Lambert, or any other commissioner.

This is an immediate disclosure request to Eurania López for the ten most recent emails sent by them to either Shaub, Lambert, or any other commissioner.

This is an immediate disclosure request to Susan Mall for the ten most recent emails sent by them to either Shaub, Lambert, or any other commissioner.

This is an immediate disclosure request to Teresa Ono for the ten most recent emails sent by them to either Shaub, Lambert, or any other commissioner.

This is an immediate disclosure request to Connie Wolf for the ten most recent emails sent by them to either Shaub, Lambert, or any other commissioner.
This is an immediate disclosure request to Michael Lambert for the ten most recent emails sent by them to either Shaub or any other commissioner.

Please comply with all rules in the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA. I will file complaints for all violations. For example:

- you must search personal accounts and devices (see City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017)).
- every redaction must be keyed by footnote or other clear reference to legal justification (SFAC 67.26)
- every document withheld must be justified in writing (SFAC 67.27)
- email addresses, including personal ones, used to conduct public business must be disclosed (Gov Code 6254.3(b)(1))
- you must provide exact copies of all electronic records (all email addresses, To, From, Cc, Bcc tool, images, attachments, hyperlinks, dates/times, etc.). (see SOTF Orders 19097, 19098, 19121)
- do not force me to agree to any terms or end-user agreements. If you use NextRequest, therefore, please make the request completely public so I do not have to sign-in. (see Santa Clara Co. v Superior Court (2009))

**NOTE:** 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous
March 8, 2021

Sent via email (94992-15550486@requests.muckrock.com and arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com)

Re: Petitions to Supervisor of Records

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter responds to your petitions sent via email to the Supervisor of Records on July 9, 2020 and February 22, 2021, both concerning your June 11, 2020 request to the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (“SFPUC”) and former SFPUC General Manager Harlan Kelly, Jr. for communications involving Mr. Kelly. Specifically, on June 11, 2020, you requested that the SFPUC provide texts, emails, and chat messages with various individuals. Relevant to these petitions, your June 11 request in part sought the following records:

All text, email, or chat messages (including group messages, in any form or application including but not limited to SMS, MMS, WhatsApp, WeChat, Signal, Instagram, Twitter, Facebook, Hangouts, Skype, Teams) sent or received to/cc/bcc/from between Harlan Kelly Jr. and Walter Wong/Jaidin Consulting Group/Jaidin Associates (including but not limited to jaidin@pacbell.net, jdngrp@pacbell.net, or any email address ending with jaidin.net ), on government or personal accounts from Jan 1, 2015 and present (you must search personal accounts pursuant to City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017))

We understand that in response to your June 11 request, and consistent with the longstanding advice of the City Attorney’s Office as described in our Office’s public memorandum dated March 24, 2017, the SFPUC asked Mr. Kelly to conduct a search of his personal cell phone and email accounts and produce all responsive records related to City business. Mr. Kelly provided the SFPUC with a document containing a series of text messages between himself and Mr. Wong. Mr. Kelly redacted a significant number of text messages in the document, asserting that the redacted communications between him and Mr. Wong did not relate to City business. Following the standard practice of City departments and the general guidance of the City Attorney’s Office under the Supreme Court’s decision in City of San Jose v. Superior Court, 2 Cal.5th 608 (2017), the SFPUC relied on Mr. Kelly to prepare the redactions, and did not ask to review the unredacted text messages before producing the document in response to the June 11 records request. The SFPUC responded to your June 11 request by providing responsive records on July 2 and July 6, 2020, including the document prepared by Mr. Kelly. The SFPUC’s reliance on Mr. Kelly to produce a redacted version of his text messages was appropriate, consistent with San Jose, and consistent with this Office’s longstanding legal advice.

On July 7, 2020, after the SFPUC provided you with the document prepared by Mr. Kelly including redacted text messages, you informed the SFPUC that Mr. Kelly had not properly redacted the text messages, so a member of the public or the SFPUC’s staff could make the redacted text visible on a computer. As the SFPUC explained in its letter to you on February 22, 2021, subsequent events in 2020 caused the SFPUC to reconsider whether it was appropriate for
the agency to review the text messages in their original, unredacted form. In light of the unique and extraordinary situation described in the SFPUC’s letter to you, the SFPUC reviewed the unredacted text messages to determine whether they were clearly private or unrelated to City business. On February 22, 2021, the SFPUC sent you a second version of the document with fewer portions of the text message exchange redacted.

Your July 9, 2020 petition asked the Supervisor of Records to examine the original unredacted records and “determine that some or all of the records or portions thereof withheld from disclosure or not yet disclosed are public.” We have reviewed the unredacted text exchange and the SFPUC’s redactions in the version the SFPUC provided to you on February 22. Based on that review, we find that the SFPUC appropriately redacted portions of the text messages that do not contain information relating to the conduct of the public’s business and therefore do not constitute public records responsive to your request (see Cal. Gov’t Code § 6252(e); City of San Jose v. Superior Court, 2 Cal.5th 608 (2017) (San Jose)), would constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy (Cal. Const. Art. I, Sec. 1; Cal. Gov’t Code § 6254(c)), or would disclose confidential personnel information (Cal. Gov’t Code § 6254(c)).

Your February 22, 2021 petition asked the Supervisor of Records to determine that image, video, and audio files attached to text messages exchanged between Mr. Kelly and Mr. Wong are “at least in part public.” The SFPUC does not currently have—and never had—possession of those attachments. As described above and in the SFPUC’s February 22 letter to you, the SFPUC relied on Mr. Kelly to conduct a search of his personal cell phone and email accounts and produce all responsive records related to City business. Mr. Kelly produced the PDF document that the SFPUC provided to you in July 2020. Mr. Kelly did not produce copies of the attached image, video, or audio files to the SFPUC, presumably based on his determination that the attached files were unrelated to City business. As noted above, it was appropriate for the SFPUC to rely on Mr. Kelly to review his text messages and produce responsive records. When the SFPUC determined it was appropriate to review the unredacted messages after Mr. Kelly’s resignation, it reviewed and produced only the files in its possession. Because the SFPUC did not have possession of, or access to, the image, video, and audio files, it could not independently review Mr. Kelly’s determination and evaluate for itself whether the attached files might relate to public business.

For the reasons stated above, your petitions are denied.

Very truly yours,

DENNIS J. HERRERA
City Attorney

Jon Givner
Deputy City Attorney
Buta, Odaya (CAT)

From: Hall, Arlene (CAT) on behalf of Supervisor Records (CAT)
Sent: Monday, March 8, 2021 5:53 PM
To: 'Anonymous'; '94992-15550486@requests.muckrock.com'
Subject: RE: Subsequent 67.21(d) petition re Kelly-Wong records (also filed to SOTF 20084)
Attachments: SOR response.pdf

Please see attached response to your petition.

The information in this email is confidential and may be protected by the attorney/client privilege and/or the attorney work product doctrine. If you are not the intended recipient of this email or received this email inadvertently, please notify the sender and delete it.

From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 22, 2021 6:49 PM
To: Supervisor Records (CAT) <supervisor.records@SFCITYATTY.ORG>; Carlin, Michael (PUC) <mcarlin@sfwater.org>
Cc: SOTF, (BOS) <sotf@sfgov.org>
Subject: Subsequent 67.21(d) petition re Kelly-Wong records (also filed to SOTF 20084)

Supervisor of Records Herrera,

For mysterious reasons -- perhaps related to the immediately prior email about this issue being BCC-ed to every reporter that I know and many that I don't -- I today got a revised 56 page production of a records request I made to PUC last year and petitioned Herrera for last summer. What could possibly have delayed Dennis Herrera and the PUC in not doing this partial disclosure for over half a year? Why was the record supposedly re-redacted on Jan 29 but released only today? Who knows - the letter in Exhibit A certainly does not explain. I'm sure some intrepid reporter will find out.

This is a new additional 67.21(d) petition against the PUC related to the Kelly-Wong text messages requested via 94992-15550486@requests.muckrock.com for a written determination that some portions withheld are public and an order for their disclosure.

Attachments in the text messages have been unlawfully withheld, were specifically requested in the original request (Exhibit C), are at least in part public, and must be ordered disclosed. This includes but is not limited to at least the image, video, and audio attachments depicted on Exhibit B pages my Bates numbers: 9 (image), 28 (the hyperlink url), 29 (two images), 30 (4 images), 31 (two images), 32 (three images), 33 (two images), 34 (two images), 44 (two audio files), 45 (two audio files), 48 (two images), 49 (one image), 53 (one image), 54 (one image).

At the time of my request in June 11, 2020, the City had "constructive possession" of the relevant records because their employee, Harlan Kelly Jr., had possession of the records, and pursuant to City of San Jose v Superior Court the possession of a record by an individual employee imputes to the local agency. The fact that the City may or may not have preserved the records as lawfully required as of the time I requested them is of no consequence as to whether or not they were lawfully mine (or the public's) to have when I made the request last year. "The effect of the City's inability or unwillingness to locate the records had the same effect as withholding requested information from the public." See Community Youth Athletic Center v. City of National City. I hope you actually collected the records when I requested them, because if the City failed to do so, I've got a pretty slam-dunk suit I can win. As in National City, any claims of the City to searching in good faith for the requested records for the records but "mistakenly" not producing them will not help you win. The fact that the records may not now be in the possession of the City (due to Kelly's separation) is also not relevant.
Note that a determination by Herrera is not conditioned on PUC actually providing me these records. Herrera's obligations are to declare the records public and order them disclosed. If PUC refuses to comply (for any reason including that they did not actually search for and preserve responsive records at the time of my request - that's not my problem or Herrera's problem), I'll deal with actually getting the records in court.

**NOTE:** I still await your legally-mandated "determination" in response to my earlier, separate, petition of last summer on this request. I **won** - at least in part as the information was *admittedly* public - and I expect an appropriate determination. Note that the earlier petition for these records ALSO needs the withheld attachments to be disclosed. This is also **NOT** a concession that any of the text still redacted in your most recent release is not a disclosable public record. Corroboration from other sources may yet be used to prove that some of the textual content still redacted continues to be withheld unlawfully.

**NOTE:** 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous
Buta, Odaya (CAT)

From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 22, 2021 6:49 PM
To: Supervisor Records (CAT); Carlin, Michael (PUC)
Cc: SOTF, (BOS)
Subject: Subsequent 67.21(d) petition re Kelly-Wong records (also filed to SOTF 20084)
Attachments: Exhibit-A-2021-Feb-22-Letter-PUC.pdf; Exhibit C - Inter-Agency Text Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF PUC) • MuckRock.pdf; Exhibit-B-New-Records-20210222-min.pdf; signature.asc

Supervisor of Records Herrera,

For mysterious reasons -- perhaps related to the immediately prior email about this issue being BCC-ed to every reporter that I know and many that I don’t -- I today got a revised 56 page production of a records request I made to PUC last year and petitioned Herrera for last summer. What could possibly have delayed Dennis Herrera and the PUC in not doing this partial disclosure for over half a year? Why was the record supposedly re-redacted on Jan 29 but released only today? Who knows - the letter in Exhibit A certainly does not explain. I'm sure some intrepid reporter will find out.

This is a new additional 67.21(d) petition against the PUC related to the Kelly-Wong text messages requested via 94992-15550486@requests.muckrock.com for a written determination that some portions withheld are public and an order for their disclosure.

Attachments in the text messages have been unlawfully withheld, were specifically requested in the original request (Exhibit C), are at least in part public, and must be ordered disclosed. This includes but is not limited to at least the image, video, and audio attachments depicted on Exhibit B pages my Bates numbers: 9 (image), 28 (the hyperlink url), 29 (two images), 30 (4 images), 31 (two images), 32 (three images), 33 (two images), 34 (two images), 44 (two audio files), 45 (two audio files), 48 (two images), 49 (one image), 53 (one image), 54 (one image).

At the time of my request in June 11, 2020, the City had "constructive possession" of the relevant records because their employee, Harlan Kelly Jr., had possession of the records, and pursuant to City of San Jose v Superior Court the possession of a record by an individual employee imputes to the local agency. The fact that the City may or may not have preserved the records as lawfully required as of the time I requested them is of no consequence as to whether or not they were lawfully mine (or the public's) to have when I made the request last year. "The effect of the City's inability or unwillingness to locate the records had the same effect as withholding requested information from the public." See Community Youth Athletic Center v. City of National City. I hope you actually collected the records when I requested them, because if the City failed to do so, I've got a pretty slam-dunk suit I can win. As in National City, any claims of the City to searching in good faith for the requested records for the records but "mistakenly" not producing them will not help you win. The fact that the records may not now be in the possession of the City (due to Kelly's separation) is also not relevant.

Note that a determination by Herrera is not conditioned on PUC actually providing me these records. Herrera's obligations are to declare the records public and order them disclosed. If PUC refuses to comply (for any reason including that they did not actually search for and preserve responsive records at the time of my request - that's not my problem or Herrera's problem), I'll deal with actually getting the records in court.

NOTE: I still await your legally-mandated "determination" in response to my earlier, separate, petition of last summer on this request. I won - at least in part as the information was admittedly public - and I expect an appropriate determination. Note that the earlier petition for these records ALSO needs the withheld attachments to be disclosed. This is also NOT a concession that any of the text still redacted in your most recent release is not a disclosable
public record. Corroboration from other sources may yet be used to prove that some of the textual content still redacted continues to be withheld unlawfully.

NOTE: 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous
EXHIBIT A
February 22, 2021

Muckrock Anonymous Requester
94992-15550486@requests.muckrock.com

Dear Requester:

We write to supplement our response to your June 11, 2020 request for communications contained in personal or government accounts of former San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (“SFPUC”) General Manager Harlan Kelly, Jr. As you know, the SFPUC provided responsive records to you on July 2 and July 6, 2020, including a document showing numerous text messages between Mr. Kelly and Walter Wong on Mr. Kelly’s personal cell phone. In that document, which the SFPUC produced in Bates-stamped pages 161 to 219, Mr. Kelly redacted a significant number of text messages. As explained below, in light of the unique and extraordinary circumstances surrounding these records, the City Attorney, working with the SFPUC, has recently reviewed an unredacted draft of the document containing those text messages in the City’s possession. Following that review, we are now providing you with a new version of the document. We have redacted certain portions of the text messages that do not contain information relating to the conduct of the public’s business and therefore do not constitute public records responsive to your request (see Cal. Gov’t Code § 6252(e); City of San Jose v. Superior Court, 2 Cal.5th 608 (2017) (San Jose)), would constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy (Cal. Const. Art. I, Sec. 1; Cal. Gov’t Code § 6254(c)), or would disclose confidential personnel information (Cal. Gov’t Code § 6254(c)).

Your request sought text messages, chats, and emails between Mr. Kelly and other individuals including Walter Wong “on government or personal accounts” during the period from January 1, 2015 through June 11, 2020. Under the California Supreme Court’s 2017 decision in San Jose, communications on City employees’ personal accounts or devices, including text messages on personal cell phones, may be public records subject to disclosure if those communications involve the conduct of the public’s business. As the City Attorney described in a public memorandum dated March 24, 2017, departments generally satisfy the legal duty under the Public Records Act to search for and produce public records on an employee’s personal electronic device by entrusting the employee to conduct the search and retrieve responsive records. That memorandum instructs that the department must notify the employee of the request and acquaint the employee with the standards for determining whether a writing on the device is a public record and responsive to the request. And should there be a court proceeding...
concerning the request, the employee may be required to testify under oath or submit a statement under penalty of perjury, describing the search conducted on the device and explaining the types of writings on the device that were not provided to the requester because of not being responsive public records.

Consistent with the longstanding advice of the City Attorney’s Office as described in the March 24, 2017 memorandum, the SFPUC asked Mr. Kelly to conduct a search of his personal cell phone and email accounts and produce all responsive records related to City business. In response, Mr. Kelly provided a document (Bates-stamped pages 161-219) containing a series of text messages between himself and Mr. Wong beginning January 1, 2015. Mr. Kelly redacted a significant number of text messages in the document, asserting that the redacted communications between him and Mr. Wong did not relate to City business. Following the standard practice of City departments and the general guidance of the City Attorney’s Office, the SFPUC relied on Mr. Kelly to prepare the redactions, and did not ask to review the unredacted text messages before producing the document to you in response to your records request.

Mr. Kelly attempted to redact text messages in the document by covering those text messages with black rectangles. But this redaction method was insufficient; it did not completely redact the content that Mr. Kelly wanted to withhold. On July 7, 2020, after the SFPUC provided you with the document prepared by Mr. Kelly including redacted text messages, you informed us that Mr. Kelly had not properly redacted the text messages, so a member of the public could make the redacted text visible on a computer. You informed us that at least some of that information appeared to be sensitive personal information like a security code. We appreciate your letting us know. After receiving your email, the SFPUC asked you to destroy the original document in your possession and remove it from the internet. The SFPUC based this request on its understanding that the redacted text messages in the document did not relate to City business, relying on Mr. Kelly’s representation.

Subsequent events have caused the SFPUC to reconsider whether it is appropriate for it to review the text messages in their original, unredacted form. On June 24, 2020, approximately one week before the SFPUC responded to your initial request for records, the U.S. Attorney for the Northern District of California announced that he had charged Walter Wong with conspiring for over 15 years to defraud the public of its right to the honest services of City officials, including schemes involving bribery, kickbacks, and money laundering. On November 30, 2020, the U.S. Attorney’s Office announced that it had charged Mr. Kelly in a federal criminal complaint with honest services wire fraud. The complaint alleged that Mr. Kelly engaged in a long-running bribery scheme and corrupt partnership with Walter Wong, and that as part of the scheme, Mr. Wong provided items of value to Mr. Kelly in exchange for official acts by Mr. Kelly that benefited or attempted to benefit Mr. Wong’s business ventures. The U.S. Attorney alleged that Mr. Kelly and Mr. Wong had a longstanding relationship involving multiple international trips paid for or subsidized by Wong, cash exchanges, free meals, repairs to Mr. Kelly’s personal residence, and personal car services, all while Mr. Kelly tried to use his City position to benefit Mr. Wong and his businesses.
Although the criminal charges are still pending and have not been proven in a court of law, the complaint alleges that the entire course of Mr. Kelly’s personal relationship with Mr. Wong was entangled with City business because Mr. Wong allegedly gave Mr. Kelly personal favors and gifts in the hope of exchange for Mr. Kelly’s acts as the General Manager of the SFPUC. Given the seriousness of these criminal allegations and the compelling public interest in potential misconduct by government employees, certain text messages between Mr. Kelly and Mr. Wong that previously appeared to be purely personal, non-City business may now reasonably be understood as related to the conduct of the City's business. In reaching this conclusion, we emphasize that Mr. Kelly, like any criminal defendant, is entitled to a presumption of innocence, and we do not suggest or imply anything to the contrary. But given the allegations in the criminal complaints against Mr. Kelly and Mr. Wong, the SFPUC deemed it prudent to review the unredacted text messages to determine whether they were clearly private or unrelated to City business. The redactions in the new version we are providing today redact only those matters that are clearly private or clearly unrelated to City business.

Two extraordinary factors, unlikely to recur, support this unorthodox approach. First, the SFPUC now has in its possession a copy of the full text exchange unredacted, such that the City is able to review the full text exchange. Second, the charges against Mr. Kelly and Mr. Wong allege that personal communications between the two men actually relate to City business and memorialize interactions and transactions related to Mr. Kelly’s exercise of duties as the SFPUC’s General Manager. The SFPUC’s decision to review the unredacted text messages is based on these unique circumstances and does not change the City’s usual protocols for responding to requests for communications on employees’ personal devices, as described in the City Attorney’s 2017 memorandum.

Accordingly, please find attached a new copy of the document provided by Mr. Kelly reflecting his communications with Mr. Wong between January 1, 2015 and June 11, 2020. As noted above, we have redacted several portions of the text exchange. We redacted those portions of the exchange the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy, such as discussions of family illnesses, children, and personal residential addresses or personal cell phone numbers, and a reference to a personnel matter on page 51 of the document. See Cal. Const., Art. I, § 1; Cal. Gov. Code § 6254(c),(k); S.F. Admin. Code § 67.1(g). We have also redacted the text message on page 1, dated January 1, 2015, because it does not contain information relating to the conduct of the public’s business and therefore is not a public record responsive to your request. See Cal. Gov't Code § 6252(e). We have also excluded the portions of the first page that Mr. Kelly previously redacted because that portion of the text exchange occurred before January 1, 2015 and is not responsive to your June 11, 2020 request.

Best Regards,

Michael P. Carlin
Acting General Manager
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
EXHIBIT B

Public Records Released by PUC on 2021-02-22 to 94992-15550486@requests.muckrock.com of text messages between Harlan Kelly, Jr. and Walter Wong
1/1/15, 6:53 AM

1/5/15, 11:26 AM

We are going to postpone the LED light dates

Till when

Doug Parrish # is
1/5/15, 8:49 PM
Did you call Doug?

Frank in my office call him and we also summit the LBE paper hope this can be final review from them hope u can help to check if they got a require Document

1/16/15, 12:46 PM
Current LED RFP does not require any assembly in SF

We legally can't requirer that. However, you can place that in the special consideration. Also one of the competitor already assemble in SF

not yet

Did u talk with Doug?

waiting for control UL we wont get it till Jan 31

UL? You told me that you had everything?

The control from France just received information from UL

You told me
That you had everything? I don't know what to do?

I don't know how to stop the process anymore

Just talk to Frank will use existing control with UL to send in will call u after work

Great! I will be in LA until Friday evening

Hope we can get together weekend

4 sure
thank

Can I call you

1/20/15, 5:05 PM

can we talk today

1/21/15, 7:04 AM

are you in town??

1/21/15, 11:12 AM

try to reach for 3 days already

Ok

1/27/15, 9:15 AM

can i call you

tech team reply, what you request is possible, do u have time to go over what we find

1/27/15, 5:39 PM

are you in town?

Yes, let me get the specs

Ok

1/30/15, 6:36 AM

Good morning do u have a few minutes to catch up

1/30/15, 7:58 AM

Ok can you send some one over to pick up specs

yes what time

1/30/15, 11:03 AM

who should we see

can we go to pick up package yet

Come now to my office

what floor
on our way ps let u know what floor

Green Source Trading, LLC

1/30/15, 3:02 PM

review info we have question ps let me know when can i call you

2/4/15, 9:01 AM

Our family would like to invite you to a Chinese New Year celebration on Monday, February 23 at 6 pm at Citi Center. Please let us know whether you can join us or not.

2/20/15, 4:28 PM

Gong Hay Fat Choy! Due to CNY preparations, we are postponing dinner on February 23, 2015 to 7PM. Sorry for the inconvenience. See you there!

2/27/15, 5:29 AM

good morning, what time will you available tomorrow

Lunch?

when today or tomorrow

2/27/15, 2:19 PM

Tomorrow

ok we got LBE thank you

2/27/15, 7:13 PM

Congrats!

Thank you

2/28/15, 6:14 AM

Good morning where do u want to meet for lunch

2/28/15, 9:16 AM

where do u want to meet for lunch

Where do u recommend?

Do u want to go to R AND G
see you at noon

In R & G 2nd fl

3/31/15, 8:08 PM

Do u have time to meet this week

Ok

3/31/15

What date

Do u have time for dinner tomorrow

4/1/15, 6:29 AM

Do u have time for dinner tonight

4/1/15, 11:15 AM

Can't tonight, Saturday?

Yes

Sat ok

4/2/15, 6:34 PM

Lunch on Saturday?

OK where do u want to meet

4/4/15, 10:46 AM

can we meet at

Shangri-La vegetarian Restaurant

2026 Irving St
San Francisco, CA at noon

Ok

OK do u want meet at 11:30

let go to Loving hut Viet nam 524 Irving and 6th ave better food for children
see you at noon

If u arrive first please get table for 5 people

Ok

I am running late 10mins

Ok

We are here

I leaving the house not

Now

Is hard to park here

Should I take uber?

Yes

Irvine and 6th

4/29/15, 9:44 PM

can you join us for dinner next tue

Unfortunately, I will be in Chicago.

how about your wife, is the boss birthday

I will ask her.

are you intown now

Naomi said that she can make it. I am currently in San Diego and getting on a plane for Atlanta. I will be back in SF on Thursday night.

are you in sf now

can Moh see you tomorrow

Naomi wants to know where and when is the party?

in Citi center ps do not tell anyone

5/1/16, 1:28 PM
The Mayor's birthday dinner has been re-scheduled to Sunday, 5/3 at 6 pm. Please rsvp.

5/3/15, 6:00 PM

We r here

On my way

5/4/15, 9:35 PM

On the 3rd floor

Have a safe trip

I will email the two letter tomorrow

Thank you

5/20/15, 7:24 AM

do u have time to meet this week?

6/2/15, 8:30 AM

I am back. Let's hook up today.

what time do u have time for a quick lunch?

Can't get away long because of meetings

how about tomorrow

6/2/15, 5:15 PM

How about after 5?

yes where do u want to meet

8/31/15, 11:53 AM

did someone hack your email

ps change your password asap

Downstairs

Yes, I changed my email.

good
9/23/15, 5:36 AM

9/23/15, 8:53 AM

11/1/15, 9:30 AM
How are you do u have time to meet before Holliday

11/1/15, 12:19 PM
Yes, I going out of town tomorrow until Wednesday

OK let meet end of week if u have time

11/2/15, 8:13 AM
Ok

11/3/15, 2:19 PM
How about Saturday?

lunch?

Ok

Tks location TBD

11/7/15, 8:48 AM
Good morning please us know where to meet

11/7/15, 10:17 AM
11:30 around here?

OK do u want me pick u up

Ok

OK will come by apox 11:25 to pick u up

Yes

Ok

ETA?

2 minutes
Arrived
11/10/15, 12:14 PM

ps ck your email for cabinet drawing
11/10/15, 2:11 PM

Perfect!

What the timing?

Will back to final measurement

Great.

Did u find the sample
11/10/15, 4:36 PM

Some were taken back. We are checking to see which ones we still have.

can i call you

Call after my meeting

tks
11/10/15, 9:19 PM

can i meet you for 5 minutes tomorrow to show you the plan
11/11/15, 9:04 AM

Can i call you

11/11/15, 10:57 AM

on our way to ck ensnarement

Ok

11/12/15, 11:43 AM

Ready to pick up

can we pick it up

When?

8 minutes from now
Who is picking it up?

me

or shoeone from my office depend where to pick up

I will leave it at the front desk with guard.

ok tks under my name?

No name on it. from Carmelita.

ok

11/12/15, 1:04 PM

Did u get it?

Yes thanks

1/7/16, 5:07 AM

Please join us at [redacted] party. This Sunday, January 10th, 2016. 10:30AM-1PM. Kome Buffet in Daly City. Please let me know if you can attend

W, when did you get back? We will be there. [redacted] Also I would like to talk to catchup.

Back yesterday thank you for coming [redacted]

Yes

Thank

Also thanks for having Alfred to finish the laundry room. It looks vice nice.

1/15/16, 8:30 AM

are you back, when do you have time to catch up

1/16/16, 1:04 PM

Can we do lunch on Sunday?

Instead of breakfast

Lunch sundry is prefect
Lunch sundry is prefect

1/16/16, 12:48 PM

So I won't be here on Sunday. I left the papers for u with Naomi. Call her to coordinate.

Ok

1/16/16, 6:34 PM

I gave Naomi the info on the device and the connect numbers.

Thank you

1/18/16, 8:43 AM

are you back sf yet

Be back in SF around 5

drive careful

1/18/16, 7:45 PM

I'm back

do u have time to a earlier breakfast

1/19/16, 6:32 AM

Please let me know when can i call you

1/20/16, 8:20 AM

Hey W, naomi asked me to give you our passports. I have them at my office. How can I get them to you?

just scan the info need ID for plan

can i meet you for 5 minutes afterwork

are you going to China to, if you need to visa

1/20/16, 10:22 AM
1/20/16, 10:22 AM
Naomi is in DC.
Just scan the passport to us for info
Lunch?
What time
Noon
Pick me up?
I am in Hayward. I can't back San Francisco until 1. Can I meet you lunch tomorrow or breakfast tomorrow?
Breakfast tomorrow 8:45
OK good
Where should we meet tomorrow? Should I pick you at where?
Please join us at construction cen2
Where should we meet tomorrow? Should I pick you at where?
At the office at 8:45am
Who office
You can pick me up at the office.
Ok
1/21/16, 8:30 AM
Kam waiting for you downstairs
Coming down in 5 mins
thank you ps bring passport
Where is he parked?
he should waiting for ou infront
he should waiting for ou infront

1/21/16, 1:47 PM
I will email you the forms filled out in PDF. Ok?

can i pick up oringal tonight

1/21/16, 4:13 PM
We filled it out online

But need you sign it too

will arrive your home apox 7:30

1/21/16, 7:56 PM
Ok

ETA?

Is it too late 15 minutes

2/1/16, 4:42 PM

when can we finish her photo for Visa

R u back? Naomi is ready for photo.

i am back

when can we do photo, ps give me date of your trip again

2/1/16, 7:36 PM
March 24-April 2. Naomi is able to take a picture any day

tomorrow after work? time?

2/2/16, 8:15 AM
How about 7:30pm tonight

ok see you at 7:30pm
Naomi said can u make it for 8:00pm instead of 7:30pm?

8 pm is fine

2/2/16, 12:07 PM

did anyCOMM reply you

2/2/16, 5:07 PM

I will be hosting a Chinese New Year feast at my office on Thursday, February 11th, 7pm. Please let me know if you family will be able to attend.

2/2/16, 7:56 PM

On my way 20 minutes

2/10/16, 9:07 AM

good morning, did you hear from anyCOMM yet?

2/19/16, 6:09 PM

remind you tomorrow night dinner at 7 pm

MO told us book ticket to J emilla she is going with your group, should i book it

2/19/16, 6:09 PM

I thought she was going. I will ask naomi. Naomi's mom is going.

ps re-confirm, you only give us 5 passports

2/22/16, 6:29 PM

can i call you

2/22/16, 6:29 PM

Yes

2/29/16, 8:17 AM

can i call re: your trip ticket , need to issue by this Wednesday

2/29/16, 12:04 PM

5k option

2/29/16, 4:12 PM

Ok
got all your visa, when do you want to pick up

Tomorrow?

What time

Please allow 15 minutes to discuss your itinerary

2/29/16, 5:40 PM

How about after work. Naomi and I can swing by to pick up visa and discuss itinerary.

do you know what time. i need to go east bay 5:30 if tomorrow not enough time we can meet Wednesday

3/1/16, 7:19 AM

Is this flight ok for your group
Mar 24 2016 SFO 12:55 arrive Hong Kong
March 25 7 pm April 3 12:30 am arrive SFO April 2 10 pm

Ok with me

which credit card should we use ps give us a copy by fax 415 554 8805

can we meet tomorrow after work?

can i call you

3/3/16, 4:46 PM

what time are we meeting tomorrow after work

3/3/16, 10:51 PM

5?

Ok

3/4/16, 3:22 AM

3/4/16, 3:46 PM

Can I come by now?

In 20 minutes

I am back

are you coming?
Here

At the lobby

3/5/16, 1:15 PM

How long is the ride from Hong Kong to Macau?

TurboJet provides ferry services between Hong Kong and Macau that take approximately 55 minutes.

3/6/16, 8:03 AM

Can you call me? I have talked with Naomi and Naomi's mom. They have a proposed itinerary.

3/11/16, 7:54 AM

just finalize schedule, do you have time to to a final review

I am in Fresno. You can call me anytime.

Here is the latest on any Comm: Hi Mary,

Thank you for your email.

We'd like to invite you and Brad (and any other interested/involved members of SFPUC) to an exclusive demonstration of the anyCOMM solution in San Jose.

March 31, 2016 is our proposed date for a demonstration.

Please reply to let me know of your availability on that date. Our schedules are open for the entire day.

can I call you now?
can you also get a sample or spec
can I call you now?

Yes

3/14/16, 2:21 PM

are you back now, do you have time to finalize the trip
"ok what time?"

3/14/16, 3:43 PM

"5?"

3/14/16, 5:20 PM

"5:40 ok. still in a meeting?"

3/15/16, 11:27 AM

Any Comm update standard 7 pin connection. They are getting me the specs for standard. The light must be connection ready. Two step process. 1) prequalified (pass or fail) 2) lowest price.

"When can we get any comm spec"

3/15/16, 12:59 PM

They are requesting a standard 7 pin connection for all lights. Any Comm system will work with the standard connection.

"do any comm require any electric power for their unit"

3/15/16, 3:25 PM

No they have to use the standard connection.

"Ok"

3/16/16, 8:49 AM

did you get your e-ticket please get seat assignment asap flight is full, ps ask LeeMei for copy if you need

3/16/16, 10:13 AM

"Got eticket"

make sure get seat assignment asap is a full flight
make sure get seat assignment asap is a full flight

3/16/16, 12:47 PM

please let us know after you got seat confirm

We got our seat assignments

Ps send it to me

Ok

Tks

3/23/16, 6:30 PM

Arrived Hong kong

Great! How was the flight? Do U have our visas?

Your visa is in your passport

Did u all get passport back?

Ps reply

Yes

See you tomorrow

3/24/16, 9:29 AM

We are going to the airport. See you 16hours.

The flight is delayed 2 hours. So we will arrive 8:49pm (HK time)

No to worry if will be at airport

3/24/16, 3:08 PM

Ok finally on the plane.

3/25/16, 12:01 PM

Where r u? 😊

Not Delivered

4/21/16, 8:32 AM

can you join us for dinner May 5 , our friend all got back from China

4/21/16, 3:59 PM
4/21/16, 3:59 PM
at citi center 6:30 pm

5/11/16, 6:10 AM
Good morning can we meet

5/11/16, 12:27 PM
Friday. I taking a group to hetchy

When will you back just take 10 minutes

I have something for u.

When can we meet for 10 minutes
After work today

I won't be back until tomorrow.

OK wait for you to let me where to meet tomorrow

5/12/16, 5:15 PM
are you back, are we meeting

5/13/16, 2:18 PM

Where r u?
I have something to give u.

I am in airport will be back in one hour

Call me when u are nearby.

6/6/16, 11:34 AM
10.4
i am back to cc now
i am back to now
Are you coming down

Coming down now
Where r u?
6/6/16, 11:34 AM
after you return from your weekend. can we meet for dinner next week

can we meet for dinner this week

6/6/16, 3:34 PM
I am traveling this week and most of next week. I just got back from hetchy, leaving for Atlanta tomorrow morning until Friday and then off to LA on Saturday until Sunday.

understand in between if you have some time Please

How about June 14?

Thank you

June 14 dinner

Thank you

6/8/16, 1:16 PM
Can we have lunch on the June 14 instead on dinner.

Yes

6/13/16, 2:28 PM
tomorrow, citi center 11:30 is it ok, do you need a ride

Yes

Yes

Should we pick you up 11:30 at Golden gate ave

6/14/16, 9:11 AM

11:45 ok

Yes sir

6/14/16, 11:49 AM

R UpDown stairs?

yes the car is downstair
Can we meet for 5 minutes
Can we meet for 4 minutes
What's up?
4 minutes your time
How about after 5
OK where to meet you
O3?
?
O3. That is the Thai restaurant that you were at
Thai 10 4
I am in Fresno until Friday.
I know
Hey Mr. W, Naomi's mom wanted to renovate her kitchen. I am trying to get pricing and budgeting. Also she is trying to get some bids from some contractors. If you have time, can we meet with u? so u can give us some advice.
I am in China now will call you July 25
Ok
Enjoy! And safe travels
I am back now please let us know when can we look
Can we meet u Thursday morning at Maria house?

Ok

What time

10:30am

For tomorrow address please

they prefer 10:00

good morning, can you and Naomi attend 08/16 dinner event for Shaoquan Mayor

We are a maybe.

when will you know, we are setting seating chart

Boss want you drop by during reception time 6 to 7
pm at 1142 Van Ness, can you for Shaoquan Mayor

We will try.

If you can drop by during reception
Please let us know Tue pm we can finalize seating

So we would love to come tonite. Can u give me the details.

OK will do

On behalf of the Huntar Company, Mr. Cheung Kwan Shan would like to cordially invite you to a dinner
reception to welcome the Mayor of Shaoguan and his delegation, as well as the President of Shaoguan University.

The dinner reception will be held on Tuesday, August 16th, 2016 at 6:PM at the Concordia Argonaut Club at 1142 Van Ness Ave. This is a semi-formal event. Please RSVP if you will be able to attend.

C
Thank you,
Walter Wong

9/2/16, 7:39 AM

are you in town, during holiday

9/5/16, 7:22 PM

Do you have time to meet this week

9/8/16, 6:58 PM

Do you have time to meet next week

Yes

What day please

Monday?

What time

5pm?

Do u want to pick you up

Yes

Ok

9/12/16, 4:27 PM

are we meeting at 5

Yes, do u want to meet later?
what time is better, just want to talk to you 2 minutes

Ok. Meet u at 5. Call me and I'll come down.

Ok

R u downstairs?

Arrived

Where are you

9/15/16, 8:40 AM

Are you coming next tue

9/15/16, 11:16 AM

Yes

2 or 4

9/20/16, 11:30 AM

Maybe 4

Hey Walter, I can't make

10/25/16, 3:00 PM

I understand

10/26/16, 8:57 AM

Can I call you

11/13/16, 4:13 PM

25th street navigation center ( need power to site )

PG&E insisting on primary service. From My power team"We're installing overhead. PUC/PW teams met Thursday afternoon. I haven't heard outcome. Will
share more when I hear from team Monday.

thank you need to overcome this issue soon

thank you

Primary service would cost the project a lot of money. What was the other item other than street lights?

30 Van Ness

Primary service approx how much?

It's primary vs secondary. And I don't know the specifics of the site, but guessing about $500k more.

Understand

Will relay to team

11/15/16, 5:19 PM

can i call you

The lowest bid is 2 mil.. go figure?

I'll call u in an hour

can i call you

ok tks

11/20/16, 7:40 PM

Are they any update for the led

any update for LED?

any update for LED?

11/29/16, 12:29 AM

I'll update up in the morning

Thank you

Are you back

11/29/16, 5:38 AM
Arrived

11/29/16, 5:03 PM

Ok coming down in 5 mins

In front golden gate

12/17/16, 9:14 AM

How r u?

Doing fine do you have time to meet next week

I leaving [redacted] on Wednesday

Do you have time Monday after work for 5 minutes

How about after 7pm? [redacted]

OK thank you

12/19/16, 10:37 AM

can we move meeting to tomorrow what time is better for you

12/19/16, 11:40 AM

5pm

tomorrow 5 pm thank

12/20/16, 4:54 PM

See you at Golden gate 5:15

Arrived

12/24/16, 12:22 PM

Ok

Come down now

Do u know a electrician that can install a 240 volt plug in the garage?

And check the amp on the panel.
Yes

When

When can he be available?

Monday?

I have someone to run the conduit.

12/26/16, 11:30 AM

We can do the work wed is it ok

12/26/16, 1:49 PM

I needed the charger today. But can ur guy make sure the work was done correctly.

12/26/16, 8:32 PM

What do you need it for

We need to get part. How many amp

I had my contractor laborer to run the wire and installed the outlet. I wanted to make sure it was ran properly.

12/27/16, 6:47 AM

We are you using the charge for. 2) do you have the house number too want to do both together

12/27/16, 7:51 AM

We purchase a Tesla electric car. We had a 240 plug installed by the laborer who help the electrician who ran the wires for our house. Just wanted an electrician to look at it to make sure it is installed correct. As far as the house number, I have the number ready to be installed.

tesla.com

OK we install several of them already is easy do you have people at home tomorrow

Yes. Also wanted them to check to see I am not overloading my circuit box

Ok
do you have people at home tomorrow

12/27/16, 10:57 AM

Yes

Let me know what time

12/27/16, 2:10 PM

we will be there 9 am do you have all the part?

I have the LED address number that went out.

9am ok

do you have the part?

What parts do I need?

need who is going to pay us

Me:). How much?

wrong person

12/28/16, 5:33 AM

Mr. W, here is the picture of the number 2 that is not working. And after your guy check to see if the electrical line was installed properly. Can he rotate the plug shown in the other photo? Thanks

Ok

12/28/16, 8:15 AM

worker call in sick, will be at you place tomorrow instead

Ok

12/29/16, 3:56 PM

Are you in town

Yes. At work.
12/29/16, 7:32 PM
Are you working tomorrow
Did you try the charge yet

12/30/16, 5:51 AM
Thanks Walter! The charger is working and the number is installed and working. I may need to replace the number 6 soon. Thanks again.

12/30/16, 8:46 AM
Are you in office

1/10/17, 9:29 AM
Home today

1/11/17, 11:40 AM
Ps let know when can I call you

1/12/17, 1:21 PM
any leaking from last night rain?

1/12/17, 1:21 PM
Yes, it looks like it is coming from the drain.

1/14/17, 1:24 PM
still leaking last night

1/14/17, 1:24 PM
will ck tomorrow

1/14/17, 1:24 PM
Do u know a locksmith?
I need my locks changed

When
Call you back answer machine

1/18/17, 4:48 AM

Please if leaking stop

I am in DC today. I am returning tonight. Is it raining there?

Can you ask who stay home just want to ck water leak?

Ok

1/18/17, 9:35 PM

any info to water leak yet?

I just landed:}

1/18/17, 10:58 PM

Still leaking! On the floor

1/19/17, 3:55 AM

OK will ck, is it as much as before

No

OK will ck

1/19/17, 7:49 AM

Still leaking, looks like around the drain.

It is leaking on the floors. So I put down towels and buckets.

Will ck

1/19/17, 11:14 AM

The door at garage is lock can enter in house, when you open let us know we can check repair
we will go back in afternoon

ps let me know

will be down

1/24/17, 8:48 AM

Hey Mr. W, it looks like we will have some dry weather for awhile. Naomi has been asking when will we get our dinning room back. Do u have sense when the will start and finish the work?

crew is at your house now

{:}

What's the plan? Did they find out the source of the leak?

we need find that fisrt

1/26/17, 6:48 PM

Any progress?

We patch it wait till next wed to make sure not leaking anymore

Can u just pour bucket of water to see if it leaks?

We did

What the problem? The drain?

1/27/17, 5:19 AM

The two drains are sweating and a occasional drip in the bucket.

Can I call you

1/27/17, 7:40 AM
Will have crew to check it

2/7/17, 6:50 AM
Roof patch already let see this rain can hold. Please let us know

2/14/17, 7:11 PM
Happy Valentine's Day! Any updates on the leak?

Will let you tomorrow they we to ck today again

2/16/17, 7:55 AM
send you report on waterproofing please review by email

I got the report

ps review and let us know what is your plan, we need to schedule crew

2/16/17, 10:18 AM
Call u around 11:30am?

2/16/17, 12:41 PM
i just finish meeting, ps call if you hve time

2/16/17, 2:28 PM
just out meeting, if you free ps call anytime now

2/16/17, 5:12 PM
Can i call you now

2/24/17, 5:13 PM
2/27/17, 6:27 PM

2/28/17, 10:08 PM
Got invoice. Great price. We are ready for you to start!:

3/3/17, 12:47 PM
if possible can you give me a call re Start date

3/9/17, 4:25 PM
can we meeting today 5 pm

3/10/17, 11:20 AM
Subject: [redacted] - Shear wall, from top of deck to 4" up along north wall is water rot damage. Manuel and crew will have to replace approx 4' x 4' of rotted shear before applying Metacrylcs

Can u have them to take pictures.

3/10/17, 4:55 PM
Arrived

3/13/17, 11:27 AM
Can u text me the picture of the dry rot u have on ur phone. The adjuster is coming by the house now.

3/13/17, 3:06 PM

3/21/17, 7:05 AM

[Image 0x0 to 612x792]
Any more leak it rain last night

3/21/17, 8:45 AM
From Naomi "There is no leaking in the dining room.

Good thank you we can start repair the ceiling now

3/28/17, 8:05 AM
I am in hong kong now ps text me

Ok, what do you think the total cost of my repairs will be? I need to explain what happen and what we did. Also some of the labor rates seem high. I or someone need to be able to explain to the adjuster. I sent him an email saying I don't agree with their estimate. Your thoughts?

Will reply to you

3/29/17, 11:58 AM
Thanks

Who should the claim adjuster contact to discuss the scope of work and pricing.

4/4/17, 6:49 PM
Hey Walter, did the adjuster reach out to you? Btw, when do u think your crew will finish the job

4/11/17, 8:11 AM
Hi Walter, we are hosting [redacted] at our house for Maria on May 6. She would like to invite you, her traveling buddy. When do you think the crews will finish the inside and the deck? Also, we need the receipt to submit to the insurance company.

4/11/17, 9:25 AM
In your house inside painting is done outside tile due to rain we will start tile when weather permit

Can u hang the chandler so I can move back the furniture. Have the adjuster called u or emailed u yet?
4/11/17, 12:44 PM

We are going to hand it today

Btw, the issuance company sent a check of $5,600. They said I could cash it. And if the cost of repairs are more, they will work with the contractor. So I will issue you a check in that amount next week.

4/26/17, 9:15 AM

Hey Mr. W., are you back in SF? Your crews are now working on the deck. I am sure they realized that the current surface doesn’t slope to the drain. So when laying the tile that will have to create a slope to the drains. I finally had the $5,286.06 check from the insurance company endorsed by my mortgage company. I will write you a check for this amount today. Have the insurance company contacted you on the final cost of the repairs? Hopefully, we can get the insurance company to pay for most of the cost and I will pay the remaining cost.

5/17/17, 3:58 PM

got your message, Paul my office is going to call you to give you detail

6/1/17, 10:25 AM

Hey W., any update from the adjuster? Also, I told Paul that he can complete the work. I will work with insurance company to pay the whole amount. If insurance company pay for a portion, I will over the rest.

6/5/17, 9:46 AM

the waterproof exterior finished will be painted today and tile will be started on Thursday

Adjuster will not talk to us as we are not the insurer.

6/6/17, 6:14 AM

I will email him and cc you

7/5/17, 8:07 PM

Hey Walter, I received the bill. Have you guy talked with the adjuster?

7/6/17, 6:25 AM

Paul talk to them before
Paul talk to them before

Ps go into new elevator
Are you in

8/28/17, 3:56 PM

Dear Harlan, Please join us for the Ceremony at Chinatown's Night Out on Friday Sept. 1st @ 5pm at Portsmouth Square. There will be over 3000 people! Can you help assign someone from your office to work with the Mayor's Office, Ashley Cheng. She's requesting 3000 cups for the Seniors. Thank you, Walter

8/30/17, 8:22 AM

Good morning, can we have water for Friday Thank you

I will follow up with my forks

Thank you they want to invite you too can you join them Friday 5 pm

8/30/17, 10:11 AM

I relayed ur text to my staff. I just followed up with them today and they will follow up with Ashley. I plan to be there.

Thank you

9/22/17, 10:48 PM

W, unfortunately, I can't make next Friday. I will be in Chicago at a conference. Naomi may come but I will ask Naomi tomorrow when she return from her trip with the mayor to Ireland.

THANK

10/2/17, 2:46 PM

Can I give you a call
The project at 1317 20th Ave requires Fire Service. We have submitted water meter application on Sep, 7th. As of today, we have not heard any updates on the application status. They need new fire service to connect the sprinkler ps help for the new water meter

10/3/17, 11:26 AM

We should be contacting the project point person soon.

Thank you

11/7/17, 5:00 PM

We can do it in Dec.

Can it be earlier

The list of projects in the queue is crazy because of the moratorium restrictions. So we can do it after holiday right after Thanksgiving.

Last week in Nov.

Thank

11/30/17, 12:52 PM

1317 20th Ave still had no fire water meter, please help

I'll check on it.

Thank you

12/5/17, 2:14 PM

any news for 1317 20th Ave fire water meter, please help

12/6/17, 2:21 PM

are you ok? any news for 1317 20th Ave fire water meter

Having my folks to look into.
Thank you please help

12/8/17, 2:30 PM
I am really trying to get my crews to 1317 20th Ave. It seems like everybody is on vacation:(

Thank for trying

I may have to fire someone for not being responsive.

who you need to respond ps let us know

12/11/17, 3:33 PM
Finally, we will start the work next week.

Thank you do you know what date

You friend wanted me to ask you are you gonna play 2 rounds of golf with him during the March trip?

I had to threaten to fire my manager if not done.

When in March?

March 23 to april 4 you will receive an invitation from Mark Chancellor (protocol office)

I'm in for golf

12/18/17, 10:35 AM
Is the water meter going to install this week for 1317 20th Ave.

Yes

Thank you

12/19/17, 3:32 PM
1317 20th. Sawcutting 12/18; installation tomorrow and rest of this week.

Thank you

12/21/17, 7:09 PM
Can we get together tomorrow?

What time
What time

3pm?

Where?

Ur place

Ok will wait do you need a ride

VIDEO: Candlelight vigil in Chinatown honors late San Francisco Mayor Ed Lee | KRON4.com

10 mins away

drive careful

Hey W, I have included the bell LED lights to the add back list for Malia Cohan. I need to know how many bells?, with these additional light, how far down 3rd street will these light extend?, and how much?

will get it for you next Wednesday Thank you

Naomi and I r here

In elevator

Just sent you 555 Fulton, we would like to know how to pay for the fire hydrant location. We understand your department cannot schedule until payment is received. Do you know when the hydrant can be installed? We are waiting for it so we can final the building.

We did not receive any information regarding the pump yet. Please give us the specifications so we can order.
1/5/18, 9:31 PM
Are you ok didn't hear from you

1/6/18, 6:20 AM
the application was submitted on 12/8, CSB processed the application that day and submitted a hydraulic analysis request to CDD which was returned on 12/28 (normal expected turnaround time for that request). CSB immediately took the next step of requesting a custom cost proposal from CDD on 12/28 which is where we currently are in the process.

Next Steps:
CDD cost proposal preparation – normal turnaround of 1-3 weeks. This was requested 12/28 and there are currently 13 proposals in the queue ahead of it. A good ETA on this would be no later than 1/18. CSB to submit proposal to customer, customer to pay fees, CSB to process fees and issue work orders. If customer provides quick turnaround, this can take less than a week so let’s say around 1/25. CDD Construction – for this phase we tell customers to allow a minimum of 65 days putting us at 4/1. Although it’s only one hydrant installation this job will require special permitting and potentially a shutdown (TBD) so I would be cautious to propose anything sooner until we get further along with the CDD process.

Thank you

1/23/18, 3:57 PM
what are meal preference for tomorrow event? We have Prime rib, chicken or Vegetarian. Thank you!

Hey Walter, Also, Naomi had to go to Washington DC tomorrow to receive an award on the behalf of Mayor Ed Lee. Maria will be there at 6:00pm. Is it ok for us to come by around 8pm?

yes

1/23/18, 7:41 PM
Thank you

1/25/18, 6:39 AM

Please give me Kitchen area and pump spec

1/29/18, 4:37 PM

the application was submitted on 12/8, CSB processed the application that day and submitted a hydraulic analysis request to CDD which was returned on 12/28 (normal expected turnaround time for that request). CSB immediately took the next step of requesting a custom cost proposal from CDD on 12/28 which is where we currently are in the process.

Next Steps:

CDD cost proposal preparation – normal turnaround of 1-3 weeks. This was requested 12/28 and there are currently 13 proposals in the queue ahead of it. A good ETA on this would be no later than 1/18. CSB to submit proposal to customer, customer

We have not received CDD cost proposal. Please help to find out the status.

2/3/18, 9:19 PM

Kitchen 70 sq ft.
Going to lay tile in laundry area that is 24 sq. Ft.

Will ck Monday and reply you

2/5/18, 3:50 PM

Please help we did not receive COD cost yet

They were working on it. They should send it to u next week.

Thank you good night

2/5/18, 5:11 PM

we find the wood where do you want it deliver to

The kitchen is 70sq.ft. That Oscar can lay right
The living room I measured as 413 sq.ft. If enough for living room I have to submit a sample + under cushion needed per HOA rules at the March 1st meeting.

one box of material is apox is 22.78 sq ft we have 7 boxes where do you want us to deliver the sample

2/6/18, 8:07 AM
You can drop the boxes off at [redacted].
You can leave the boxes at the front desk for Maria Little.

2/7/18, 9:33 AM
will do it tomorrow
all 7 boxes

2/7/18, 11:25 AM
Ok

2/12/18, 8:09 PM
I will ask Maria. Thanks

2/13/18, 5:09 PM
I will have Tom contact you on 555 fulton.

2/15/18, 2:51 PM
Thank you

2/15/18, 6:55 PM
we still don't have your confirmation for tomorrow's new year celebration at 11am at Portsmouth Sq. please let us know so we can arrange seating. Thank you and Happy New year! I bring Year of dog bring alot of water to you. Make sure your reservoir is full without creating flooding.
2/15/18, 6:55 PM
Walter, I'm in Colombia until the 19th.

5/10/18, 6:41 PM
Melanie Lok
Address: [redacted]
Cell #: [redacted]

Thank you will ck permit tomorrow

5/11/18, 5:51 PM
Can I call you re Melanie project

5/12/18, 8:58 AM
When can we pick up the plan

5/12/18, 10:28 AM
I just picked up the plans now. Melanie also thinks she will need more power to the house.
Also, I can show the architect all the other work.

what time can i see you I am free after 1:30 pm
and where can we meet

3:00 at my house?

Ser you 3 pm

Any time after 4

Ok 4 pm

5/12/18, 12:36 PM
At 4 pm can we meet at site I need to see the panel and the deck
Meet you 4 pm a: [redacted]

5/12/18, 3:39 PM

on my way to [redacted] see you at 4 pm

Ok

Arrived where are you

5/12/18, 5:57 PM

Not Delivered

Did not see PGE bill

PG&E - [redacted]

Sent it to ur email

did not get it. you know anyone from PGE and find out for her

if we call we need to know lot of her person info before PGE will talk to us

Just emailed u

Will ck

read the PGE statement . if you know some one from PGE can you help to call to find out how many amp
in the building
5/12/18, 8:15 PM
Ok

Thank you
5/13/18, 4:16 PM
Burt can meet after 10 am Tuesday morning, can we set that time to meet?
How about the afternoon?

what time?
3pm?

let me ck with Burt to confirm
5/15/18, 2:59 PM
Confirmed Tuesday 3 pm meeting at [redacted] with Burt

I'm here

We are 5 min out
5/16/18, 4:31 PM
Ok

when will you have time to practice ping Pong
when will you have time to practice ping Pong?
5/17/18, 4:37 AM
Let me look at my schedule.

send you Burg est for [redacted]
review it and let us know
5/31/18, 5:16 PM
No, I was looking for it. Can u resend?

just resend
6/1/18, 3:89 PM
Can I call you, I talk to Burt today

6/1/18, 5:18 PM
Call me

6/3/18, 9:54 AM
any more information for [redacted] from owner

Did you receive my email with comments on Burt's proposal? I told Melanie that we should move forward in the architect and the demo permit now. She just want to know the total price. Your thoughts?

i did not receive email ps resend
consult@jaidin.net ps resend

Resent
Did you get it?

received and review it now

The conversation was with Burt.

7/23/18, 8:45 AM
Good Morning, can we pick up
Guangzhou vice Governor Letter today and we did not get [redacted] items letter yet

7/23/18, 10:35 AM
I just sent email for [redacted] I'm still out of town. I will have Kathy to sign for me. Edgar will call you so you can pick it up.

Thank you

The letter is ready. The letter with wet signature has my Chinese business card attached to it. It will be in an envelope with Walter's name on it at the security counter in lobby of 525. I'll go down now.

Thank you on my way to pick it up
Thank you on my way to pick you up

7/25/18, 6:16 AM

Good morning, we need to revise the invitation letter, please help

Email me the charges

I will thank

Thank you for revising the letter, let us know when to pick up.

8/13/18, 6:20 PM

good evening, do you still need to do the side of your building where is leak before? please give me a call

8/20/18, 12:47 PM

Hey Mr. W, I just remembered that I won't be available tomorrow at eight. So can Paul come over Thursday at 8 o'clock?

8/31/18, 11:19 AM

Next week I work Wednesday - Friday (9/5 - 9/7)

I will check Paul and let you know by end of today

9/4/18, 8:32 PM

What's the status of Melanie's project? The design and the construction?
I will call you tomorrow what time is good?

9:45am

yes sir

9/7/18, 5:30 PM

did you meet Burt, please let us know

Yes

I'll will call u later

Thank

9/9/18, 6:34 PM

Just want to make sure Paul is coming tomorrow at 8:15am

Yes

Can i call you

12/4/18, 3:47 PM

can i call you

Yes

12/5/18, 11:10 PM

Hey Walter, here is a photo of my backlit numbers

I was wondering can we place this one a timer because this is always on and I had to replace the numbers because they stop illuminating. Thanks

Will let election know

12/6/18, 6:28 AM

12/14/18, 2:41 PM

Can u forward me the invoice for the bell lights again.

Yes sir

who should we invoice to, or you need a quotation first? Thanks
12/29/18, 10:03 PM

Mr. W. Happy Holidays! I received your invoice for the repairs of the side of the house. Since your repairs I have not noticed any leakage. I will not be submitting this to my insurance company. So, I would like to know my cost for this repair? Also I wanted to have your electrician to place my address numbers on a timer. On a different note, the SFPUC will be purchasing the remaining of the bells and the snowflakes from you. I have the invoice for the bells but not for the snowflakes.

I will take care both issue Wednesday Happy New Year

1/3/19, 8:31 AM

Good Morning do you have the part for your exterior number light need to replace?

Let me check with staff.

1/3/19, 4:56 PM

Can the electrician come by tomorrow?

My exterior number are good for now.

Thank you

1/21/19, 4:53 PM

Hey Mr. W, I wanted to check on the status of the bill I need to pay for the water damage since I'm not going thru my insurance and the electrician for the address lights. Also, the city will pay you for the lights. I will try to make this happen this month.

I will review the file tomorrow, how is Burt doing?

He is working with Wayne (Melanie's brother). I will check in with him to find out the status.

Thank you
1/26/19, 8:52 AM

Good morning can I call you

1/27/19, 7:06 PM

I don't have peter's number. This is Lainar's cell:

I got it you give me before and he responded he will take care it tomorrow

Thank you

1/31/19, 12:14 AM

Hey Mr. W, I received the invoice for the repairs. I have issued a bank check for that amount which you should receive by next week. Thanks!

Thank you very much

1/31/19, 2:58 PM

Happy New Year! Hi Harlen, please help to confirm if you are attending the Chinese New Year event on Tuesday, Feb. 5 at Portsmouth Square. The program will start at 10:30 am, Mayor Breed will arrive at 10:55am. If you plan to attend the event, please arrive at Portsmouth square by 10:15 am on that day. Look forward to your respond. Thank you Walter

5/3/19, 3:08 PM

Harlen, how are you? 1) the ping pong will be held on 8/3, Do PUC have a team to participate? 2) Can PUC sponsor a trophy for the winner of advance level? 3) Do you want to practice ping pong before the event? 4) What happened to the LED Christmas light? 5) Alan Varela wants to have dinner with you, are you available on the week of 14th?

5/3/19, 6:32 PM

Hey Mr. W, how are you doing? Yes we plan to participate in the ping pong tournament. We place to be a sponsor. Yes I would like to practice.

I will check the status of the LED Christmas Lights.
Remind me who is Alan varela?

Please call me when you have time

5/23/19, 12:27 AM
Hey W, I had to fire the guy that was [REDACTED]. He was incompetent. I have appointment a person that will create a purchase order to buy the bells. Sorry sorry for the delay. Call me tomorrow. By the way, we are putting a PUC team that will win the ping pong tournament.

I would like to get some ping pong lessons. However, I can't make the tournament because I have family reunion on that day.

5/28/19, 11:18 AM
Ping Pong coach just confirm he is available, please let us know when you available, hope can see you tonight at Mayor Lee event

6/28/19, 10:51 AM
Hi Harlan, it's only a month apart from the ping pong tournament. Would you like some practice before the event? I can arrange a coach for you if you are interested. Thanks

7/9/19, 4:11 PM
Hey W, can we hook up next week to catch up.

7/9/19, 6:38 PM
yes sir

7/14/19, 1:39 PM
your practice July 22 and July 24 confirmed

7/14/19, 7:20 PM
Got it!

7/22/19, 5:18 PM
We are waiting for you

I am still in a meeting. Trying to get out

I'm stuck here. I'm with my commissioner
Should we reset to Wednesday

7/23/19, 8:23 AM

coach just confirmed tonight at 6:30 pm

Thanks

Great

7/23/19, 6:27 PM

Here
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7/24/19, 10:36 PM

Hey Walter, the police will join me in ping pong practice tomorrow. Ok?

Good we are ready

7/25/19, 2:07 AM

We will be ready for both

7/25/19, 6:30 AM

Police Chief

7/25/19, 5:18 PM

Here

7/25/19, 7:23 PM

i just my schedule can Aug 11 dinner move to Aug 10 6:30 pm ps ck with

Chief

7/30/19, 2:22 PM

We will be coming from hetchy on August 11.

I also have closed session at the BOS today. It is scheduled for 4. It should be over by 5 but I'll let you know if will be late. I'll let Chief Scott know.

understand

How about July 8-6 pm to Olympia city club

Aug 8?
Aug 8?

Ping pong at 6:00 today?

Ok, Chief have confirmed

Thank you

7/30/19, 5:34 PM

ML
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We are ready for you

8/8/19, 5:24 PM

we missed you with the Ping Pong tournament, how are you 1) we still not receive any PO for Bell and snow flake Led yet please help 2) are we together for dinner Aug 16 or 17 with you,

Naomi, Scott and his wife and Mohammed please let me know I need to confirm with Kinison

8/11/19, 4:51 PM

Harlan, are you ok, ?

Hey Mr. W, I just got back. Naomi and I went to Camp Mather [REDACTED] No cell coverage. I will check on the bells tomorrow. What did Washington say? As far as dinner, I have on my calendar Saturday the 16th. I'll check in with the Chief.

Thank

I just check with Washington they asked quote we give them but they did not get back to us

8/13/19, 6:10 AM
Good morning please confirm how many people this Friday for dinner

Naomi and I are coming. I’ll check with the Chief.

The dinner is on Saturday. Right?

Friday or Saturday both day is ok with me for now is set on Friday

I can make Saturday not Friday.

Thank please ck with chief Saturday is ok with me

8/13/19, 8:01 PM

Any news from Chief for dinner Saturday

The Chief is available. [redacted]
Where and what time for dinner?

Do you want Chinese Food

[redacted] Is Mo joining us?

I will ask him tomorrow

I can ask Kin on prepare a very Vegetarian din e

Harbor View is ok
Should we invite others?

Yes please just let me k ow hiw .any
Just let know how many people

Anybody u want me to invite?

8/14/19, 8:08 AM

Mo will not join us, please let me know how many people for Sat night

8/14/19, 10:11 AM

8/15/19, 7:54 PM

Hi my friend how many people on Saturday dinner
3 and ww 4 total right

8/16/19, 9:11 PM
Just Na, Bill, and me.

8/17/19, 4:33 AM

8/17/19, 10:00 AM

8/17/19, 6:02 PM

8/29/19, 12:16 PM
Hi Harlan, Christmas is around the corner in 3 months. We previously sent a quote to PUC, but have not received response yet. Is it gonna happen this year? Please help, thank you.

Hi, Harlan
Summer is over while Fall is approaching. It is about the time for us to celebrate the Chinese tradition - Moon Festival. We cordially invite you and your family to join our Moon Festival dinner on Friday, Sep. 13 at 6 p.m. at Harborview Restaurant & Bar at 4 Embarcadero Center, Street Level, San Francisco, CA 94111. Look forward to seeing you at the dinner.

Thanks.
Walter

9/5/19, 6:34 PM
Everything has been approved. We should be arranging delivery. Right?

Washington didn't receive the PO yet

1/7/20, 4:01 PM
Happy New Year, do you still need to wine rack support?

Yes!
Ok will set time for Burg to come by next week.
From: Anonymous Person

06/11/2020

Subject: California Public Records Act Request: Inter-Agency Text Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request

Public Utilities Commission and Harlan Kelly Jr.:

Below are new Immediate Disclosure Requests (SF Admin Code 67.25(a)) directed to your agency and its department head. Your response is required by June 12, 2020. Rolling records responses are requested (SFAC 67.25(d)) if you are unable to immediately produce records. Exact copies of every responsive record are requested (Gov Code 6253(b)) - do not: provide mere URLs, print and scan electronic records, convert native files to PDFs, or provide black and white versions of any color images. Provide only copies of records not requiring fees and in-person inspection of all other records (GC 6253).

1. All text, email, or chat messages (including group messages, in any form or application including but not limited to SMS, MMS, WhatsApp, WeChat, Signal, Instagram, Twitter, Facebook, Hangouts, Skype, Teams) sent or received to/cc/bcc/from between Harlan Kelly Jr. and London Breed, on government or personal accounts from Jan 1, 2015 and present (you must search personal accounts pursuant to City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017))

2. All text, email, or chat messages (including group messages, in any form or application including but not limited to SMS, MMS, WhatsApp, WeChat, Signal, Instagram, Twitter, Facebook, Hangouts, Skype, Teams) sent or received to/cc/bcc/from between Harlan Kelly Jr. and Walter Wong/Jaidin Consulting Group/Jaidin Associates (including but not limited to jadin@pachell.net, jdngrp@pachell.net, or any email address ending with jadin.net ), on government or personal accounts from Jan 1, 2015 and present (you must search personal accounts pursuant to City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017))

3. All text, email, or chat messages (including group messages, in any form or application including but not limited to SMS, MMS, WhatsApp, WeChat, Signal, Instagram, Twitter, Facebook, Hangouts, Skype, Teams) sent or received to/cc/bcc/from between Harlan Kelly Jr. and Mohammed Nuru, on government or personal accounts from Jan 1, 2015 and present (you must search personal accounts pursuant to City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017))

4. All text, email, or chat messages (including group messages, in any form or application including but not limited to SMS, MMS, WhatsApp, WeChat, Signal, Instagram, Twitter, Facebook, Hangouts, Skype, Teams) sent or received to/cc/bcc/from between Harlan Kelly Jr. and Naomi Kelly, on government or personal accounts from Jan 1, 2020 and present (you must search personal accounts pursuant to City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017))

For text messages: While the phone numbers are not needed, the following must be preserved: the timestamps, the textual content, attachments, and images, and also ALL sender and recipient names (including groups). Pursuant to SF Admin Code 67.21(l), which requires you to use any electronic format that we request, please provide the records in spreadsheet format. For an example of the format of the response, see SFPD Chief Scott's prior response here: https://cdn.muckrock.com/foia_files/2020/04/14/text_Messages_Breed_Scott_Redacted.pdf and clearly referenced redaction justifications here: https://cdn.muckrock.com/foia_files/2020/04/14/ChiefOfficeResponse201.pdf (though I do not concede all of them are appropriate redactions). Please provide rolling responses, starting with the most recent records going backwards. Messages to/from before your current department head became the department head must still be provided.

Do not destroy or discard any responsive records - we will appeal all withholdings or Sunshine violations. Remember Mr. Kelly has an obligation to maintain in a professional and businesslike
manner their correspondence and release them as public records (SF Admin Code 67.27-9(a)); and we will cross-check your responses with all other parties to ensure you have not destroyed or withheld records improperly.

Your non-exhaustive obligations:
- All withholding of any information must be justified in writing (SFAC 67.27).
- All withholdings by masking or deletion (aka redactions) must be keyed by footnote or other clear reference to the specific justification for that redaction, and only the minimal exempt portion of any record may be withheld (SFAC 67.26).
- You must respond to mailed requests (SFAC 67.21(b)).
- You must notify us if whether or not responsive records exist and/or were withheld for each below request (Gov Code 6253(c), 6255(b)).
- You must state the name and title of each person responsible for withholding any information (Gov Code 6253(d)).
- Do not impose any end-user restrictions upon me (Santa Clara Co. vs Superior Ct, 170 Cal.App 4th 1301); so if you use a third-party website like NextRequest to publish records, please make them completely public without any login or sign-in.

Your agency must do all of the above things in your response, and you cannot wait until we file complaints.

***** We have no duty to, and we will not again, remind the City of its obligations. Instead, we will file complaints for every Sunshine Ordinance or CPRA violation. We will continue to file complaints until the City’s procedures are modified to fully comply with the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA, without caveat or exception. *****

Thank you for your anticipated cooperation in this matter.

NOTE: Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. The email address sending this request is a publicly-viewable mailbox. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,
Anonymous

From: Anonymous Person
06/11/2020

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Inter-Agency Text Messages - Immediate Disclosure...

MR. KELLY: This was also sent to the Public Records email, and is being sent directly to you so you do not destroy responsive records:

Public Utilities Commission and Harlan Kelly Jr.:

Below are new Immediate Disclosure Requests (SF Admin Code 67.25(a)) directed to your agency and its department head. Your response is required by June 12, 2020. Rolling records
responses are requested (SFAC 67.25(d)) if you are unable to immediately produce records. Exact copies of every responsive record are requested (Gov Code 6253(b)) - do not: provide mere URLs, print and scan electronic records, convert native files to PDFs, or provide black and white versions of any color images. Provide only copies of records not requiring fees and in-person inspection of all other records (GC 6253).

1. All text, email, or chat messages (including group messages, in any form or application including but not limited to SMS, MMS, WhatsApp, WeChat, Signal, Instagram, Twitter, Facebook, Hangouts, Skype, Teams) sent or received to/cc/bcc/from between Harlan Kelly Jr. and London Breed, on government or personal accounts from Jan 1, 2015 and present (you must search personal accounts pursuant to City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017))

2. All text, email, or chat messages (including group messages, in any form or application including but not limited to SMS, MMS, WhatsApp, WeChat, Signal, Instagram, Twitter, Facebook, Hangouts, Skype, Teams) sent or received to/cc/bcc/from between Harlan Kelly Jr. and Walter Wong/Jaidin Consulting Group/Jaidin Associates (including but not limited to jaidin@pacbell.net, jdngrp@pacbell.net, or any email address ending with jaidin.net ), on government or personal accounts from Jan 1, 2015 and present (you must search personal accounts pursuant to City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017))

3. All text, email, or chat messages (including group messages, in any form or application including but not limited to SMS, MMS, WhatsApp, WeChat, Signal, Instagram, Twitter, Facebook, Hangouts, Skype, Teams) sent or received to/cc/bcc/from between Harlan Kelly Jr. and Mohammed Nuru, on government or personal accounts from Jan 1, 2015 and present (you must search personal accounts pursuant to City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017))

4. All text, email, or chat messages (including group messages, in any form or application including but not limited to SMS, MMS, WhatsApp, WeChat, Signal, Instagram, Twitter, Facebook, Hangouts, Skype, Teams) sent or received to/cc/bcc/from between Harlan Kelly Jr. and Naomi Kelly, on government or personal accounts from Jan 1, 2020 and present (you must search personal accounts pursuant to City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017))

For text messages: While the phone numbers are not needed, the following must be preserved: the timestamps, the textual content, attachments, and images, and also ALL sender and recipient names (including groups). Pursuant to SF Admin Code 67.21(l), which requires you to use any electronic format that we request, please provide the records in spreadsheet format. For an example of the format of the response, see SFPD Chief Scott’s prior response here: https://cdn.muckrock.com/foia_files/2020/04/14/Text_Messages_Breed_Scott_Redacted.pdf and clearly referenced redaction justifications here: https://cdn.muckrock.com/foia_files/2020/04/14/ChiefOfficeResponse201.pdf (though I do not concede all of them are appropriate redactions). Please provide rolling responses, starting with the most recent records going backwards. Messages to/from before your current department head became the department head must still be provided.

Do not destroy or discard any responsive records - we will appeal all withholdings or Sunshine violations. Remember Mr. Kelly has an obligation to maintain in a professional and businesslike manner their correspondence and release them as public records (SF Admin Code 67.27-9(a)); and we will cross-check your responses with all other parties to ensure you have not destroyed or withheld records improperly.

Your non-exhaustive obligations:
- All withholding of any information must be justified in writing (SFAC 67.27).
- All withholdings by masking or deletion (aka redactions) must be keyed by footnote or other clear reference to the specific justification for that redaction, and only the minimal exempt
portion of any record may be withheld (SFAC 67.26).
- You must respond to emailed requests (SFAC 67.21(b)).
- You must notify us of whether or not responsive records exist and/or were withheld for each
  below request (Gov Code 6253(c), 6255(b)).
- You must state the name and title of each person responsible for withholding any information
  (Gov Code 6253(d)).
- Do not impose any end-user restrictions upon me (Santa Clara Co. vs Superior Ct, 170 Cal.App
  4th 1301); so if you use a third-party website like NextRequest to publish records, please make
  them completely public without any login or sign-in.

Your agency must do all of the above things in your response, and you cannot wait until we file
complaints.

***** We have no duty to, and we will not again, remind the City of its obligations. Instead, we
will file complaints for every Sunshine Ordinance or CPRA violation. We will continue to file
complaints until the City’s procedures are modified to fully comply with the Sunshine Ordinance
and CPRA, without caveat or exception. *****

Thank you for your anticipated cooperation in this matter.

NOTE: Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them
to us, there is no going back. The email address sending this request is a publicly-viewable
mailbox. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and
automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this
request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing
herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express
or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event
shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages
whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement
or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as
I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,
Anonymous
April 28, 2021

Sent via email (arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com)

Re: Petition to Supervisor of Records

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter responds to your second petition to the Supervisor of Records dated February 24, 2021, concerning a request to Supervisor Sandra Lee Fewer. The Clerk of the Board of Supervisors responded on behalf of former Supervisor Fewer.

In our response to your first petition, we found that the Clerk properly applied redactions to the record at issue based on Government Code Section 6254(k) and Evidence Code Section 1041. The redactions relate to a reported complaint and an investigation of that complaint. Thus, many of the redactions were proper to protect the identity of the complainant, including any information that could lead to the identity of the complainant. Evid. Code Sec. 1041: People v. Hobbs, 7 Cal. 4th 948, 961-62 (1994). We inadvertently neglected to cite Section 1040 of the Evidence Code as a basis to justify the redactions in our prior response. Portions of the redactions were proper based on the official information privilege, as the information was obtained by a City employee in confidence and the need for confidentiality outweighs the necessity for disclosure due to the nature of the allegations.

For these reasons, the Clerk properly redacted the record at issue.

Very truly yours,

DENNIS J. HERRERA
City Attorney

Bradley A. Russi
Deputy City Attorney
Buta, Odaya (CAT)

From: Russi, Brad (CAT) on behalf of Supervisor Records (CAT)
Sent: Wednesday, April 28, 2021 8:24 AM
To: 'Anonymous'; Ng, Wilson (BOS); SOTF, (BOS); Givner, Jon (CAT)
Subject: RE: New SOTF complaint, a message to DCA Givner and RE: Petition - RE: Sandra Fewer - Immediate Disclosure Request for one email of yours

Please see the attached response to your petition.

Bradley Russi
Deputy City Attorney
Office of City Attorney Dennis Herrera
City Hall, Room 234
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., San Francisco, CA 94102
www.sfcityattorney.org

From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 24, 2021 8:51 PM
To: Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org>; SOTF, (BOS) <sotf@sfgov.org>; Givner, Jon (CAT) <Jon.Givner@sfcityatty.org>
Cc: Supervisor Records (CAT) <supervisor.records@SFCITYATTY.ORG>
Subject: New SOTF complaint, a message to DCA Givner and RE: Petition - RE: Sandra Fewer - Immediate Disclosure Request for one email of yours

Mr. Givner, since I assume you are the ultimate supervisor of DCAs who advise agencies: Whichever of your DCA’s originally (incorrectly) advised the Clerk of the Board that "It has been determined by the City Attorney’s office that the identified records are subject to withholding in their entirety in accordance with CA Evidence Code 1041. " needs some retraining. As the City has now already accepted, that total withholding was not legal. Anyone working on public records must know that EC 1041 has no ability to exempt anything but a confidential informant’s identity - it doesn’t cover other information. Might there be some other exemption applicable? Maybe, but not EC 1041.

A good half of my complaints and petitions would not exist if the agency-level DCAs gave precise advice on exemptions and redactions, as opposed to waiting for the SOTF in hearings or Supervisor of Records behind-the-scenes. It’s unclear whether DCAs intentionally tell agencies to over-withhold because most people will never challenge it (which would be helping your clients do something illegal), or because they genuinely don’t know the PRA exemptions...

Supervisor of Records Herrera: This is a new 67.21(d) petition for the revised redactions attached. The vast majority of redactions cannot be exempt under cited Evidence Code 1041. You must determine them public and order them released. EC 1041 protects a confidential informant’s identity - and that’s it. Someone should actually read the difference between EC 1040 and EC 1041 - which are separate exemptions. Your prior reply is simply wrong.

SOTF: This is a new complaint against the Office of the Clerk of the Board. The alleged violations are: 67.26 non-minimal withholding and 67.27 improper written justification for withholding. Please determine the information public and order it released. Note they already had one chance with the Supervisor of Records and they still have not gotten it right. You will momentarily receive an SOTF complaint webform.

The vast majority of redactions in Exhibit A (the provided records after one round of petition with the Sup of Records already) are not for the identity of a confidential informant and thus must be disclosed. They may be able to (though we...
do not concede) redact the sender's identity if the sender meets all the requirements of EC 1041. Evidence Code 1041 does not exempt the information disclosed by the confidential informant - just their identity.

Evidence Code 1041 cited by Respondent is a very narrow exemption for only "the identity of a person," to wit (emphasis mine):

"(a) Except as provided in this section, a public entity has a privilege to refuse to disclose the identity of a person who has furnished information as provided in subdivision (b) purporting to disclose a violation of a law of the United States or of this state or of a public entity in this state, and to prevent another from disclosing the person's identity, if the privilege is claimed by a person authorized by the public entity to do so and either of the following apply:

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

(2) Disclosure of the identity of the informer is against the public interest because the necessity for preserving the confidentiality of his or her identity outweighs the necessity for disclosure in the interest of justice. The privilege shall not be claimed under this paragraph if a person authorized to do so has consented that the identity of the informer be disclosed in the proceeding. In determining whether disclosure of the identity of the informer is against the public interest, the interest of the public entity as a party in the outcome of the proceeding shall not be considered."

Note that the Dec 23 2020 original request was sent to both Sup. Fewer (when she was a City official) and Wilson Ng of the Office of the Clerk of the Board, and the Office of the Clerk of the Board apparently has custody of the record and has given all responses for the request, so they are the Respondent.

Requests and responses are in the below email thread.

NOTE: 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,
Anonymous

------- Original Message -------
On Wednesday, February 24th, 2021 at 3:30 PM, Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org> wrote:

To Whom It May Concern,

Thank you for providing reference to SOTF File No. 19120. Our office has circled back with the City Attorney's office, and they have confirmed that they indeed previously disclosed a version of the requested document(s). Per amended guidance by the City Attorney's office, our office is hereby amending our response and disclosing the attached records responsive to your request below. All
redactions have been made pursuant to CA Evidence Code Section 1041 in coordination with the City Attorney’s office and are consistent with the records previously disclosed.

Sincerely,

—

Wilson L. Ng
Deputy Director of Operations

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Web: www.sfbos.org

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form

Disclosures: Personal information that is provided in communications to the Clerk of 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.

From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 25, 2021 11:38 AM
To: Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org>
Cc: Records, Supervisor (CAT) <Supervisor.records@sfcityatty.org>
Subject: Petition - RE: Sandra Fewer - Immediate Disclosure Request for one email of yours

The Supervisor of Records,

This is a 67.21(d) petition for a written determination and order for the disclosure of the below mentioned email to former Sup Fewer now in the custody of the Clerk of the Board.
Evid Code 1041 protects only the "identity of a person who has furnished information .... purporting to disclose a violation entity of a law". But one can disclose the rest of the email without disclosing the From name/email and the ending signature (thus protecting the identity but not the content), and the City is required to do so under SF Admin Code 67.26 to keep withholding to a minimum.

Furthermore, this email has been partially disclosed publicly by the Office of the City Attorney (see SOTF File 19120 Anonymous v Herrera), for over 1 year. Therefore, under Gov Code 6254.5, it cannot now be withheld in entirety.

**NOTE:** 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

Sent from ProtonMail Mobile

On Mon, Jan 25, 2021 at 9:51 AM, Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org> wrote:

To Whom It May Concern,

Thank you for your patience.

As per the Office of the Clerk of the Board’s inquiry and follow up to the City Attorney’s office, the records identified as potentially responsive to your request have been reviewed. Your original request is attached for reference. It has been determined by the City Attorney’s office that the identified records are subject to withholding in their entirety in accordance with CA Evidence Code 1041.

If you have questions regarding the authority for withholding or require further determination, you may petition to the City Attorney’s Office, Supervisor of Records at Supervisor.Records@sfcityatty.org in accordance with San Francisco Administrative Code, Sec. 67.21d.

Our office was not able to identify any other records subject to disclosure.

Sincerely,

—

Wilson L. Ng

Deputy Director of Operations

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
PLEASE NOTE: I will be on leave from February 1 through February 12, 2021.

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form

Disclosures: Personal information that is provided in communications to the Clerk of 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.

From: Ng, Wilson (BOS)
Sent: Friday, January 22, 2021 12:27 PM
To: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Cc: Records, Supervisor (CAT) <Supervisor.records@sfcityatty.org>
Subject: RE: Sandra Fewer - Immediate Disclosure Request for one email of yours

Thank you for your follow up. On behalf of the Office of the Clerk of the Board, I am confirming receipt and handling of your request to Supervisor Fewer’s office. Our office is following up with the City Attorney’s office and will provide you with records on a rolling basis as they are reviewed and available to us. I will keep you apprised.

—

Wilson L. Ng

Deputy Director of Operations

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

Web: www.sfbos.org

PLEASE NOTE: I will be on leave from February 1 through February 12, 2021.
Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

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

**Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Clerk of 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.

---

**From:** Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
**Sent:** Friday, January 22, 2021 11:27 AM
**To:** Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org>
**Cc:** FewerStaff (BOS) <fewerstaff@sfgov.org>; Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>; Records, Supervisor (CAT) <Supervisor.records@sfcityatty.org>
**Subject:** RE: Sandra Fewer - Immediate Disclosure Request for one email of yours

How's this going? Your total CPRA time of 24 days is expired.

**NOTE:** Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the government all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous
On Friday, January 8th, 2021 at 10:20 AM, Ng, Wilson (BOS) wrote:

To Whom it May Concern:

To provide you with an update, as per our inquiry with the City Attorney’s office, their office will require additional time to review potentially responsive records. I anticipate providing you with an update or response by January 15, 2021 close of business, and will keep you apprised.

Sincerely,

___

Wilson L. Ng

Deputy Director of Operations

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

Phone: (415) 554-7725

Web: www.sfbos.org

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.
Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

**Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Clerk of 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.

---

From: Ng, Wilson (BOS)

Sent: Thursday, January 7, 2021 9:53 AM

To: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>

Cc: FewerStaff (BOS) <fewerstaff@sfgov.org>; Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>; Records, Supervisor (CAT) <Supervisor.records@sfcityatty.org>

Subject: RE: Sandra Fewer - Immediate Disclosure Request for one email of yours

To Whom it May Concern:

On behalf of the Office of the Clerk of the Board, this is to confirm receipt of your inquiry and follow up.

Our office, in coordination with the Office of Supervisor Fewer has identified records potentially responsive request, and is currently in consultation with the City Attorney’s office to review.

I will follow up and provide you with an update by close of business tomorrow.
Thank you for your patience.

Sincerely,

Wilson L. Ng
Deputy Director of Operations

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Phone: (415) 554-7725
Web: www.sfbos.org

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form

Disclosures: Personal information that is provided in communications to the Clerk of 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.
From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, January 7, 2021 9:23 AM

To: FewerStaff (BOS) <fewerstaff@sfgov.org>; Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>; Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org>; Records, Supervisor (CAT) <Supervisor.records@sfcityatty.org>

Subject: Re: Sandra Fewer - Immediate Disclosure Request for one email of yours

Supervisor of Records Dennis Herrera,

This is a 67.21(d) petition that the below request has not been complied with, a written determination that the record or any parts thereof are public, and an order for their disclosure.

Sent from ProtonMail mobile

-------- Original Message --------

On Jan 6, 2021, 1:02 PM, Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:

Hi Sup. Fewer staff,
You were going to update me on this request by Jan. 2 - any progress? It’s a single email that I requested.

NOTE: Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the government all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

------- Original Message -------

On Thursday, December 24th, 2020 at 12:53 PM, Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:

Thanks - just so you know this is an email from a member of the public to Sup Fewer and the CAO. It is not an email between Fewer and the CAO as atty/client privileged. Please do know that after a request has been made, the record cannot be destroyed regardless of whether Sup Fewer leaves office.
NOTE: Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the government all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

Sent from ProtonMail Mobile

On Thu, Dec 24, 2020 at 12:45 PM, FewerStaff (BOS) <fewerstaff@sfgov.org> wrote:

Hello,

Thank you for your inquiry. On behalf of the Office of Supervisor
Sandra Lee Fewer, I am confirming receipt of your request.

Please note that in accordance with the second and fifth supplementals to the Mayor’s proclamation of local emergency, immediate disclosure request and public records production deadlines under San Francisco Administrative Code, Chapter 67 (Sunshine Ordinance), have been suspended for the duration of the COVID-19 state of emergency.

However, our office endeavors to respond to records requests within the normal deadlines as feasible.

As our office will require additional time to review potentially responsive records for privilege, we intend to provide you with an update or response by January 2, 2021 close of business, and will keep you apprised if additional time is required.
Thanks,

Angelina

From: Anonymous
<arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 23, 2020 3:03 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS)
<sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>; FewerStaff (BOS)
<fewerstaff@sfgov.org>
; Ng, Wilson (BOS)
<wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org>
Subject: Sandra Fewer - Immediate Disclosure Request for one email of yours

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

Please produce the single email received by you at your official email address, with all attachments, on August 18, 2019 with a subject starting with "Code Enforcement Request:". You must minimally redact the record with citations as needed.

As of receipt of this request, you remain a public official subject to CPRA and Sunshine Ordinance.

Enjoy your soon-departure from being subject to public records requests =) and have a happy holiday.

NOTE: Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the government all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous
Buta, Odaya (CAT)

From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 24, 2021 8:51 PM
To: Ng, Wilson (BOS); SOTF, (BOS); Givner, Jon (CAT)
Cc: Supervisor Records (CAT)
Subject: New SOTF complaint, a message to DCA Givner and RE: Petition - RE: Sandra Fewer - Immediate Disclosure Request for one email of yours
Attachments: EXHIBIT A - Anonymous PRR - August 18 Communication.pdf; signature.asc

Mr. Givner, since I assume you are the ultimate supervisor of DCAs who advise agencies: Whichever of your DCA's originally (incorrectly) advised the Clerk of the Board that "It has been determined by the City Attorney’s office that the identified records are subject to withholding in their entirety in accordance with CA Evidence Code 1041. " needs some retraining. As the City has now already accepted, that total withholding was not legal. Anyone working on public records must know that EC 1041 has no ability to exempt anything but a confidential informant's identity - it doesn't cover other information. Might there be some other exemption applicable? Maybe, but not EC 1041.

A good half of my complaints and petitions would not exist if the agency-level DCAs gave precise advice on exemptions and redactions, as opposed to waiting for the SOTF in hearings or Supervisor of Records behind-the-scenes. It's unclear whether DCAs intentionally tell agencies to over-withhold because most people will never challenge it (which would be helping your clients do something illegal), or because they genuinely don't know the PRA exemptions...

Supervisor of Records Herrera: This is a new 67.21(d) petition for the revised redactions attached. The vast majority of redactions cannot be exempt under cited Evidence Code 1041. You must determine them public and order them released. EC 1041 protects a confidential informant's identity - and that's it. Someone should actually read the difference between EC 1040 and EC 1041 - which are separate exemptions. Your prior reply is simply wrong.

SOTF: This is a new complaint against the Office of the Clerk of the Board. The alleged violations are: 67.26 non-minimal withholding and 67.27 improper written justification for withholding. Please determine the information public and order it released. Note they already had one chance with the Supervisor of Records and they still have not gotten it right. You will momentarily receive an SOTF complaint webform.

The vast majority of redactions in Exhibit A (the provided records after one round of petition with the Sup of Records already) are not for the identity of a confidential informant and thus must be disclosed. They may be able to (though we do not concede) redact the sender's identity if the sender meets all the requirements of EC 1041. Evidence Code 1041 does not exempt the information disclosed by the confidential informant - just their identity.

Evidence Code 1041 cited by Respondent is a very narrow exemption for only "the identity of a person," to wit (emphasis mine):

"(a) Except as provided in this section, a public entity has a privilege to refuse to disclose the identity of a person who has furnished information as provided in subdivision (b) purporting to disclose a violation of a law of the United States or of this state or of a public entity in this state, and to prevent another from disclosing the person's identity, if the privilege is claimed by a person authorized by the public entity to do so and either of the following apply:

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

(2) Disclosure of the identity of the informer is against the public interest because the necessity for preserving the confidentiality of his or her identity outweighs the necessity for disclosure in the interest
of justice. The privilege shall not be claimed under this paragraph if a person authorized to do so has consented that the identity of the informer be disclosed in the proceeding. In determining whether disclosure of the identity of the informer is against the public interest, the interest of the public entity as a party in the outcome of the proceeding shall not be considered."

Note that the Dec 23 2020 original request was sent to both Sup. Fewer (when she was a City official) and Wilson Ng of the Office of the Clerk of the Board, and the Office of the Clerk of the Board apparently has custody of the record and has given all responses for the request, so they are the Respondent.

Requests and responses are in the below email thread.

NOTE: 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

-------- Original Message --------
On Wednesday, February 24th, 2021 at 3:30 PM, Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org> wrote:

To Whom It May Concern,

Thank you for providing reference to SOTF File No. 19120. Our office has circled back with the City Attorney’s office, and they have confirmed that they indeed previously disclosed a version of the requested document(s). Per amended guidance by the City Attorney’s office, our office is hereby amending our response and disclosing the attached records responsive to your request below. All redactions have been made pursuant to CA Evidence Code Section 1041 in coordination with the City Attorney’s office and are consistent with the records previously disclosed.

Sincerely,

—

Wilson L. Ng

Deputy Director of Operations

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form

Disclosures: Personal information that is provided in communications to the Clerk of 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.

From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 25, 2021 11:38 AM
To: Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org>
Cc: Records, Supervisor (CAT) <Supervisor.records@sfcityatty.org>
Subject: Petition - RE: Sandra Fewer - Immediate Disclosure Request for one email of yours

Supervisor of Records,

This is a 67.21(d) petition for a written determination and order for the disclosure of the below mentioned email to former Sup Fewer now in the custody of the Clerk of the Board.

Evid Code 1041 protects only the "identity of a person who has furnished information .... purporting to disclose a violation entity of a law". But one can disclose the rest of the email without disclosing the From name/email and the ending signature (thus protecting the identity but not the content), and the City is required to do so under SF Admin Code 67.26 to keep withholding to a minimum.
Furthermore, this email has been partially disclosed publicly by the Office of the City Attorney (see SOTF File 19120 Anonymous v Herrera), for over 1 year. Therefore, under Gov Code 6254.5, it cannot now be withheld in entirety.

**NOTE:** 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

Sent from ProtonMail Mobile

On Mon, Jan 25, 2021 at 9:51 AM, Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org> wrote:

To Whom It May Concern,

Thank you for your patience.

As per the Office of the Clerk of the Board’s inquiry and follow up to the City Attorney’s office, the records identified as potentially responsive to your request have been reviewed. Your original request is attached for reference. It has been determined by the City Attorney’s office that the identified records are subject to withholding in their entirety in accordance with CA Evidence Code 1041.

If you have questions regarding the authority for withholding or require further determination, you may petition to the City Attorney’s Office, Supervisor of Records at...
Supervisor.Records@sfcityatty.org in accordance with San Francisco Administrative Code, Sec. 67.21d.

Our office was not able to identify any other records subject to disclosure.

Sincerely,

___

Wilson L. Ng

Deputy Director of Operations

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

Web: www.sfbos.org

PLEASE NOTE: I will be on leave from February 1 through February 12, 2021.

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form

Disclosures: Personal information that is provided in communications to the Clerk of 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.
Thank you for your follow up. On behalf of the Office of the Clerk of the Board, I am confirming receipt and handling of your request to Supervisor Fewer’s office. Our office is following up with the City Attorney’s office and will provide you with records on a rolling basis as they are reviewed and available to us. I will keep you apprised.

Wilson L. Ng

Deputy Director of Operations

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

Web: www.sfbos.org

Please note: I will be on leave from February 1 through February 12, 2021.

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form

Disclosures: Personal information that is provided in communications to the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine
From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Friday, January 22, 2021 11:27 AM
To: Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org>
Cc: FewerStaff (BOS) <fewerstaff@sfgov.org>; Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>; Records, Supervisor (CAT) <Supervisor.records@sfcityatty.org>
Subject: RE: Sandra Fewer - Immediate Disclosure Request for one email of yours

How's this going? Your total CPRA time of 24 days is expired.

NOTE: Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the government all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

-------- Original Message --------
On Friday, January 8th, 2021 at 10:20 AM, Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org> wrote:

To Whom it May Concern:

To provide you with an update, as per our inquiry with the City Attorney’s office, their office will require additional time to review potentially responsive records. I anticipate providing you with an update or response by January 15, 2021 close of business, and will keep you apprised.

Sincerely,

__

Wilson L. Ng
Deputy Director of Operations

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Phone: (415) 554-7725
Web: www.sfbos.org

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form

Disclosures: Personal information that is provided in communications to the Clerk of 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.

From: Ng, Wilson (BOS)

Sent: Thursday, January 7, 2021 9:53 AM

To: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>

Cc: FewerStaff (BOS) <fewerstaff@sfgov.org>; Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>; Records, Supervisor (CAT) <Supervisor.records@sfcityatty.org>

Subject: RE: Sandra Fewer - Immediate Disclosure Request for one email of yours

To Whom it May Concern:

On behalf of the Office of the Clerk of the Board, this is to confirm receipt of your inquiry and follow up.

Our office, in coordination with the Office of Supervisor Fewer has identified records potentially responsive request, and is currently in consultation with the City Attorney’s office to review.

I will follow up and provide you with an update by close of business tomorrow.

Thank you for your patience.
Sincerely,

__

Wilson L. Ng
Deputy Director of Operations

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

Phone: (415) 554-7725
Web: www.sfbos.org

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

Disclosures: Personal information that is provided in communications to the Clerk of 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.

From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, January 7, 2021 9:23 AM
To: FewerStaff (BOS) <fewerstaff@sfgov.org>; Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>; Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org>; Records, Supervisor (CAT) <Supervisor.records@sfcityatty.org>

Subject: Re: Sandra Fewer - Immediate Disclosure Request for one email of yours

Supervisor of Records Dennis Herrera,

This is a 67.21(d) petition that the below request has not been complied with, a written determination that the record or any parts thereof are public, and an order for their disclosure.

Sent from ProtonMail mobile

-------- Original Message --------

On Jan 6, 2021, 1:02 PM, Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:

Hi Sup. Fewer staff,

You were going to update me on this request by Jan. 2 - any progress? It's a single email that I requested.
NOTE: Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the government all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

-------- Original Message --------

On Thursday, December 24th, 2020 at 12:53 PM, Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:

Thanks - just so you know this is an email from a member of the public to Sup Fewer and the CAO. It is not an email between Fewer and the CAO as atty/client privileged. Please do know that after a request has been made, the record cannot be destroyed regardless of whether Sup Fewer leaves office.

NOTE: Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event
shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the government all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

Sent from ProtonMail Mobile

On Thu, Dec 24, 2020 at 12:45 PM, FewerStaff (BOS) <fewerstaff@sfgov.org> wrote:

Hello,

Thank you for your inquiry. On behalf of the Office of Supervisor Sandra Lee Fewer, I am confirming receipt of your request.
Please note that in accordance with the second and fifth supplemental to the Mayor’s proclamation of local emergency, immediate disclosure request and public records production deadlines under San Francisco Administrative Code, Chapter 67 (Sunshine Ordinance), have been suspended for the duration of the COVID-19 state of emergency.

However, our office endeavors to respond to records requests within the normal deadlines as feasible.

As our office will require additional time to review potentially responsive records for privilege, we intend to provide you with an update or response by January 2, 2021 close of business, and will keep you apprised if additional time is required.

Thanks,
From: Anonymous
<arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 23, 2020 3:03 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>; FewerStaff (BOS) <fewerstaff@sfgov.org>; Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org>
Subject: Sandra Fewer - Immediate Disclosure Request for one email of yours

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

Supervisor Fewer,
Please produce the single email received by you at your official email address, with all attachments, on August 18, 2019 with a subject starting with "Code Enforcement Request:"

As of receipt of this request, you remain a public official subject to CPRA and Sunshine Ordinance.

Enjoy your soon-departure from being subject to public records requests =) and have a happy holiday.

NOTE: Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the government all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

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

The Honorable Dennis Herrera  
City Attorney of San Francisco  
City Hall, Room 234  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Email: cityattorney@sfcityatty.org  
Tel: (415) 554-4700
3. **Possible Identity Theft**: A young man (who is housesitting the property while is in 30-days of rehab) last week disposed of mail from her unit which included several pieces of mail from financial institutions (Wells Fargo, Card Services, etc.) addressed to Brian Carmody at [redacted]. This is the same journalist who was involved with investigating the Jeff Adachi case. Our neighbors alerted Mr. Carmody to the strange mail in case somebody is trying to open credit in his name.
The Honorable Dennis Herrera
City Attorney of San Francisco
City Hall, Room 234
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA 94102
Email: cityattorney@sfcityatty.org
Tel: (415) 554-4700
3. Possible Identity Theft: A young man (who is housesitting the property while [redacted] is in 30-days of rehab) last week disposed of mail from her unit which included several pieces of mail from financial institutions (Wells Fargo, Card Services, etc.) addressed to Brian Carmody at [redacted]. This is the same journalist who was involved with investigating the Jeff Adachi case. Our neighbors alerted Mr. Carmody to the strange mail in case somebody is trying to open credit in his name.
The Honorable Dennis Herrera
City Attorney of San Francisco
City Hall, Room 234
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA 94102
Email: cityattorney@sfcityatty.org
Tel: (415) 554-4700

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.
On Sun, Aug 18, 2019 at 2:59 PM [Redacted] wrote:
The Honorable Dennis Herrera
City Attorney of San Francisco
City Hall, Room 234
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA 94102
Email: cityattorney@sfcityatty.org
Tel: (415) 554-4700
3. Possible Identify Theft: A young man (who is housesitting the property while he is in 30-days of rehab) last week disposed of mail from her unit which included several pieces of mail from financial institutions (Wells Fargo, Card Services, etc.) addressed to Brian Carmody at [redacted]. This is the same journalist who was involved with investigating the Jeff Adachi case. Our neighbors alerted Mr. Carmody to the strange mail in case somebody is trying to open credit in his name.
To Whom It May Concern –

We understand that the Ethics Commission provided a further response to your request at issue below and that you filed a separate petition contesting that response on April 23, 2021. Accordingly, we consider this petition closed.

Bradley Russi  
Deputy City Attorney  
Office of City Attorney David Chiu  
City Hall, Room 234  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
www.sfcityattorney.org

From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, February 25, 2021 3:00 PM  
To: Pierce, Jeffrey (ETH) <jeffrey.pierce@sfgov.org>; Supervisor Records (CAT) <supervisor.records@SFCITYATTY.ORG>  
Subject: RE: The Path to Forced, Universal Government Transparency - Immediate disclosure request

Thank you. We are challenging your response to our third request. Your written justification is based on local law. However, local law cannot make non-disclosable any information that is disclosable pursuant to state law. Local law can only enhance disclosure, not limit it.

**Supervisor of Records Herrera:** Since there is no state law exemption cited, please determine in writing that the records responsive to request #3 are public and order them disclosed. Alternatively, please determine that some portion of the records - such as, in a complaint log, the dates the complaints were filed, their statuses, and possibly some part of their subject matter - are public and order them disclosed. Also, all portion of such records (like a log) reflecting finally adjudicated complaints should be public even by the Commission’s argument (which we do not concede is valid, nevertheless) since they are willing to provide (online) other records about those adjudicated complaints. Once finally adjudicated, they are no longer open investigations subject to for example Gov Code 6254(f). Even if some information may be exempt under a valid state exemption (like 6254(f)) that does not mean all of the information may be withheld.

**NOTE:** 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,
Anonymous

Sent from ProtonMail Mobile

------- Original Message -------
On Thursday, February 25th, 2021 at 2:41 PM, Pierce, Jeffrey (ETH) <jeffrey.pierce@sfgov.org> wrote:
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From: Pierce, Jeffrey (ETH)  
Sent: Tuesday, February 23, 2021 7:47 PM  
To: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>  
Subject: RE: The Path to Forced, Universal Government Transparency - Immediate disclosure request

Is this the Ethics Commission's complete response to my records request?
NOTE: 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

------- Original Message -------
On Monday, February 22nd, 2021 at 6:02 PM, Pierce, Jeffrey (ETH) <jeffrey.pierce@sfgov.org> wrote:
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From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>  
Sent: Sunday, February 21, 2021 11:43 PM  
To: Dennis Herrera (City Attorney, SF) <dennis.herrera@sfgov.org>; Cityattorney <Cityattorney@sfcityatty.org>; FEITELBERG, BRITTANY (CAT) <Brittany.Feitelberg@sfcityatty.org>; Ethics Commission, (ETH) <ethics.commission@sfgov.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; SOTF, (BOS) <sotf@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Elsbernd, Sean (MYR) <sean.elsbernd@sfgov.org>; Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org>; Thompson, Marianne (ECN) <marianne.thompson@sfgov.org>; GIVNER, JON (CAT) <Jon.Givner@sfcityatty.org>  
Subject: The Path to Forced, Universal Government Transparency – Immediate disclosure request

---

see bottom for requests to your agencies

---

Mayor Breed and City Attorney Herrera:

departments BCC-ed

A member of the public astutely hypothesized that your offices make the risk analysis that it is efficient for your subordinates and clients to regularly violate CPRA/Sunshine laws for all members of the public and then just deal later with people like me, as a cost of doing business.
If true, no matter how many rulings SOTF makes in specific cases, it will never help generally improve government transparency for all. According to this theory you and the City have made a rational economic calculation to, as a rule, violate the Sunshine Ordinance because it allows you and your fellow officials to hide or delete records, overredact them without legal justifications, and delay access to the vast majority of the public, even if it means belatedly losing appeals repeatedly to the small number of us who will vigorously defend our legal rights. But its not just those other requesters that lose out - the public domain is deprived of timely, lawfully disclosable public records which illuminate how officials conduct the public's business.

Your strategy's success depends on:

- no meaningful penalty to you or the City as long as we few use only SOTF which imposes no financial penalty, instead of Superior Court which does, (example: agencies routinely wait until immediately prior to an SOTF hearing to produce records voluntarily),
- the Ethics Commission ignoring the Sunshine Ordinance so as to protect senior officials from the few personal consequences that do exist in law (example: even if my complaints about you destroying your text message public records in violation of 67.29-7 are eventually heard and won by me, you will still have gotten the substantial political benefits of destroying records for years prior, which the public will permanently never be able to learn about), and
- your certainty that only a small percent of requesters are aware of their rights or have the time, legal, or financial resources to defend their rights even if known.

However... such a strategy would no longer be viable if a person who does know how to enforce the transparency laws re-makes the same requests for which you violate others' rights, and enforced full compliance themselves in court where you would be forced to pay for each and every violation, and where Breed, Herrera, and the Board cannot change the judges (or pressure them during appointment) or suspend the rules when they lose. Evidence shows even the Ethics Commission bends to a court that once forced it to do its job.

The City will be transparent only when it fears meaningful, legally-enforced financial repercussions for unlawful opacity. And when the taxpayers get tired of footing the bill for their officials' obstruction of transparency laws, voters can boot them out of office or amend the law to make department heads and elected officials personally financially liable for violations. Having partially and successfully tested this strategy in a few others' requests, it is now time to implement it fully:

To Each Supervisor, President Walton (for the Board), Mayor Breed, Chair Wolfe and Vice-Chair Yankee (for the SOTF), Clerk Calvillo, Chair Ambrose and Vice-Chair Lee (for the Ethics Commission), OEWD, and City Attorney Herrera:
Unlike many City agencies, none of your agencies use NextRequest or another web platform to make automatically public all of your records requests so I cannot statistically analyze the quality of your responses to other requesters automatically.

1. This is an immediate disclosure request for the records request-tracking spreadsheet/database/log (if you keep any) for all records requests made to your agency meeting either of the following criteria: request was received on or after March 23, 2020 OR any response was issued on or after March 23, 2020. This request includes personal account searches. Include all columns or fields in any database. Any electronic format preserving ALL non-exempt electronic information is acceptable (all exempt info in the original electronic record must be specifically justified). For the SOTF and Ethics Commission: these requests do NOT include any logs tracking complaints filed with your agency - only records requests made to your agency.

2. This is an immediate disclosure request for all emails or mailed letters related to records requests/responses with the phrase "10 business days" case-insensitive anywhere in the thread (i.e. including replies/forward bodies included in other emails) sent by anyone in your Office/agency (sent to a requester, or to another City employee) on or after March 23, 2020. Exact PDF copies with all attachments, formatting, hyperlinks, images, email addresses, INCLUDING To/From/Cc AND Bcc email address, is necessary and sufficient; other email headers are not necessary at this time. This request includes personal account searches. For some period of time since the COVID emergency orders - Herrera's office falsely told records requesters that the City had "10 business days" to respond (i.e. 14 calendar days as opposed to 10) under the CPRA. I would like to determine whether this false statement of law was directed solely to me, or all requesters. Mysteriously, immediately after I complained, Herrera stopped doing this (to me at least). This is especially interesting in light of the fact that Herrera - long before I complained - had issued a public legal opinion about the City's obligation to meet the 10 day requirement under state law even under the Mayor's purported orders. For the SOTF and Ethics Commission: these requests do NOT include any logs tracking complaints filed with your agency - only records requests made to your agency.

3. To SOTF and Ethics only: This is an immediate disclosure request for any tracking spreadsheet/database/log for all complaints filed with your agency from March 23, 2020 to present. This request includes personal account searches. Include all columns or fields in any database. Any electronic format preserving ALL non-exempt electronic information is acceptable (all exempt info in the original electronic record must be specifically justified).

Unfortunately, if the City is only correcting the legal process of records response just for me, I'm not really achieving my goal of universal government transparency as required by law. In some ways, thus it helps that there are now so many unaffiliated members of the public using MuckRock with an anonymous moniker and copy-pasting my request
verbiage -- instead of complying with the law just in my cases, you are forced to comply with the law at least a larger group of people.

**NOTE:** 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous
Thank you. We are challenging your response to our third request. Your written justification is based on local law. However, local law cannot make non-disclosable any information that is disclosable pursuant to state law. Local law can only enhance disclosure, not limit it.

**Supervisor of Records Herrera:** Since there is no state law exemption cited, please determine in writing that the records responsive to request #3 are public and order them disclosed. Alternatively, please determine that some portion of the records - such as, in a complaint log, the dates the complaints were filed, their statuses, and possibly some part of their subject matter - are public and order them disclosed. Also, all portion of such records (like a log) reflecting finally adjudicated complaints should be public even by the Commission’s argument (which we do not concede is valid, nevertheless) since they are willing to provide (online) other records about those adjudicated complaints. Once finally adjudicated, they are no longer open investigations subject to for example Gov Code 6254(f). Even if some information may be exempt under a valid state exemption (like 6254(f)) that does not mean all of the information may be withheld.

**NOTE:** 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

Sent from ProtonMail Mobile

------- Original Message -------
On Thursday, February 25th, 2021 at 2:41 PM, Pierce, Jeffrey (ETH) <jeffrey.pierce@sfgov.org> wrote:
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Is this the Ethics Commission's complete response to my records request?

**NOTE:** 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.
2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.
From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 21, 2021 11:43 PM
To: Dennis Herrera (City Attorney, SF) <dennis.herrera@sfgov.org>; Cityattorney <Cityattorney@sfcityatty.org>; FEITELBERG, BRITTANY (CAT) <Brittany.Feitelberg@sfcityatty.org>; Ethics Commission, (ETH) <ethics.commission@sfgov.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; SOTF, (BOS) <sotf@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Elsbernd, Sean (MYR) <sean.elsbernd@sfgov.org>; Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org>; Thompson, Marianne (ECN) <marianne.thompson@sfgov.org>; GIVNER, JON (CAT) <Jon.Givner@sfcityatty.org>
Subject: The Path to Forced, Universal Government Transparency - Immediate disclosure request

see bottom for requests to your agencies

Mayor Breed and City Attorney Herrera:

departments BCC-ed

A member of the public astutely hypothesized that your offices make the risk analysis that it is efficient for your subordinates and clients to regularly violate CPRA/Sunshine laws for all members of the public and then just deal later with people like me, as a cost of doing business.

If true, no matter how many rulings SOTF makes in specific cases, it will never help generally improve government transparency for all. According to this theory you and the City have made a rational economic calculation to, as a rule, violate the Sunshine Ordinance because it allows you and your fellow officials to hide or delete records, over-redact them without legal justifications, and delay access to the vast majority of the public, even if it means belatedly losing appeals repeatedly to the small number of us who will vigorously defend our legal rights. But its not just those other requesters that lose out - the public domain is deprived of timely, lawfully disclosable public records which illuminate how officials conduct the public's business.

Your strategy's success depends on:

- no meaningful penalty to you or the City as long as we few use only SOTF which imposes no financial penalty, instead of Superior Court which does, (example:
agencies routinely wait until immediately prior to an SOTF hearing to produce records voluntarily),

- the Ethics Commission ignoring the Sunshine Ordinance so as to protect senior officials from the few personal consequences that do exist in law (example: even if my complaints about you destroying your text message public records in violation of 67.29-7 are eventually heard and won by me, you will still have gotten the substantial political benefits of destroying records for years prior, which the public will permanently never be able to learn about), and

- your certainty that only a small percent of requesters are aware of their rights or have the time, legal, or financial resources to defend their rights even if known.

However... such a strategy would no longer be viable if a person who does know how to enforce the transparency laws re-makes the same requests for which you violate others' rights, and enforced full compliance themselves in court where you would be forced to pay for each and every violation, and where Breed, Herrera, and the Board cannot change the judges (or pressure them during appointment) or suspend the rules when they lose. Evidence shows even the Ethics Commission bends to a court that once forced it to do its job.

The City will be transparent only when it fears meaningful, legally-enforced financial repercussions for unlawful opacity. And when the taxpayers get tired of footing the bill for their officials' obstruction of transparency laws, voters can boot them out of office or amend the law to make department heads and elected officials personally financially liable for violations. Having partially and successfully tested this strategy in a few others' requests, it is now time to implement it fully:

To Each Supervisor, President Walton (for the Board), Mayor Breed, Chair Wolfe and Vice-Chair Yankee (for the SOTF), Clerk Calvillo, Chair Ambrose and Vice-Chair Lee (for the Ethics Commission), OEWD, and City Attorney Herrera:

Unlike many City agencies, none of your agencies use NextRequest or another web platform to make automatically public all of your records requests so I cannot statistically analyze the quality of your responses to other requesters automatically.

1. This is an immediate disclosure request for the records request-tracking spreadsheet/database/log (if you keep any) for all records requests made to your agency meeting either of the following criteria: request was received on or after March 23, 2020 OR any response was issued on or after March 23, 2020. This request includes personal account searches. Include all columns or fields in any database. Any electronic format preserving ALL non-exempt electronic information is acceptable (all exempt info in the original electronic record must be specifically justified). For the SOTF and Ethics Commission: these requests do NOT include any logs tracking complaints filed with your agency - only records requests made to your agency.
2. This is an immediate disclosure request for all emails or mailed letters related to records requests/responses with the phrase "10 business days" case-insensitive anywhere in the thread (i.e. including replies/forward bodies included in other emails) sent by anyone in your Office/agency (sent to a requester, or to another City employee) on or after March 23, 2020. Exact PDF copies with all attachments, formatting, hyperlinks, images, email addresses, INCLUDING To/From/Cc AND Bcc email address, is necessary and sufficient; other email headers are not necessary at this time. This request includes personal account searches. For some period of time since the COVID emergency orders - Herrera's office falsely told records requesters that the City had "10 business days" to respond (i.e. 14 calendar days as opposed to 10) under the CPRA. I would like to determine whether this false statement of law was directed solely to me, or all requesters. Mysteriously, immediately after I complained, Herrera stopped doing this (to me at least). This is especially interesting in light of the fact that Herrera - long before I complained - had issued a public legal opinion about the City's obligation to meet the 10 day requirement under state law even under the Mayor's purported orders. For the SOTF and Ethics Commission: these requests do NOT include any logs tracking complaints filed with your agency - only records requests made to your agency.

3. To SOTF and Ethics only: This is an immediate disclosure request for any tracking spreadsheet/database/log for all complaints filed with your agency from March 23, 2020 to present. This request includes personal account searches. Include all columns or fields in any database. Any electronic format preserving ALL non-exempt electronic information is acceptable (all exempt info in the original electronic record must be specifically justified).

Unfortunately, if the City is only correcting the legal process of records response just for me, I'm not really achieving my goal of universal government transparency as required by law. In some ways, thus it helps that there are now so many unaffiliated members of the public using MuckRock with an anonymous moniker and copy-pasting my request verbiage -- instead of complying with the law just in my cases, you are forced to comply with the law at least a larger group of people.

NOTE: 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.
To Whom It May Concern –

We understand that the Clerk’s Office produced records responsive to this request in March 2021 and you filed separate petitions regarding that response. Accordingly, we consider this petition closed.

Bradley Russi  
Deputy City Attorney  
Office of City Attorney David Chiu  
City Hall, Room 234  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
www.sfcityattorney.org

From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>  
Sent: Friday, February 26, 2021 2:59 PM  
To: Supervisor Records (CAT) <supervisor.records@SFCITYATTY.ORG>  
Subject: Petition – Fw: RE: All Supervisors and the Clerk – Future calendars – Immediate disclosure request

After 24 days, a notice of *disclosable* public records not having been received as required by Gov Code 6253(c), the supervisors and the clerk have failed to comply with my request. Please determine the records, in writing, to be public and order them disclosed.

**NOTE:** 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

-------- Original Message --------
On Friday, February 26th, 2021 at 2:56 PM, Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:

No Mr. Ng, I will get the records before the events occur. Supervisor of Records this is a petition under 67.21(d) to determine that the future calendar entries requested are public and order them disclosed. No records having been disclosed in 24 days is an unreasonable delay.
Mr. Ng because you refuse to provide these records prior to the meeting date, I will be momentarily requesting various further future calendar series including far into the future that you cannot possibly delay until the event date. Have a good day.

**NOTE:**
1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.
2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness.
3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.
4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

------ Original Message ------
On Friday, February 26th, 2021 at 2:52 PM, Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org> wrote:

To Whom It May Concern,

To provide you with an update, our office has conducted an inquiry to department staff, and has collected and compiled records of calendar entries available to date that are responsive to your request.

However, our office will require additional time to review the compiled records for applicable redactions to personal, privileged, and personnel information and consult the City Attorney’s office prior to production.

We intend to provide you with an update or response by Friday, March 12, 2021 close of business, and will keep you apprised if a response can be provided sooner or if additional time is required.

Sincerely,

__

Wilson L. Ng

Deputy Director of Operations
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Web: www.sfbos.org

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form

Disclosures: Personal information that is provided in communications to the Clerk of 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.

From: Ng, Wilson (BOS)
Sent: Tuesday, February 16, 2021 1:24 PM
To: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Subject: RE: All Supervisors and the Clerk - Future calendars - Immediate disclosure request

To Whom It May Concern,

Thank you for your inquiry. On behalf of the Office of the Clerk of the Board, I am confirming receipt of your request.

As you may also know, in accordance with the second and fifth supplementals to the Mayor’s proclamation of local emergency, public records production deadlines – including immediate disclosure requests – under San Francisco Administrative Code,
Chapter 67 (Sunshine Ordinance), have been suspended for the duration of the COVID-19 state of emergency. However, our office endeavors to respond to records requests within the normal deadlines as feasible.

As you may have noticed from my out of office reply, I have been on leave and just returned to the office today to confirm receipt of your request. I also noticed that your email was flagged as spam by the City's email system, so the intended recipients may not have received your request. However, I will be glad to assist and coordinate with the Clerk of the Board and all Board member’s offices to compile, review, and provide you with responsive records to your request.

Given the circumstances, our office will require additional time to process your request, and I intend to provide you with an update or response by next Friday, February 26, 2021. I will keep you apprised if additional time is required.

Thank you for your patience and understanding.

Sincerely,

—

Wilson L. Ng

Deputy Director of Operations

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

Web: www.sfbos.org

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.
Disclosures: Personal information that is provided in communications to the Clerk of 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.

From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 2, 2021 5:59 PM
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; Haney, Matt (BOS) <matt.haney@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; PrestonStaff (BOS) <prestonstaff@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>
Cc: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org>
Subject: All Supervisors and the Clerk - Future calendars - Immediate disclosure request

Clerk Calvillo, and Supervisors Chan, Haney, Mandelman, Mar, Melgar, Peskin, Preston, Ronen, Safai, Stefani, and Walton, and all Offices thereof:

As promised, this is an immediate disclosure request to each Supervisor and the Clerk of the Board for:

- the details of each entry on all calendars or scheduling documents containing your future meetings (physical, virtual, phone, or in any other form) for the dates of March 1st through March 14th, 2021 regardless of whether that calendar is electronic or physical, or on your government account, your personal account (see City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017)), or the government or personal accounts of your staff members/assistants documenting your own meetings, and preserving all details including but not limited to attendees, date and time stamps, email addresses, subject lines, category/importance flags, locations, attendee/invite status, hyperlinks, images, body text, and attachments. Pursuant to SFAC 67.21(L), please produce electronic records in individual meeting details format (called "Memo Style" in Microsoft Outlook) and NOT as a monthly, daily, or weekly summary. If records of business-related meetings that you (the Supervisor/Clerk) will attend are documented on
someone else's calendar (like an aide's), I am indeed requesting those records as well.

In San Francisco, the deliberative process privilege is prohibited (SFAC 67.24(h)) - therefore the people do indeed have the right to know who you will meet with and for what purpose even in the future. Please also note that if you decide to redact security information, it is only redactable if the info is a security procedure of a police agency (i.e. if the sheriff or SFPD are protecting you at the meeting - see Gov Code 6254(f)). Redacting or withholding supposedly "sensitive" information not explicitly exempt under a law will be challenged.

Please see:

- SOTF Order 19103 Anonymous v Breed ordering Mayor Breed to produce her future calendars with redactions for security procedures (which Breed claims she will comply with),
- SOTF Order 19112 Anonymous v Scott ordering Chief Scott to produce his future calendars with redactions for security procedures (and SOTF's referral of Scott to the Ethics Commission for willful violation due to non-compliance with the Order), and
- City Attorney Herrera's Feb 1, 2021 voluntary change of mind and decision to disclose in redacted form his own future calendars after SOTF Order 19103, quoting: "In light of recent discussions at the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force regarding public officials’ disclosure of their future calendars, we have re-evaluated the legal question and consulted with the Police Department about security risks. Following that evaluation, we have concluded that in most circumstances the City Attorney may safely and legally disclose certain information about his future meetings, including the subject matter of the meeting and the attendees, if that information is recorded in his calendar, and the week during which the meeting will occur. Due to security concerns, we will continue to withhold the location, time, and specific date of each meeting. There may be circumstances in the future where information about the subject matter or attendees of a meeting should be withheld based on fact-specific security concerns or other legal grounds, but your current request does not raise those concerns."

If you wait to produce the entries after the meetings occur (as happened in 19103/19112) or attempt to hide politically sensitive meetings (which are not exempt under any law), I will file immediate appeals and complaints, and given past rulings I expect to win.

Thank you for your expected cooperation in this matter.

**NOTE:** 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or
professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, 
including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event 
shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other 
damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this 
email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the 
sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous
After 24 days, a notice of disclosable public records not having been received as required by Gov Code 6253(c), the supervisors and the clerk have failed to comply with my request. Please determine the records, in writing, to be public and order them disclosed.

NOTE: 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

------ Original Message -------
On Friday, February 26th, 2021 at 2:56 PM, Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:

No Mr. Ng, I will get the records before the events occur.
Supervisor of Records this is a petition under 67.21(d) to determine that the future calendar entries requested are public and order them disclosed. No records having been disclosed in 24 days is an unreasonable delay.

Mr. Ng because you refuse to provide these records prior to the meeting date, I will be momentarily requesting various further future calendar series including far into the future that you cannot possibly delay until the event date. Have a good day.

NOTE: 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

------ Original Message -------
On Friday, February 26th, 2021 at 2:52 PM, Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org> wrote:
To Whom It May Concern,

To provide you with an update, our office has conducted an inquiry to department staff, and has collected and compiled records of calendar entries available to date that are responsive to your request.

However, our office will require additional time to review the compiled records for applicable redactions to personal, privileged, and personnel information and consult the City Attorney’s office prior to production.

We intend to provide you with an update or response by Friday, March 12, 2021 close of business, and will keep you apprised if a response can be provided sooner or if additional time is required.

Sincerely,

—

Wilson L. Ng
Deputy Director of Operations

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Web: www.sfbos.org

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form
Disclosures: Personal information that is provided in communications to the Clerk of 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.

From: Ng, Wilson (BOS)
Sent: Tuesday, February 16, 2021 1:24 PM
To: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Subject: RE: All Supervisors and the Clerk - Future calendars - Immediate disclosure request

To Whom It May Concern,

Thank you for your inquiry. On behalf of the Office of the Clerk of the Board, I am confirming receipt of your request.

As you may also know, in accordance with the second and fifth supplementals to the Mayor’s proclamation of local emergency, public records production deadlines – including immediate disclosure requests – under San Francisco Administrative Code, Chapter 67 (Sunshine Ordinance), have been suspended for the duration of the COVID-19 state of emergency. However, our office endeavors to respond to records requests within the normal deadlines as feasible.

As you may have noticed from my out of office reply, I have been on leave and just returned to the office today to confirm receipt of your request. I also noticed that your email was flagged as spam by the City’s email system, so the intended recipients may not have received your request. However, I will be glad to assist and coordinate with the Clerk of the Board and all Board member’s offices to compile, review, and provide you with responsive records to your request.

Given the circumstances, our office will require additional time to process your request, and I intend to provide you with an update or response by next Friday, February 26, 2021. I will keep you apprised if additional time is required.
Thank you for your patience and understanding.

Sincerely,

Wilson L. Ng
Deputy Director of Operations

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Web: www.sfbos.org

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

Disclosures: Personal information that is provided in communications to the Clerk of 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.

From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 2, 2021 5:59 PM
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; Haney, Matt (BOS) <matt.haney@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; PrestonStaff
Clerk Calvillo, and Supervisors Chan, Haney, Mandelman, Mar, Melgar, Peskin, Preston, Ronen, Safai, Stefani, and Walton, and all Offices thereof:

As promised, this is an immediate disclosure request to each Supervisor and the Clerk of the Board for:

- the details of each entry on all calendars or scheduling documents containing your future meetings (physical, virtual, phone, or in any other form) for the dates of March 1st through March 14th, 2021 regardless of whether that calendar is electronic or physical, or on your government account, your personal account (see City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017)), or the government or personal accounts of your staff members/assistants documenting your own meetings, and preserving all details including but not limited to attendees, date and time stamps, email addresses, subject lines, category/importance flags, locations, attendee/invite status, hyperlinks, images, body text, and attachments. Pursuant to SFAC 67.21(L), please produce electronic records in individual meeting details format (called "Memo Style" in Microsoft Outlook) and NOT as a monthly, daily, or weekly summary. If records of business-related meetings that you (the Supervisor/Clerk) will attend are documented on someone else's calendar (like an aide's), I am indeed requesting those records as well.

In San Francisco, the deliberative process privilege is prohibited (SFAC 67.24(h)) - therefore the people do indeed have the right to know who you will meet with and for what purpose even in the future. Please also note that if you decide to redact security information, it is only redactable if the info is a security procedure of a police agency (i.e. if the sheriff or SFPD are protecting you at the meeting - see Gov Code 6254(f)). Redacting or withholding supposedly "sensitive" information not explicitly exempt under a law will be challenged.

Please see:

- SOTF Order 19103 Anonymous v Breed ordering Mayor Breed to produce her future calendars with redactions for security procedures (which Breed claims she will comply with),
- SOTF Order 19112 Anonymous v Scott ordering Chief Scott to produce his future calendars with redactions for security procedures (and SOTF's referral of Scott to the Ethics Commission for willful violation due to non-compliance with the Order), and
City Attorney Herrera's Feb 1, 2021 voluntary change of mind and decision to disclose in redacted form his own future calendars after SOTF Order 19103, quoting: "In light of recent discussions at the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force regarding public officials’ disclosure of their future calendars, we have re-evaluated the legal question and consulted with the Police Department about security risks. Following that evaluation, we have concluded that in most circumstances the City Attorney may safely and legally disclose certain information about his future meetings, including the subject matter of the meeting and the attendees, if that information is recorded in his calendar, and the week during which the meeting will occur. Due to security concerns, we will continue to withhold the location, time, and specific date of each meeting. There may be circumstances in the future where information about the subject matter or attendees of a meeting should be withheld based on fact-specific security concerns or other legal grounds, but your current request does not raise those concerns."

If you wait to produce the entries after the meetings occur (as happened in 19103/19112) or attempt to hide politically sensitive meetings (which are not exempt under any law), I will file immediate appeals and complaints, and given past rulings I expect to win.

Thank you for your expected cooperation in this matter.

NOTE: 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous
Dear Supervisor of Public Records:

I am writing to notify you that the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency "SFMTA" has provided a revised response in response to the appeal that I filed on February 26th, 2021.

The SFMTA provided a full revised response and provided the requested records on March 5th, 2021.

Accordingly, I hereby withdraw my Petition to the Supervisor of Public Records. The department is instructed to take no further action and close its file regarding this request.

If you have any questions, do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Anonymous Record Requester

anonymousrecordspublicca@gmail.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE:
The contents of this email message and any attachments are intended solely for the addressee(s) and may contain confidential and/or privileged information and may be legally protected from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient of this message or their agent, or if this message has been addressed to you in error, please immediately alert the sender by reply email and then delete this message and any attachments. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, copying, or storage of this message or its attachments is strictly prohibited.

Please note that the Public Records Act does not require a requester to identify themselves.

Therefore, I am submitting an Anonymous Records Request.

On Tue, Mar 2, 2021 at 11:00 AM Supervisor Records (CAT) <supervisor.records@sfcityatty.org> wrote:

I write to acknowledge receipt of your petition. Due to the COVID-19 emergency, the Mayor has suspended provisions of the Sunshine Ordinance, including the deadline for the Supervisor of Records to make a determination on a petition. We will look into the issues raised in your petition as soon as we are able. Thank you.

Bradley Russi
To Whom It May Concern:

Please confirm receipt of the aforementioned appeal.

Sincerely,

Anonymous Record Requester

anonymousrecordspublcca@gmail.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE:
The contents of this email message and any attachments are intended solely for the addressee(s) and may contain confidential and/or privileged information and may be legally protected from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient of this message or their agent, or if this message has been addressed to you in error, please immediately alert the sender by reply email and then delete this message and any attachments. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, copying, or storage of this message or its attachments is strictly prohibited.

Please note that the Public Records Act does not require a requester to identify themselves.

Therefore, I am submitting an Anonymous Records Request.

On Fri, Feb 26, 2021 at 7:00 PM Anonymous Record Requester <anonymousrecordspublcca@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Supervisor of Public Records:
Please find enclosed an appeal of the action of Caroline Celaya, Public Records Manager of SFMTA on SFMTA Public Record Request P000132-021521.

Please acknowledge receipt of this appeal upon your receipt of it.

I have copied the agency on this email. They are not required to respond but am copying them to notify them of the appeal.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Anonymous Record Requester

anonymousrecordspublicca@gmail.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE:
The contents of this email message and any attachments are intended solely for the addressee(s) and may contain confidential and/or privileged information and may be legally protected from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient of this message or their agent, or if this message has been addressed to you in error, please immediately alert the sender by reply email and then delete this message and any attachments. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, copying, or storage of this message or its attachments is strictly prohibited.

Please note that the Public Records Act does not require a requester to identify themselves.

Therefore, I am submitting an Anonymous Records Request.
Dear Supervisor of Public Records:

Please find enclosed an appeal of the action of Caroline Celaya, Public Records Manager of SFMTA on SFMTA Public Record Request P000132-021521.

Please acknowledge receipt of this appeal upon your receipt of it.

I have copied the agency on this email. They are not required to respond but am copying them to notify them of the appeal.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Anonymous Record Requester

anonymousrecordspublicca@gmail.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE:
The contents of this email message and any attachments are intended solely for the addressee(s) and may contain confidential and/or privileged information and may be legally protected from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient of this message or their agent, or if this message has been addressed to you in error, please immediately alert the sender by reply email and then delete this message and any attachments. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, copying, or storage of this message or its attachments is strictly prohibited.

Please note that the Public Records Act does not require a requester to identify themselves.

Therefore, I am submitting an Anonymous Records Request.
Anonymous Record Requester
anonymousrecordspublicca@gmail.com

Office of the City Attorney
ATTN: Supervisor of Public Records
City Hall, Room 234
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: 415-554-4700
Email: Supervisor.Records@sfcityatty.org

Via: Electronic Correspondence
February 26th, 2021

Dear Supervisor of Public Records:

I write pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code §§ 67.20(c) and 67.21(d) to appeal the action of Caroline Celaya of the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency “SFMTA” on a California Public Records Act request that I filed on February 15th, 2021. The SFMTA assigned my request a reference number of P000132-021521.

I requested the following records:

To Whom It May Concern:

Pursuant to the California Public Records Act, I hereby request the following records:

I request the owner information (name and license plate number) associated with the below-listed residential parking permit number.

Permit Number: 2000603
Please advise of any fees that may be incurred in the processing of this request prior to incurring them.

Please release the requested information via the online records portal.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Respectfully Submitted,
Anonymous Record Requester

On February 26th, 2021, the SFMTA responded to my request and denied access to the records claiming that the records contained information about an individual and that the disclosure of such records was a unwarranted invasion of privacy. The SFMTA used codes Cal. Govt. Code §§6250, 6254(c); Cal. Const., Art. I, §1; S.F. Admin. Code Chapter 12M to deny my request.

I disagree with the SFMTA on their response to the request for the reasons listed below. Accordingly, I hereby appeal their action pursuant to my rights under San Francisco Administrative Code §§67.20(c) and 67.21(d).

The SFMTA claims that this information would constitute an “unwarranted” invasion of privacy. I am not requesting information that would invade any person's “reasonable” expectation of privacy. A name of a person and their license plate number is information that is public record and would not invade one's privacy.

For example, a public driver license report is a matter of public record and can be released upon request from the California Department of Motor Vehicles to any member of the public. This would include one’s name. See California Vehicle Code §§1808 and 1810.

The name of a person in no way invades their privacy, as much as a home address would. For example, a home address would be exempt under the California Public Records Act.
In regard to a license plate number, this information is already displayed by persons travelling on roadways. As a reminder, this is no exception of privacy in public. A license plate number is a public record because anyone can view it when walking or driving within the State of California.

For the reasons stated above, these records are a public record and the SFMTA improperly withheld these records from release. Accordingly, my appeal should be granted and the department should be ordered to release the requested information pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code §§ 67.20(c) and 67.21(d).

I reserve my right to file a complaint with the San Francisco Sunshine Task Force or take further legal action against the SFMTA in San Francisco Superior Court.

I have copied the agency on this email, and they have been notified of the appeal being filed.

If the department makes a statement regarding this appeal, they are asked to notify me.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions regarding this appeal.

Respectfully Submitted,
Anonymous Record Requester

Cc: Anonymous Record Requester, anonymousrecordspublicca@gmail.com
Cc: Caroline Celaya, Manager of Public Records, SFMTA, caroline.celaya@sfmta.com

Enclosures:
  ● Communication Regarding SFMTA Request P000132-021521
August 5, 2022

Sent via email (94992-15550486@requests.muckrock.com)

Re: Petition to Supervisor of Records

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter responds to your petition to the Supervisor of Records dated March 9, 2021, concerning a request to the Public Utilities Commission (“PUC”). You contend that PUC unlawfully redacted information from an email.

We find that PUC properly redacted a portion of the email that contains attorney advice. See Gov’t Code Sec. 6254(k), Evid. Code Sec. 954.

Very truly yours,

DENNIS J. HERRERA
City Attorney

Bradley A. Russi
Deputy City Attorney
Buta, Odaya (CAT)

From: Russi, Brad (CAT) on behalf of Supervisor Records (CAT)
Sent: Friday, August 5, 2022 11:36 AM
To: '94992-15550486@requests.muckrock.com'
Cc: Buta, Odaya (CAT)
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Inter-Agency Text Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF PUC)
Attachments: Ltr. to Anonymous 8.5.2022.pdf

Please see the attached response to your petition.

Bradley Russi
Deputy City Attorney
Office of City Attorney David Chiu
City Hall, Room 234
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA 94102
www.sfcityattorney.org

From: 94992-15550486@requests.muckrock.com <94992-15550486@requests.muckrock.com>
Sent: Monday, March 8, 2021 9:55 PM
To: Supervisor Records (CAT) <supervisor.records@SFCITYATTY.ORG>
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Inter-Agency Text Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF PUC)

Public Utilities Commission
PRA Office
Polk Street
525 Golden Gate Avenue
SF, CA 94102

March 9, 2021

This is a follow up to a previous request:

Supervisor of Records Herrera:

New 67.21(d) petition.

The attached record produced by PUC in response to a records request from this email address is challenged. An email between Sean Elsbernd and Naomi Kelly cannot be Attorney-Client Privileged - neither of them is the attorney for the other. Furthermore the two attachments were not provided. Furthermore the email addresses of the Kellys were clearly available as hyperlinks in the records, but have been stripped for no legal reason - likely because the government continues to fail to produce even simple PDFs as actual full-fidelity PDFs instead of image renderings. Please determine some portion of these records are public (in writing) and order them disclosed.
On March 8, 2021:
Subject: RE: Subsequent 67.21(d) petition re Kelly-Wong records (also filed to SOTF 20084)
Please see attached response to your petition.

The information in this email is confidential and may be protected by the attorney/client privilege and/or the attorney work product doctrine. If you are not the intended recipient of this email or received this email inadvertently, please notify the sender and delete it.

---

On March 5, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Inter-Agency Text Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF PUC) FOR FILE 20084 and FILE 20127:

1. As the Task Force is aware, attempting to produce records months after I file a complaint does not in any way mean that the Respondents did not violate the ordinance at the time I filed the complaint. By the City's logic as long as some point down the line you produce records, there are never any violations of the Ordinance. You've never made a determination in that manner, and you should not now do so.

2. The records have still not been produced in full even to this day. Various text messages had attachment parts, have been admitted to be public, and the attachments have not yet been provided. That remains non-minimal withholding and an incomplete response.

While I do not have to specifically request attachments (since attachments are in fact stored within the text message electronic record), I did specifically request them:
"For text messages: While the phone numbers are not needed, the following must be preserved: the timestamps, the textual content, attachments, and images, and also ALL sender and recipient names (including groups)."

Thanks,
Anonymous

---

On March 5, 2021:
Subject: RE: SOTF - Complaint Filed with the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force - File No. 20127
Good afternoon,

Attached is the SFPUC's full response to Complaints Nos. 20127 and 20084, as well as the two documents mentioned in the response letter.

Thank you,
Mayara Ruski Augusto Sa
SFPUC Public Records Senior Analyst

---

On March 2, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Inter-Agency Text Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF PUC)
See attached distinct 67.21(D) petition about Kelly-Breed messages.

---

On Feb. 23, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Inter-Agency Text Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF PUC)
Mr. Carlin and SFPUC:

This is a NEW immediate disclosure request for all communications between Harlan Kelly Jr. and Walter Wong in the possession of the PUC for dates (a) BEFORE Jan 1, 2015, and also (b) ON OR AFTER June 11, 2020. These were not responsive to my request on June 11. I'm not arguing PUC has to go talk to Kelly now as a former employee (for this request) - but if you (i.e. PUC, or any of its current employees) have anywhere in your computer systems or in hardcopy any copies (including the black hiliter but unredacted file) of responsive records - you must provide them to me. I know that your agency still possesses at least some of these records both based on the black hiliter file and also based on your admission in the recent letter to me (https://cdn.muckrock.com/foia_files/2021/02/22/2-22-21_Letter_re_Harlan_Kelly_texts.pdf).

Thanks,
Anonymous

---

On June 11, 2020:
Subject: California Public Records Act Request: Inter-Agency Text Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF PUC)
Public Utilities Commission and Harlan Kelly Jr.:

Below are new Immediate Disclosure Requests (SF Admin Code 67.25(a)) directed to your agency and its department head. Your response is required by June 12, 2020. Rolling records responses are requested (SFAC 67.25(d)) if you are unable to immediately produce records. Exact copies of every responsive record are requested (Gov Code 6253(b)) - do not: provide mere URLs, print and scan electronic records, convert native files to PDFs, or provide black and white
versions of any color images. Provide only copies of records not requiring fees and in-person inspection of all other records (GC 6253).

1. All text, email, or chat messages (including group messages, in any form or application including but not limited to SMS, MMS, WhatsApp, WeChat, Signal, Instagram, Twitter, Facebook, Hangouts, Skype, Teams) sent or received to/cc/bcc/from between Harlan Kelly Jr. and London Breed, on government or personal accounts from Jan 1, 2015 and present (you must search personal accounts pursuant to City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017))

2. All text, email, or chat messages (including group messages, in any form or application including but not limited to SMS, MMS, WhatsApp, WeChat, Signal, Instagram, Twitter, Facebook, Hangouts, Skype, Teams) sent or received to/cc/bcc/from between Harlan Kelly Jr. and Walter Wong/Jaidin Consulting Group/Jaidin Associates (including but not limited to jaidin@pacbell.net, jdngrp@pacbell.net, or any email address ending with jaidin.net ), on government or personal accounts from Jan 1, 2015 and present (you must search personal accounts pursuant to City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017))

3. All text, email, or chat messages (including group messages, in any form or application including but not limited to SMS, MMS, WhatsApp, WeChat, Signal, Instagram, Twitter, Facebook, Hangouts, Skype, Teams) sent or received to/cc/bcc/from between Harlan Kelly Jr. and Mohammed Nuru, on government or personal accounts from Jan 1, 2015 and present (you must search personal accounts pursuant to City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017))

4. All text, email, or chat messages (including group messages, in any form or application including but not limited to SMS, MMS, WhatsApp, WeChat, Signal, Instagram, Twitter, Facebook, Hangouts, Skype, Teams) sent or received to/cc/bcc/from between Harlan Kelly Jr. and Naomi Kelly, on government or personal accounts from Jan 1, 2020 and present (you must search personal accounts pursuant to City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017))

For text messages: While the phone numbers are not needed, the following must be preserved: the timestamps, the textual content, attachments, and images, and also ALL sender and recipient names (including groups). Pursuant to SF Admin Code 67.21(l), which requires you to use any electronic format that we request, please provide the records in spreadsheet format. For an example of the format of the response, see SFPD Chief Scott's prior response here: https://cdn.muckrock.com/foia_files/2020/04/14/Text_Messages_Breed_Scott_Redacted.pdf and clearly referenced redaction justifications here: https://cdn.muckrock.com/foia_files/2020/04/14/ChiefOfficeResponse201.pdf (though I do not concede all of them are appropriate redactions). Please provide rolling responses, starting with the most recent records going backwards. Messages to/from before your current department head became the department head must still be provided.

Do not destroy or discard any responsive records - we will appeal all withholdings or Sunshine violations. Remember Mr. Kelly has an obligation to maintain in a professional and businesslike manner their correspondence and release them as public records (SF Admin Code 67.27-9(a)); and we will cross-check your responses with all other parties to ensure you have not destroyed or withheld records improperly.

Your non-exhaustive obligations:
- All withholding of any information must be justified in writing (SFAC 67.27).
- All withholdings by masking or deletion (aka redactions) must be keyed by footnote or other clear reference to the specific justification for that redaction, and only the minimal exempt portion of any record may be withheld (SFAC 67.26).
- You must respond to emailed requests (SFAC 67.21(b)).
- You must notify us of whether or not responsive records exist and/or were withheld for each below request (Gov Code 6253(c), 6255(b)).
- You must state the name and title of each person responsible for withholding any information (Gov Code 6253(d)).
- Do not impose any end-user restrictions upon me (Santa Clara Co. vs Superior Ct, 170 Cal.App 4th 1301); so if you use a third-party website like NextRequest to publish records, please make them completely public without any login or sign-in.
Your agency must do all of the above things in your response, and you cannot wait until we file complaints.

****** We have no duty to, and we will not again, remind the City of its obligations. Instead, we will file complaints for every Sunshine Ordinance or CPRA violation. We will continue to file complaints until the City's procedures are modified to fully comply with the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA, without caveat or exception. ******

Thank you for your anticipated cooperation in this matter.

NOTE: Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. The email address sending this request is a publicly-viewable mailbox. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,
Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 94992-15550486@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:
https://accounts.muckrock.com/accounts/login/?next=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.muckrock.com%2Faccounts%2Flogin%2F%3Fnext%3D%253D%252Faccounts%252Fagency_login%252Fpublic-utilities-commission-4834%252Finter-agency-text-messages-immediate-disclosure-request-sf-puc-94992%252F252Femail%252Dsupervisor.records%252540sfcityatty.org&url_auth_token=AABcOvckKY8Kp2249Biuji8PBY%3A1JIVKK%3ATQwcoWPwo_EjFcBCIVclb5kuSFOc
Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 94992
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.
Public Utilities Commission
PRA Office
Polk Street
525 Golden Gate Avenue
SF, CA 94102

March 9, 2021

This is a follow up to a previous request:

Supervisor of Records Herrera:

New 67.21(d) petition.

The attached record produced by PUC in response to a records request from this email address is challenged. An email between Sean Elsbernd and Naomi Kelly cannot be Attorney-Client Privileged - neither of them is the attorney for the other. Furthermore the two attachments were not provided. Furthermore the email addresses of the Kellys were clearly available as hyperlinks in the records, but have been stripped for no legal reason - likely because the government continues to fail to produce even simple PDFs as actual full-fidelity PDFs instead of image renderings. Please determine some portion of these records are public (in writing) and order them disclosed.

--Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 94992-15550486@requests.muckrock.com

Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 94992
On March 8, 2021:
Subject: RE: Subsequent 67.21(d) petition re Kelly-Wong records (also filed to SOTF 20084)
Please see attached response to your petition.

The information in this email is confidential and may be protected by the attorney/client privilege and/or the attorney work product doctrine. If you are not the intended recipient of this email or received this email inadvertently, please notify the sender and delete it.

---

On March 5, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Inter-Agency Text Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF PUC) FOR FILE 20084 and FILE 20127:

1. As the Task Force is aware, attempting to produce records months after I file a complaint does not in any way mean that the Respondents did not violate the ordinance at the time I filed the complaint. By the City's logic as long as some point down the line you produce records, there are never any violations of the Ordinance. You've never made a determination in that manner, and you should not now do so.

2. The records have still not been produced in full even to this day. Various text messages had attachment parts, have been admitted to be public, and the attachments have not yet been provided. That remains non-minimal withholding and an incomplete response.

While I do not have to specifically request attachments (since attachments are in fact stored within the text message electronic record), I did specifically request them:

"For text messages: While the phone numbers are not needed, the following must be preserved: the timestamps, the textual content, attachments, and images, and also ALL sender and recipient names (including groups)."

Thanks,
Anonymous

---

On March 5, 2021:
Subject: RE: SOTF - Complaint Filed with the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force - File No. 20127
Good afternoon,

Attached is the SFPUC's full response to Complaints Nos. 20127 and 20084, as well as the two documents mentioned in the response letter.
Thank you,
Mayara Ruski Augusto Sa
SFPUC Public Records Senior Analyst

---

On March 2, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Inter-Agency Text Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF PUC)
See attached distinct 67.21(D) petition about Kelly-Breed messages.

---

On Feb. 23, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Inter-Agency Text Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF PUC)
Mr. Carlin and SFPUC:

This is a NEW immediate disclosure request for all communications between Harlan Kelly Jr. and Walter Wong in the possession of the PUC for dates (a) BEFORE Jan 1, 2015, and also (b) ON OR AFTER June 11, 2020. These were not responsive to my request on June 11. I'm not arguing PUC has to go talk to Kelly now as a former employee (for this request) - but if you (i.e. PUC, or any of its current employees) have anywhere in your computer systems or in hardcopy any copies (including the black hiliter but unredacted file) of responsive records - you must provide them to me. I know that your agency still possesses at least some of these records both based on the black hiliter file and also based on your admission in the recent letter to me (https://cdn.muckrock.com/foia_files/2021/02/22/2-22-21_Letter_re_Harlan_Kelly_texts.pdf).

Thanks,
Anonymous

---

On June 11, 2020:
Subject: California Public Records Act Request: Inter-Agency Text Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF PUC)
Public Utilities Commission and Harlan Kelly Jr.:

Below are new Immediate Disclosure Requests (SF Admin Code 67.25(a)) directed to your agency and its department head. Your response is required by June 12, 2020. Rolling records responses are requested (SFAC 67.25(d)) if you are unable to immediately produce records. Exact copies of every responsive record are requested (Gov Code 6253(b)) - do not: provide mere URLs, print and scan electronic records, convert native files to PDFs, or provide black and white versions of any color images. Provide only copies of records not requiring fees and in-person inspection of all other records (GC 6253).

1. All text, email, or chat messages (including group messages, in any form or application including but not limited to SMS, MMS, WhatsApp, WeChat, Signal, Instagram, Twitter, Facebook, Hangouts, Skype, Teams) sent or received to/cc/bcc/from between Harlan Kelly Jr. and London Breed, on government or personal accounts from Jan 1, 2015 and present (you must search personal accounts pursuant to City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017))

2. All text, email, or chat messages (including group messages, in any form or application including but not limited to SMS, MMS, WhatsApp, WeChat, Signal, Instagram, Twitter, Facebook, Hangouts, Skype, Teams) sent or received to/cc/bcc/from between Harlan Kelly Jr. and Walter Wong/Jaidin Consulting Group/Jaidin Associates (including but not limited to jaidin@pacbell.net, jdngrp@pacbell.net, or any email address ending with jaidin.net ), on government or personal accounts from Jan 1, 2015 and present (you must search personal accounts pursuant to City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017))
3. All text, email, or chat messages (including group messages, in any form or application including but not limited to SMS, MMS, WhatsApp, WeChat, Signal, Instagram, Twitter, Facebook, Hangouts, Skype, Teams) sent or received to/cc/bcc/from between Harlan Kelly Jr. and Mohammed Nuru, on government or personal accounts from Jan 1, 2015 and present (you must search personal accounts pursuant to City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017))

4. All text, email, or chat messages (including group messages, in any form or application including but not limited to SMS, MMS, WhatsApp, WeChat, Signal, Instagram, Twitter, Facebook, Hangouts, Skype, Teams) sent or received to/cc/bcc/from between Harlan Kelly Jr. and Naomi Kelly, on government or personal accounts from Jan 1, 2020 and present (you must search personal accounts pursuant to City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017))

For text messages: While the phone numbers are not needed, the following must be preserved: the timestamps, the textual content, attachments, and images, and also ALL sender and recipient names (including groups). Pursuant to SF Admin Code 67.21(l), which requires you to use any electronic format that we request, please provide the records in spreadsheet format. For an example of the format of the response, see SFPD Chief Scott's prior response here: https://cdn.muckrock.com/foia_files/2020/04/14/Text_Messages_Breed_Scott_Redacted.pdf and clearly referenced redaction justifications here: https://cdn.muckrock.com/foia_files/2020/04/14/ChiefOfficeResponse201.pdf (though I do not concede all of them are appropriate redactions). Please provide rolling responses, starting with the most recent records going backwards. Messages to/from before your current department head became the department head must still be provided.

Do not destroy or discard any responsive records - we will appeal all withholdings or Sunshine violations. Remember Mr. Kelly has an obligation to maintain in a professional and businesslike manner their correspondence and release them as public records (SF Admin Code 67.27-9(a)); and we will cross-check your responses with all other parties to ensure you have not destroyed or withheld records improperly.

Your non-exhaustive obligations:
- All withholding of any information must be justified in writing (SFAC 67.27).
- All withholdings by masking or deletion (aka redactions) must be keyed by footnote or other clear reference to the specific justification for that redaction, and only the minimal exempt portion of any record may be withheld (SFAC 67.26).
- You must respond to emailed requests (SFAC 67.21(b)).
- You must notify us of whether or not responsive records exist and/or were withheld for each below request (Gov Code 6253(c), 6255(b)).
- You must state the name and title of each person responsible for withholding any information (Gov Code 6253(d)).
- Do not impose any end-user restrictions upon me (Santa Clara Co. vs Superior Ct, 170 Cal.App 4th 1301); so if you use a third-party website like NextRequest to publish records, please make them completely public without any login or sign-in.

Your agency must do all of the above things in your response, and you cannot wait until we file complaints.

****** We have no duty to, and we will not again, remind the City of its obligations. Instead, we will file complaints for every Sunshine Ordinance or CPRA violation. We will continue to file complaints until the City's procedures are modified to fully comply with the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA, without caveat or exception. ******

Thank you for your anticipated cooperation in this matter.

NOTE: Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. The email address sending this request is a publicly-viewable mailbox. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special,
direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,
Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 94992-15550486@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:
%3Fnext%3D%253D%252Faccounts%252Fagency_login%252Fpublic-utilities-commission-4834%252Finter-agency-text-
messages-immediate-disclosure-request-sf-puc-
94992%252F%253Femail%253D%252Fsupervisor.records%252Fsfcityatty.org&url_auth_token=AABcOvcgKY8Kp2249Biuij8P
PBY%3A1JIVK%3DTQwcWPwo_EjFcBCIcVcLb5kuSFOc
Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 94992
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.
From: Sean Elsbernd <sean.elsbernd@sfgov.org>
Date: Friday, March 20, 2020 at 1:06 PM
To: "Kelly, Naomi (ADM)" <naomi.kelly@sfgov.org>
Subject: Fwd: Final signed order

From: John Doherty <jdoherty@ibew6.org>
Sent: Friday, March 20, 2020 11:14 AM
To: Elsbernd, Sean (MYR) <sean.elsbernd@sfgov.org>
Cc: Tom Coleman <tcoleman@sfeca.org>
Subject: RE: Final signed order

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

Sean,
I know that this may be the last thing you or the Mayor need thrown in your lap, but I would be negligent in my duty to my members if I didn’t ask. We are truly appreciative of all of the efforts made by the City during this crisis, and acknowledge that we are not the only ones seeking your ear at this time.

Attached is a letter seeking clarification about what projects are allowed to proceed and what minimum safety and sanitation requirements are envisioned in the Shelter-in-Place Order. We do not know of anyone from the SF Building Trades that was asked to be part of the discussion related to the exemption of construction, but I can assure we would have asked these questions, or something similar, at that time.

If the general idea is that most construction should proceed, we do not argue that position, we just seek clarity on it. We have members and contractors who want to comply, either way, but are confused as how to proceed.

No matter what level of construction is deemed allowable to proceed, we also need to know what minimum standards the Director of Public Health envisioned, and ask that that vision be communicated to the construction industry.

We do not look to put our members idle on the bench, nor do we look to shutter our contractors doors. If the contractor knows that work can proceed under clear conditions, and the individual worker feels safe to go to work, then they should do so. At that point, all involved will be making an accurate and informed decision for their personal and professional interests.

I am happy to discuss this further if you so desire, and the local industry is available to help in any way you may need. A hard copy of this letter will be mailed today.

Thank you for listening to our concerns, and please take care of yourself.

John J. Doherty
IBEW Local 6

From: Elsbernd, Sean (MYR) <sean.elsbernd@sfgov.org>
Sent: Monday, March 16, 2020 1:55 PM
To: John Doherty <jdoherty@ibew6.org>
Subject: FW: Final signed order
May 10, 2022

Sent via email (105580-37750790@requests.muckrock.com)

Re: Petition to Supervisor of Records

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter responds to your petition to the Supervisor of Records dated March 10, 2021, concerning a request to the Office of Economic and Workforce Development (“OEWD”). You contend that OEWD unlawfully redacted information from a text message that it produced in response to your request and that it withheld attachments to text messages.

We find that OEWD properly redacted the information at issue on the basis of privacy. See Gov’t Code §§ 6254(c), (k); Cal. Const. Art. I, Sec. 1. With respect to the attachments you contend that OEWD has not produced, we are unclear on what you are referring to, and we suggest that you follow up with OEWD directly to address this concern.

Very truly yours,

DENNIS J. HERRERA
City Attorney

Bradley A. Russi
Deputy City Attorney
Please see the attached response to your petition. Thank you.

Bradley Russi  
Deputy City Attorney  
Office of City Attorney David Chiu  
City Hall, Room 234  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., San Francisco, CA 94102  
www.sfcityattorney.org

From: 105580-37750790@requests.muckrock.com <105580-37750790@requests.muckrock.com>  
Sent: Wednesday, March 10, 2021 9:17 AM  
To: Supervisor Records (CAT) <supervisor.records@SFCITYATTY.ORG>  
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (OEWD)

Office of Economic and Workforce Development  
PRA Office  
City Hall, Room 448  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, CA 94102

March 10, 2021

This is a follow up to a previous request:

See attached 67.21(d) petition against OEWD.

Filed via MuckRock.com  
E-mail (Preferred): 105580-37750790@requests.muckrock.com  
Upload documents directly:  
mRCL2ZUwPh3k7c%3A1k2SP%3AAe_lPawXM5tSnPcB87Ajd6PyaZo
Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 105580
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.

---

On March 10, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (OEWD)
Anonymous,

On behalf of OEWD please see the attached responsive to your request below.
Regards,

Hank Heckel
Compliance Officer
Office of the Mayor
City and County of San Francisco
---

On March 10, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (OEWD)
Anonymous,

On behalf of OEWD, please see the attached texts responsive to the Universal Search request below. Please note that certain material has been redacted to protect personal privacy as indicated. See Cal. Gov. Code § 6254(c), California Constitution, Art. I.
Regards,

Hank Heckel
Compliance Officer
Office of the Mayor
City and County of San Francisco
---

On Feb. 28, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (OEWD)
OEWD: Please provide as an immediate disclosure request all copies within your office of the emails attached, and all replies and forwards thereto, as exact PDF copies using PDFMaker with all email addresses, to, from, cc, bcc, attachments, date/time stamps.
City employees' attacks on the First Amendment to protect their actions from scrutiny will itself be scrutinized. It is also sad that you tried to use Trump's attacks on the First Amendment to invite the SOTF to suppress free speech. Fortunately you failed. There's no difference when your agency attacks transparency versus when the former President did. Fortunately at least one City employee, Ms. Boomer, seemed to understand.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

---

On Feb. 27, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (OEWD)
OEWD (not Mayor's Office): Your office recently received a request "All City comms with Mr. Kelly's yahoo accounts - immediate disclosure request".
Please provide all further responses on this email address.

All of your responses will be available to the public on MuckRock.com

Thank you,
Anonymous

---

On Jan. 27, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (OEWD)
Great - thanks.

---

On Dec. 5, 2020:
Subject: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (OEWD)
To Office of Economic and Workforce Development and its Department Head or Elected Official:

** DO NOT DESTROY ANY RESPONSIVE RECORDS. YOU MUST PRESERVE AND ORDER YOUR EMPLOYEES TO PRESERVE RECORDS DURING THE PENDENCY OF ALL APPEALS. WE WILL APPEAL ALL REDACTIONS OR WITHHOLDINGS. **
Immediate Disclosure Request.

Every department head/elected official must preserve and maintain all correspondence in a professional and businesslike manner (SFAC 67.29-7(a)) and also separately must comply with retention policies (SFAC 67.29-1). Note that if your retention policies do not retain text messages, I will argue before the SOTF and court that this is a failure to maintain **all correspondence** in a professional and businesslike manner.

Relevant precedent: SOTF 19098 - Anonymous v SFPD. Unanimous finding of violation for unlawfully withholding text message metadata (including the to/from/etc. - note SFPD had provided the dates and times, and you must as well), and also for unlawfully printing and scanning electronic records which does not constitute a "copy" of an electronic record. See also prior rulings in my favor in SOTF 19044, 19047, 19091, 19098, 19103, and 19108 which ruled against the City for email, text messages, past and future calendar entries, meeting details, electronic metadata, and attachments.

The Mayor's Office appears to have destroyed their copies of certain text messages. I'd be happy to get them from her, if she preserved every record. Alas she did not, therefore we must now conduct a universal search of the City. You cannot
refer me to another department unless you search and determine that you have no copies in your department. If this is causing more work for you, ask your Mayor to stop destroying her public records.

Note there are many anonymous requesters using MuckRock - I am just one of them. If you previously produced some subset of these records to a MuckRock email address, please reference that prior response so you do not duplicate work. If I am unable to get the prior MuckRock response because it is someone else's and they have marked it private, you will however need to provide me a copy here as well.

1. This is an immediate disclosure request for text, chat, or instant messages between the Department Head/Elected Official and either Sean Elsbernd, Andrea Bruss, London Breed, Harlan Kelly, Jr., Naomi Kelly, Hank Heckel, or Walter Wong, including all group messages, and all messages in threads, in any form and any app (including, but not limited to, SMS, MMS, text, iMessage, Teams, Discord, WeChat, QQ, Signal, Telegram, WhatsApp, Facebook, Facebook Messenger, Twitter, Instagram, Hangouts, Meet, Slack, Skype, Viber, Snapchat, Line, Kik, FaceTime, Wickr Me, Chatroulette, Threema, KakaoTalk, Duo, GroupMe, Wire, Voxer, Allo, Tango, Bumble, Grindr, Tinder, Olive, Taimi, but NOT including email), on any government accounts/devices or on personal accounts or devices regarding the conduct of public business, including all participant names, message text, images, attachments, dates, and times, including any in trash or deleted folders or similar (see Good Government Guide - if the records have not been permanently deleted as of the time you receive this request, you must retrieve them from the so-called trash folders and provide them). Provide rolling responses. Provide exact copies including all metadata. There is no limitation by subject or date. If the total pages to produce numbers over 500, inform me of the rough dates, employees involved, and subject matter, and I may be willing to narrow the initial production, AS LONG AS YOU PRESERVE ALL THE RECORDS.

2. This is a regular records request for text, chat, or instant messages between any non-department head/elected official (i.e. the other dept employees) and either Sean Elsbernd, Andrea Bruss, London Breed, Harlan Kelly, Jr., Naomi Kelly, Hank Heckel, or Walter Wong, including all group messages, and all messages in threads, in any form and any app (including, but not limited to, SMS, MMS, text, iMessage, Teams, Discord, WeChat, QQ, Signal, Telegram, WhatsApp, Facebook, Facebook Messenger, Twitter, Instagram, Hangouts, Meet, Slack, Skype, Viber, Snapchat, Line, Kik, FaceTime, Wickr Me, Chatroulette, Threema, KakaoTalk, Duo, GroupMe, Wire, Voxer, Allo, Tango, Bumble, Grindr, Tinder, Olive, Taimi, but NOT including email), on any government accounts/devices or on personal accounts or devices regarding the conduct of public business, including all participant names, message text, images, attachments, dates, and times, including any in trash or deleted folders or similar (see Good Government Guide - if the records have not been permanently deleted as of the time you receive this request, you must retrieve them from the so-called trash folders and provide them). Provide rolling responses. Provide exact copies including all metadata. There is no limitation by subject or date. If the total pages to produce numbers over 500, inform me of the rough dates, employees involved, and subject matter, and I may be willing to narrow the initial production, AS LONG AS YOU PRESERVE ALL THE RECORDS.

Please provide only those copies of records available without any fees. If you determine certain records would require fees, please instead provide the required notice of which of those records are available and non-exempt for inspection in-person if we so choose.

Your non-exhaustive obligations:
- All withholding of any information must be justified in writing by specific statutory authority (SFAC 67.27).
- Every redaction must be keyed by footnote or by other clear reference to the specific justification for that redaction, and only the minimal exempt portion of any record may be withheld (SFAC 67.26).
- You must respond to emailed requests (SFAC 67.21(b)).
- You must notify us of whether or not responsive records exist and/or were withheld for each above request (Gov Code 6253(c), 6255(b)).
- You must state the name and title of each person responsible for withholding any information (Gov Code 6253(d)).
- Do not impose any end-user restrictions upon me (Santa Clara Co. vs Superior Ct, 170 Cal.App 4th 1301); so if you use a third-party website to publish records, please make them completely public without any login or sign-in.

Your agency must do all of the above things in your response, and you cannot wait until we file complaints.
***** We have no duty to, and we will not again, remind the City of its obligations. Instead, we will file complaints for every Sunshine Ordinance or CPRA violation. We will continue to file complaints until the City's procedures are modified to fully comply with the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA, without caveat or exception. *****

I look forward to your lawful response.

NOTE: THE EMAIL ADDRESS SENDING THIS REQUEST IS A PUBLICLY-VIEWABLE MAILBOX. Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,
Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 105580-37750790@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:
Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 105580
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.
Office of Economic and Workforce Development  
PRA Office  
City Hall, Room 448  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, CA 94102

March 10, 2021

This is a follow up to a previous request:

See attached 67.21(d) petition against OEWD.

Filed via MuckRock.com  
E-mail (Preferred): 105580-37750790@requests.muckrock.com  
Upload documents directly:
Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News  
DEPT MR 105580  
411A Highland Ave  
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.

---
On March 10, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (OEWD)
Anonymous,

On behalf of OEWD please see the attached responsive to your request below.
Regards,

Hank Heckel
Compliance Officer
Office of the Mayor
City and County of San Francisco
---

On March 10, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (OEWD)
Anonymous,

On behalf of OEWD, please see the attached texts responsive to the Universal Search request below. Please note that certain material has been redacted to protect personal privacy as indicated. See Cal. Gov. Code § 6254(c), California Constitution, Art. I.
Regards,

Hank Heckel
Compliance Officer
Office of the Mayor
City and County of San Francisco
---

On Feb. 28, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (OEWD)
OEWD: Please provide as an immediate disclosure request all copies within your office of the emails attached, and all replies and forwards thereto, as exact PDF copies using PDFMaker with all email addresses, to, from, cc, bcc, attachments, date/time stamps.

City employees' attacks on the First Amendment to protect their actions from scrutiny will itself be scrutinized. It is also sad that you tried to use Trump's attacks on the First Amendment to invite the SOTF to suppress free speech. Fortunately you failed. There's no difference when your agency attacks transparency versus when the former President did. Fortunately at least one City employee, Ms. Boomer, seemed to understand.

Sincerely,

Anonymous
---

On Feb. 27, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (OEWD)
OEWD (not Mayor's Office): Your office recently received a request "All City comms with Mr. Kelly's yahoo accounts -
immediate disclosure request".
Please provide all further responses on this email address.

All of your responses will be available to the public on MuckRock.com

Thank you,
Anonymous

---

On Jan. 27, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (OEWD)
Great - thanks.

---

On Dec. 5, 2020:
Subject: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (OEWD)
To Office of Economic and Workforce Development and its Department Head or Elected Official:

** DO NOT DESTROY ANY RESPONSIVE RECORDS. YOU MUST PRESERVE AND ORDER YOUR EMPLOYEES TO PRESERVE RECORDS DURING THE PENDENCY OF ALL APPEALS. WE WILL APPEAL ALL REDACTIONS OR WITHHOLDINGS. **
Immediate Disclosure Request.

Every department head/elected official must preserve and maintain all correspondence in a professional and businesslike manner (SFAC 67.29-7(a)) and also separately must comply with retention policies (SFAC 67.29-1). Note that if your retention policies do not retain text messages, I will argue before the SOTF and court that this is a failure to maintain **all correspondence** in a professional and businesslike manner.

Relevant precedent: SOTF 19098 - Anonymous v SFPD. Unanimous finding of violation for unlawfully withholding text message metadata (including the to/from/etc. - note SFPD had provided the dates and times, and you must as well), and also for unlawfully printing and scanning electronic records which does not constitute a "copy" of an electronic record. See also prior rulings in my favor in SOTF 19044, 19047, 19091, 19098, 19103, and 19108 which ruled against the City for email, text messages, past and future calendar entries, meeting details, electronic metadata, and attachments.

The Mayor's Office appears to have destroyed their copies of certain text messages. I'd be happy to get them from her, if she preserved every record. Alas she did not, therefore we must now conduct a universal search of the City. You cannot refer me to another department unless you search and determine that you have no copies in your department. If this is causing more work for you, ask your Mayor to stop destroying her public records.

Note there are many anonymous requesters using MuckRock - I am just one of them. If you previously produced some subset of these records to a MuckRock email address, please reference that prior response so you do not duplicate work. If I am unable to get the prior MuckRock response because it is someone else's and they have marked it private, you will however need to provide me a copy here as well.

1. This is an immediate disclosure request for text, chat, or instant messages between the Department Head/Elected Official and either Sean Elsbernd, Andrea Bruss, London Breed, Harlan Kelly, Jr., Naomi Kelly, Hank Heckel, or Walter Wong, including all group messages, and all messages in threads, in any form and any app (including, but not limited to, SMS, MMS, text, iMessage, Teams, Discord, WeChat, QQ, Signal, Telegram, WhatsApp, Facebook, Facebook Messenger, Twitter, Instagram, Hangouts, Meet, Slack, Skype, Viber, Snapchat, Line, Kik, FaceTime, Wickr Me, Chatroulette, Threema, KakaoTalk, Duo, GroupMe, Wire, Voxer, Allo, Tango, Bumble, Grindr, Tinder, Olive, Taimi, but NOT including email), on any government accounts/devices or on personal accounts or devices regarding the conduct of public
business, including all participant names, message text, images, attachments, dates, and times, including any in trash or deleted folders or similar (see Good Government Guide - if the records have not been permanently deleted as of the time you receive this request, you must retrieve them from the so-called trash folders and provide them). Provide rolling responses. Provide exact copies including all metadata. There is no limitation by subject or date. If the total pages to produce numbers over 500, inform me of the rough dates, employees involved, and subject matter, and I may be willing to narrow the initial production, AS LONG AS YOU PRESERVE ALL THE RECORDS.

2. This is a regular records request for text, chat, or instant messages between any non-department head/elected official (i.e. the other dept employees) and either Sean Elsbernd, Andrea Bruss, London Breed, Harlan Kelly, Jr., Naomi Kelly, Hank Heckel, or Walter Wong, including all group messages, and all messages in threads, in any form and any app (including, but not limited to, SMS, MMS, text, iMessage, Teams, Discord, WeChat, QQ, Signal, Telegram, WhatsApp, Facebook, Facebook Messenger, Twitter, Instagram, Hangouts, Meet, Slack, Skype, Viber, Snapchat, Line, Kik, FaceTime, Wickr Me, Chatroulette, Threema, KakaoTalk, Duo, GroupMe, Wire, Voxer, Allo, Tango, Bumble, Grindr, Tinder, Olive, Taimi, but NOT including email), on any government accounts/devices or on personal accounts or devices regarding the conduct of public business, including all participant names, message text, images, attachments, dates, and times, including any in trash or deleted folders or similar (see Good Government Guide - if the records have not been permanently deleted as of the time you receive this request, you must retrieve them from the so-called trash folders and provide them). Provide rolling responses. Provide exact copies including all metadata. There is no limitation by subject or date. If the total pages to produce numbers over 500, inform me of the rough dates, employees involved, and subject matter, and I may be willing to narrow the initial production, AS LONG AS YOU PRESERVE ALL THE RECORDS.

Please provide only those copies of records available without any fees. If you determine certain records would require fees, please instead provide the required notice of which of those records are available and non-exempt for inspection in-person if we so choose.

Your non-exhaustive obligations:
- All withholding of any information must be justified in writing by specific statutory authority (SFAC 67.27).
- Every redaction must be keyed by footnote or by other clear reference to the specific justification for that redaction, and only the minimal exempt portion of any record may be withheld (SFAC 67.26).
- You must respond to emailed requests (SFAC 67.21(b)).
- You must notify us of whether or not responsive records exist and/or were withheld for each above request (Gov Code 6253(c), 6255(b)).
- You must state the name and title of each person responsible for withholding any information (Gov Code 6253(d)).
- Do not impose any end-user restrictions upon me (Santa Clara Co. vs Superior Ct, 170 Cal.App 4th 1301); so if you use a third-party website to publish records, please make them completely public without any login or sign-in.

Your agency must do all of the above things in your response, and you cannot wait until we file complaints.

****** We have no duty to, and we will not again, remind the City of its obligations. Instead, we will file complaints for every Sunshine Ordinance or CPRA violation. We will continue to file complaints until the City's procedures are modified to fully comply with the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA, without caveat or exception. ******

I look forward to your lawful response.

NOTE: THE EMAIL ADDRESS SENDING THIS REQUEST IS A PUBLICLY-VIEWABLE MAILBOX. Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this
email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 105580-37750790@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:
Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 105580
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.
Need to connect re Mendel Plaza for the Census.

Yes. Just heard from Christine

California Const.

10 pm curfew affects outdoor dining

😭😭😭
Hi it's Laurel. Are you calling Laura Albers? Do you want me to? If so, can I have her #?

I already did. I also spoke with Brandon Shorenstein, Clint Reilly, Mark covaribius, Rodney, jim winderman, and left a message for Marc Intermaggio

Thanks.

I talked to Marc directly.
Hi! FYI – Just received this from Miguel Bustos via text – Dear All, As you may know, I am a CA Census Committee Commissioner, appointed by Gavin. And I have to tell you that we are all upset with Adrienne Pon. She has been a horrible partner with regards to the Census. She and her office do not return calls, nor have they been helpful to our Census team. It saddens me that San Francisco is being seen as a disaster by the rest of the state. All because Adrienne is refusing to partner. I am lost for words.

Good grief! Have Miguel contact me.

Need to connect re Mendel Plaza for the Census.
Yes. Resolving it with staff this week. I should have an update by end of week.

Michael Krouse
Madrone Art Bar
Can you call him and help with his issues at madrone

Yes. We’ve spoken. But I’ll reach out again.

Good morning Mayor,
I wanted to highlight a memo on nonprofit initiative that is in your file for review. It includes one award, new RFP, and update on Chinatown item that you’ve discussed with David Ho and Sandra Fewer.
Darie "Charles" Murry DM

Can you please reach out to him on Monday

Yes

Wed, Oct 28, 8:35 AM

Did you talk to him about his problem?

Yes. Resolving it with staff this week. I should have an update by end of week

Thu, Oct 29, 7:04 PM

Michael Krouse MK

Madrone Art Bar

Can you call him and help with his issues at madrone

Yes. We've spoken. But I'll reach out again.
We will get involved directly and also make legal services available to encourage dialogue between landlords and small biz.

You've asked me to write letters and engage.

Michael Krouse
Madrone Art Bar

Please call him, he owns Madrone and they need help with info, also specific info for artist.

Will do.

Can you please reach out to
iMessage
Fri, Oct 23, 3:21 PM
I'm in a meeting. When's a good time to reach you?
With community folks online - when is good?

After 6:30pm today works

K

Thank you

Fri, Oct 23, 7:42 PM
Thank you for call. Sorry to miss you! Let me know if anything later works. No rush.
I'll ring ya in the morning. Have a great night
Attn. General Government Team
Supervisor of Records
City Hall, Room 234
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102
via email

March 10, 2021

Petition under SF Admin Code § 67.21(d)

Supervisor of Records Dennis Herrera,

Please determine in writing that the following parts of records are public and order OEWD to disclose them:

- the redaction and 3 missing attachments in


Sincerely,

Anonymous
Buta, Odaya (CAT)

From:  
Russi, Brad (CAT) on behalf of Supervisor Records (CAT)

Sent:  
Friday, March 26, 2021 12:42 PM

To:  
'Public Records Department'

Cc:  
controller.con@sfgov.org; Chun, Edward (CON)

Subject:  
RE: Supervisor of Records Appeal – overdue request for records - constructive denial - failure to comply (Our File 146733)

Mr. Christian –

The Controller’s Office has now responded to your request. Accordingly, we consider your petition to the Supervisor of Records closed. If you continue to take issue with the Controller’s Office’s response, please let us know the basis of your complaint. Thank you.

Bradley Russi
Deputy City Attorney
Office of City Attorney Dennis Herrera
City Hall, Room 234
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., San Francisco, CA 94102
www.sfcityattorney.org

From:  
Public Records Department <foia@expertmoneyfinders.com>

Sent:  
Friday, March 19, 2021 2:45 PM

To:  
Supervisor Records (CAT) <supervisor.records@SFCITYATTY.ORG>; Chun, Edward (CON) <edward.chun@sfgov.org>
Cc:  
Russi, Brad (CAT) <Brad.Russi@sfcityatty.org>; CityAttorney (CAT) <cityattorney@SFCITYATTY.ORG>; controller.con@sfgov.org; Coolbrith, Elizabeth (CAT) <Elizabeth.Coolbrith@sfcityatty.org>

Subject:  
RE: Supervisor of Records Appeal – overdue request for records - constructive denial - failure to comply (Our File 146733)

Importance:  
High

March 19, 2021

Via Email and Certified US Mail 7019 1640 0001 7585 6286:
Dennis J. Herrera, City Attorney
Attn. General Government Team
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place (Room 234)
San Francisco, CA 94102

Copy Via Email:
Benjamin Rosenfield, Controller
City and County of San Francisco Controller’s Office
City Hall, Room 316
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA 94102

Mr. Herrera:

I am in receipt of the email below from Mr. Russi in which he indicates the Controller’s Office is “attempting to comply” and also curiously avers “[t]he Supervisor of Records does not have jurisdiction to consider whether a department has timely complied with a request…”

However, Sections 67.21(b) and (d) of the Administrative Code provide, in pertinent part, that:

(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.

(d) If the custodian refuses, fails to comply, or incompletely complies with a request, 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.

As shown, there is no exception in the Administrative Code allowing additional time for “attempting to comply” or for “working on the manual process to provide responsive records…”

And, assuming, arguendo, the Custodian’s purported need for more time was permissible under the CPRA (and actually needed), which I in no way concede, Government Code §6253 (c) plainly specifies the only “unusual circumstances” that actually qualifies for a single 14-day extension (which has not been requested by the County) is as follows:

(c) Each agency, upon a request for a copy of records, shall, within 10 days from receipt of the request, determine whether the request, in whole or in part, seeks copies of disclosable public records in the possession of the agency and shall promptly notify the person making the request of the determination and the reasons therefor. In unusual circumstances, the time limit prescribed in this section may be extended by written notice by the head of the agency or his or her designee to the person making the request, setting forth the reasons for the extension and the date on which a determination is expected to be dispatched. No notice shall specify a date that would result in an extension for more than 14 days. When the agency dispatches the determination, and if the agency determines that the request seeks disclosable public records, the agency shall state the estimated date and time when the records will be made available. As used in this section, “unusual circumstances” means the following, but only to the extent reasonably necessary to the proper processing of the particular request:

1. The need to search for and collect the requested records from field facilities or other establishments that are separate from the office processing the request.
2. The need to search for, collect, and appropriately examine a voluminous amount of separate and distinct records that are demanded in a single request.
3. The need for consultation, which shall be conducted with all practicable speed, with another agency having substantial interest in the determination of the request or among two or more components of the agency having substantial subject matter interest therein.
4. The need to compile data, to write programming language or a computer program, or to construct a computer report to extract data.

(d) Nothing in this chapter shall be construed to permit an agency to delay or obstruct the inspection or copying of public records. The notification of denial of any request for records required by Section 6255 shall set forth the names and titles or positions of each person responsible for the denial.

Emphasis provided.

Here, the County has clearly failed to comply with my request within ten days:

- Date of request: February 15, 2021
- 10 calendar days to respond: February 25, 2021
- One extension of 14 calendar days: March 15, 2021

Not only has the County failed to comply with its requirement to produce the requested records within the time limits prescribed by statute, but also it has failed to comply with its requirement to provide a date by which a determination is expected to be dispatched as required by Government Code §6253 (c).

This failure to comply is a constructive denial of my request and has obstructed production of public records, thereby violating the California Constitution and Government Code §6253 (d).

Accordingly, pursuant to Section 67.21(d) I hereby petition the Supervisor of Records for a determination whether the records requested are public.

Please inform me of your determination within 10 days as required by the Administrative Code.

G. Harold Christian
Vice President Operations
Payment Processing Services, LLC
129 Hanbury Road West, Suite 203, Chesapeake, Virginia 23322
T 757.389.8869 Ext. 101 F 804.237.0196
"Cast all your anxieties on Him because He cares for you." 1 Peter 5:7

Please note: For tracking purposes, please email the records to FOIA@expertmoneyfinders.com

From: Russi, Brad (CAT) <Brad.Russi@sfcityatty.org> On Behalf Of Supervisor Records (CAT)
Sent: Thursday, March 18, 2021 11:23 PM
To: Public Records Department <foia@expertmoneyfinders.com>; Chun, Edward (CON) <edward.chun@sfgov.org>
Subject: RE: Supervisor of Records Appeal – overdue request for records (Our File 146733)

Mr. Christian –

Under the Sunshine Ordinance (Section 67.21(d) of the Administrative Code), the Supervisor of Records is responsible for determining whether a City department has withheld a record, or any part of a record, without a lawful basis for doing so – for determining “whether the record requested, or any part of the record requested, is public.” The Supervisor of Records does not have jurisdiction to consider whether a department has timely complied with a request. The Controller’s Office has indicated they are searching for records responsive to your request and attempting to comply. If the Controller’s Office withholds or redacts records...
when they respond to your request and you believe that they have acted unlawfully in doing so, please let us
know and we will look into the issue. Thank you.

Bradley Russi
Deputy City Attorney
Office of City Attorney Dennis Herrera
City Hall, Room 234
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., San Francisco, CA 94102
www.sfcityattorney.org

From: Public Records Department <foia@expertmoneyfinders.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2021 6:04 PM
To: Chun, Edward (CON) <edward.chun@sfgov.org>
Cc: Russi, Brad (CAT) <Brad.Russi@sfcityatty.org>; dennis.herrera@sfcityatty.org
Subject: FW: Supervisor of Records Appeal – overdue request for records (Our File 146733)

Dear Mr. Herrera,

I am in receipt of the email correspondence below (with attachments) from the Controller’s Office (herein “the County”). Rather than provide the requested records, the County instead provided the same, unresponsive records previously provided. For example, the most recent item on this prior list is 6/27/2019 (almost 2 years ago). And to be clear, I did not request the “stale dated check list” provided.

The Controller’s Office avers “[o]ur team has been working on the manual process to provide responsive records for your request. Our team will meet again tomorrow to see what records can be produced at this time “ As you know, this is not an appropriate statutory response.

Further, I find it disingenuous the County would contend it needs to “work on the manual process” in order to provide the requested records. This is a very simple, straightforward request - little more than adjusting the parameters to the query of the County’s databases should required (both reports already exist and are provided annually, albeit with a different date range). And, in response to a virtually identical prior request from me, the County provided uncashed check records apart from the “stale dated check list.” See attached email “Overdue CPRA Request for uncashed records – not the annual compiled list (Our File 146733).

In any event, I look forward to a prompt resolution.

Sincerely,

G. Harold Christian
Vice President Operations
Payment Processing Services, LLC
129 Hanbury Road West, Suite 203, Chesapeake, Virginia 23322
T 757.389.8689 Ext. 101 F 804.237.0196
“Cast all your anxieties on Him because He cares for you.” 1 Peter 5:7

Please note: For tracking purposes, please email the records to FOIA@expertmoneyfinders.com

From: CON, Controller (CON) <controller.con@sfgov.org>
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2021 2:35 PM
To: Public Records Department <foia@expertmoneyfinders.com>
Cc: RUSSI, BRAD (CAT) <Brad.Russi@sfcityatty.org>; Records, Supervisor (CAT) <Supervisor.records@sfcityatty.org>
CON, Controller (CON) <controller.con@sfgov.org>; Chun, Edward (CON) <edward.chun@sfgov.org>; Rydstrom, Todd (CON) <Todd.Rydstrom@sfgov.org>
Subject: RE: Supervisor of Records Appeal – overdue request for records (Our File 146733)

Dear Mr. Christian,
Thank you for contacting the Controller’s Office and City Attorney regarding your public records request. Our team has been working on the manual process to provide responsive records for your request. Our team will meet again tomorrow to see what records can be produced at this time. As you have received in January, the stale dated check list is available to the public and attached for reference.

Best,
Office of the Controller

From: Public Records Department
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2021 11:40 AM
To: cityattorney@sfcityatty.org cityattorney@sfcityatty.org; dennis.herrera@sfcityatty.org
dennis.herrera@sfcityatty.org
Cc: edward.chun@sfgov.org edward.chun@sfgov.org

Subject: Supervisor of Records Appeal – overdue request for records (Our File 146733)

March 16, 2021
Via Email and Priority US Mail 9405 5112 9837 0117 6491 18:
Dennis J. Herrera, City Attorney
Attn. General Government Team
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place (Room 234)
San Francisco, CA 94102

RE: Supervisor of Records Appeal for records (Our File 146733)

Copy Via Email:
Benjamin Rosenfield, Controller
City and County of San Francisco Controller’s Office
City Hall, Room 316
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA 94102

RE: Supervisor of Records Appeal – overdue request for records (Our File 146733)

Dear Mr. Herrera:

Pursuant to (S.F. Administrative Code §§ 67.20(c) and 67.21(d)), I hereby appeal Controller’s Office failure to produce records in response to my request for public records pursuant to the California Constitution, Article I, Section 3, subdivision (b), and the California Public Records Act, California Government Code Section 6250, et seq. (“CPRA”).

I requested public records by email dated February 15, 2021 to Benjamin Rosenfield, Controller, (“CPRA Request”) (see my CPRA Request and the agency’s acknowledgement attached hereto as Exhibit A).

No records have been produced within the time limit required, nor has information has been provided as to when I could expect to receive the records.

My CPRA Request reasonably described the records and adhered to all applicable rules and regulations. The records requested by are within the agency’s control and do not fall within any CPRA exception or exemption.

The agency has violated CPRA by failing to timely and fully produce the records requested.

I am aware that Government Code Section 6258 permits an action seeking a writ of mandate, injunctive or declaratory relief, including an award of costs and attorneys’ fees. However, I would prefer not to escalate.

To save the aggravation and unnecessary cost inherent to litigation, I respectfully request that this appeal be granted and that I be promptly be provided the documents requested.

Sincerely,

G. Harold Christian
Vice President Operations
Payment Processing Services, LLC
129 Hanbury Road West, Suite 203, Chesapeake, Virginia 23322
T 757.389.8899 Ext. 101 F 804.237.0196

"Cast all your anxieties on Him because He cares for you." 1 Peter 5:7

Please note: For tracking purposes, please email the records to FOIA@expertmoneyfinders.com

From: CON, Controller (CON) <controller.con@sfgov.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 4, 2021 9:14 PM
To: Public Records Department <foia@expertmoneyfinders.com>
Cc: CON, Controller (CON) <controller.con@sfgov.org>

Subject: RE: *NEW* 2-15-21 CPRA REQUEST for up-to-date uncashed check records - not the annual compiled list (Our File 146733)

Hi Mr. Christian,
Thank you for reaching out to the Controller's Office. Our team has begun researching your request and we hope to have more information shortly.

Best,
Office of the Controller

From: Public Records Department <foia@expertmoneyfinders.com>
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2021 8:02 AM
To: Chun, Edward (CON) <edward.chun@sfgov.org>; benjamin.rosenfield@sfgov.org; Disbursement, Con (CON) <con.disbursement@sfgov.org>

Subject: *NEW* 2-15-21 CPRA REQUEST for up-to-date uncashed check records - not the annual compiled list (Our File 146733)

Importance: High

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

Via Email:

Benjamin Rosenfield, Controller
City and County of San Francisco Controller's Office
City Hall, Room 316
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA 94102

RE: *NEW* 2-15-21 CPRA REQUEST for up-to-date uncashed check records - not the annual compiled list (Our File 146733)

Dear Mr. Rosenfield and Official Records Custodian:

Pursuant to the California Constitution, Article I, Section 3, subdivision (b), and the California Public Records Act, California Government Code Section 6250, et seq., I respectfully request you produce copies of public records in an electronic XLS format (if available) to foia@expertmoneyfinders.com.

Kindly give close attention to the text of this request, particularly the date range of the records requested. The last time the County responded it did not provide responsive records (see attached NOT RESPONSIVE records provided previously).

Please provide an exact copy of a list, report or individual record – from both the FAMIS and PS systems (such as a list/report, payment advice, screen print, check copy, etc.) as of February 15, 2021 that shows the payee, date issued and amount of all checks (not just those deemed “stale-dated”) that meets all of the following parameters:

1. Were issued between January 1, 2015 and February 15, 2021 (date range requested) and
2. Have not been presented for payment or already replaced (i.e., negotiated or replaced checks are not responsive and ought not be provided) and
3. Were issued in amounts equal to or greater than $1,000.00 (one thousand dollars).

Please note: I am aware of the annual compiled list of uncashed. I am also in receipt of the lists as of September 30, 2018. These records are not what I am requesting. The annual list is generally not released until December, and the date range is not the same as I am requesting.

The attached lists *previously provided* as of from September 30, 2018 are not responsive. These previously provided lists (attached as EXAMPLES ONLY) are NOT as of February 15, 2021 and do not include ALL UNCASHED CHECKS issued up through the date of the search.

I seek records to be released within the 10 period required by the CPRA.

This should be a fairly straightforward request to fulfill as both reports already exist and are provided annually (albeit with a different date range).

I agree to pay up to 25.00. Please also inform me if you determine to withhold a responsive record its entirety or disclose it in redacted form. If you do intend to disclose any responsive record in redacted form, I ask that you redact that record for the time being (by blacking it out not whiting it out) and make the rest of the records available as requested. If you do determine to withhold any record in its entirety or redact any part of a disclosable record, please provide (i) a signed notification citing the legal authorities on which you rely and the reason(s) therefor, and (ii) the name and title of each person responsible for the decision. Gov. Code, §§ 6253, subd. (d), 6255, subd. (b).

Finally, pursuant to Gov. Code, § 6253.1, please assist me in identifying records and information responsive to my request or purpose of my request, describe the information technology and physical location in which the records exist,
and provide suggestions for overcoming any practical basis for denying access to the records or information sought.

Thank you for your assistance in fulfilling this request.

Sincerely,

G. Harold Christian
Vice President Operations
Payment Processing Services, LLC
129 Hanbury Road West, Suite 203, Chesapeake, Virginia 23322
T 757.389.8689 Ext. 101 F 804.237.0196

"Cast all your anxieties on Him because He cares for you." 1 Peter 5:7

Please note: For tracking purposes, please email the records to FOIA@expertmoneyfinders.com
March 16, 2021

Via Email and Priority US Mail 9405 5112 9837 0117 6491 18:
Dennis J. Herrera, City Attorney
Attn. General Government Team
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place (Room 234)
San Francisco, CA 94102

RE: Supervisor of Records Appeal – overdue request for records (Our File 146733)

Copy Via Email:
Benjamin Rosenfield, Controller
City and County of San Francisco Controller’s Office
City Hall, Room 316
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA 94102

RE: Supervisor of Records Appeal – overdue request for records (Our File 146733)

Dear Mr. Herrera:

Pursuant to (S.F. Administrative Code §§ 67.20(c) and 67.21(d)), I hereby appeal Controller’s Office failure to produce records in response to my request for public records pursuant to the California Constitution, Article I, Section 3, subdivision (b), and the California Public Records Act, California Government Code Section 6250, et seq. (“CPRA”).

I requested public records by email dated February 15, 2021 to Benjamin Rosenfield, Controller, (“CPRA Request”) (see my CPRA Request and the agency’s acknowledgement attached hereto as Exhibit A).

No records have been produced within the time limit required, nor has information has been provided as to when I could expect to receive the records.

My CPRA Request reasonably described the records and adhered to all applicable rules and regulations. The records requested by are within the agency’s control and do not fall within any CPRA exception or exemption.

The agency has violated CPRA by failing to timely and fully produce the records requested.

I am aware that Government Code Section 6258 permits an action seeking a writ of mandate, injunctive or declaratory relief, including an award of costs and attorneys’ fees. However, I would prefer not to escalate.

To save the aggravation and unnecessary cost inherent to litigation, I respectfully request that this appeal be granted and that I be promptly be provided the documents requested.

Sincerely,

G. Harold Christian
Vice President Operations
Payment Processing Services, LLC
129 Hanbury Road West, Suite 203, Chesapeake, Virginia 23322
Hi Mr. Christian,

Thank you for reaching out to the Controller’s Office. Our team has begun researching your request and we hope to have more information shortly.

Best,

Office of the Controller

---

RE: *NEW* 2-15-21 CPRA REQUEST for up-to-date uncashed check records - not the annual compiled list (Our File 146733)

Dear Mr. Rosenfield and Official Records Custodian:

Pursuant to the California Constitution, Article I, Section 3, subdivision (b), and the California Public Records Act, California Government Code Section 6250, et seq., I respectfully request you produce copies of public records in an electronic XLS format (if available) to foia@expertmoneyfinders.com.

Kindly give close attention to the text of this request, particularly the date range of the records requested. The last time the County responded it did not provide responsive records (see attached NOT RESPONSIVE records provided previously).
Please provide an exact copy of a list, report or individual record – from both the FAMIS and PS systems (such as a list/report, payment advice, screen print, check copy, etc.) as of February 15, 2021 that shows the payee, date issued and amount of all checks (not just those deemed “stale-dated”) that meets all of the following parameters:

1. Were issued between **January 1, 2015 and February 15, 2021** (date range requested) and
2. Have not been presented for payment or already replaced (i.e., negotiated or replaced checks are not responsive and ought not be provided) and
3. Were issued in amounts equal to or greater than $1,000.00 (one thousand dollars).

**Please note:** I am aware of the annual compiled list of uncashed. I am also in receipt of the lists as of September 30, 2018. These records are not what I am requesting. The annual list is generally not released until December, and the date range is not the same as I am requesting.

The attached lists *previously provided* as of from September 30, 2018 are not responsive. These previously provided lists (attached as EXAMPLES ONLY) are NOT as of February 15, 2021 and do not include ALL UNCASHED CHECKS issued up through the date of the search.

I seek records to be released within the 10 period required by the CPRA.

This should be a fairly straightforward request to fulfill as both reports already exist and are provided annually (albeit with a different date range).

I agree to pay up to 25.00. Please also inform me if you determine to withhold a responsive record its entirety or disclose it in redacted form. If you do intend to disclose any responsive record in redacted form, I ask that you redact that record for the time being (by blacking it out not whitening it out) and make the rest of the records available as requested. If you do determine to withhold any record in its entirety or redact any part of a disclosable record, please provide (i) a signed notification citing the legal authorities on which you rely and the reason(s) therefor, and (ii) the name and title of each person responsible for the decision. Gov. Code, §§ 6253, subd. (d), 6255, subd. (b).

Finally, pursuant to Gov. Code, § 6253.1, please assist me in identifying records and information responsive to my request or purpose of my request, describe the information technology and physical location in which the records exist, and provide suggestions for overcoming any practical basis for denying access to the records or information sought.

Thank you for your assistance in fulfilling this request.

Sincerely,

G. Harold Christian
Vice President Operations

Payment Processing Services, LLC
129 Hanbury Road West, Suite 203, Chesapeake, Virginia 23322
T 757.389.8899 Ext. 101 F 804.237.0196

"Cast all your anxieties on Him because He cares for you." 1 Peter 5:7

**Please note:** For tracking purposes, please email the records to **FOIA@expertmoneyfinders.com**
March 16, 2021

**Via Email and Priority US Mail 9405 5112 9837 0117 6491 18:**
Dennis J. Herrera, City Attorney  
Attn. General Government Team  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place (Room 234)  
San Francisco, CA 94102

**Copy Via Email:**
Benjamin Rosenfield, Controller  
City and County of San Francisco Controller’s Office  
City Hall, Room 316  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.  
San Francisco, CA 94102

**RE: Supervisor of Records Appeal – overdue request for records (Our File 146733)**

Dear Mr. Herrera:

Pursuant to (S.F. Administrative Code §§ 67.20(c) and 67.21(d)), I hereby appeal Controller’s Office failure to produce records in response to my request for public records pursuant to the California Constitution, Article I, Section 3, subdivision (b), and the California Public Records Act, California Government Code Section 6250, et seq. (“CPRA”).

I requested public records by email dated February 15, 2021 to Benjamin Rosenfield, Controller, (“CPRA Request”) (see my CPRA Request and the agency’s acknowledgement attached hereto as Exhibit A).

No records have been produced within the time limit required, nor has information has been provided as to when I could expect to receive the records.

My CPRA Request reasonably described the records and adhered to all applicable rules and regulations. The records requested by are within the agency’s control and do not fall within any CPRA exception or exemption.

The agency has violated CPRA by failing to timely and fully produce the records requested.

I am aware that Government Code Section 6258 permits an action seeking a writ of mandate, injunctive or declaratory relief, including an award of costs and attorneys’ fees. However, I would prefer not to escalate.

To save the aggravation and unnecessary cost inherent to litigation, I respectfully request that this appeal be granted and that I promptly be provided the documents requested.

Sincerely,

G. Harold Christian  
Vice President Operations

"Blessed is the man who trusts in the Lord, and whose hope is in the Lord." Jeremiah 17:7
February 15, 2021 CPRA Request and Agency Acknowledgment
Hi Mr. Christian,

Thank you for reaching out to the Controller's Office. Our team has begun researching your request and we hope to have more information shortly.

Best,

Office of the Controller

RE: "NEW" 2-15-21 CPRA REQUEST for up-to-date uncashed check records - not the annual compiled list (Our File 146733)

Pursuant to the California Constitution, Article I, Section 3, subdivision (b), and the California Public Records Act, California Government Code Section 6250, et seq., I respectfully request you produce copies of public records in an electronic XLS format (if available) to foia@expertmoneyfinders.com.

Kindly give close attention to the text of this request, particularly the date range of the records requested. The last time the County responded it did not provide responsive records (see attached NOT RESPONSIVE records...
Please provide an exact copy of a list, report or individual record – from both the FAMIS and PS systems (such as a list/report, payment advice, screen print, check copy, etc.) as of February 15, 2021 that shows the payee, date issued and amount of all checks (not just those deemed “stale-dated”) that meets all of the following parameters:

1. Were issued between January 1, 2015 and February 15, 2021 (date range requested); and
2. Have not been presented for payment or already replaced (i.e., negotiated or replaced checks are not responsive and ought not be provided); and
3. Were issued in amounts equal to or greater than $1,000.00 (one thousand dollars).

Please note: I am aware of the annual compiled list of uncashed. I am also in receipt of the lists as of September 30, 2018. These records are not what I am requesting. The annual list is generally not released until December, and the date range is not the same as I am requesting.

The attached lists *previously provided* as of from September 30, 2018 are not responsive. These previously provided lists (attached as EXAMPLES ONLY) are NOT as of February 15, 2021 and do not include ALL UNCASHED CHECKS issued up through the date of the search.

I seek records to be released within the 10 period required by the CPRA.

This should be a fairly straightforward request to fulfill as both reports already exist and are provided annually (albeit with a different date range).

I agree to pay up to $25.00. Please also inform me if you determine to withhold a responsive record its entirety or disclose it in redacted form. If you do intend to disclose any responsive record in redacted form, I ask that you redact that record for the time being (by blacking it out not whiting it out) and make the rest of the records available as requested. If you do determine to withhold any record in its entirety or redact any part of a disclosable record, please provide (i) a signed notification citing the legal authorities on which you rely and the reason(s) therefor, and (ii) the name and title of each person responsible for the decision. Gov. Code, §§ 6253, subd. (d), 6255, subd. (b).

Finally, pursuant to Gov. Code, § 6253.1, please assist me in identifying records and information responsive to my request or purpose of my request, describe the information technology and physical location in which the records exist, and provide suggestions for overcoming any practical basis for denying access to the records or information sought.

Thank you for your assistance in fulfilling this request.

Sincerely,

G. Harold Christian
Vice President Operations

Payment Processing Services, LLC
129 Hanbury Road West, Suite 203, Chesapeake, Virginia 23322
T 757.389.8689 Ext. 101 F 804.237.0196

"Cast all your anxieties on Him because He cares for you." 1 Peter 5:7

Please note: For tracking purposes, please email the records to FOIA@expertmoneyfinders.com
Mr. Karnazes -

I understand that DAS/HSA has now produced the records responsive to your request. If you believe the department improperly withheld or redacted records, please let me know and we will look into it. Thank you.

Bradley Russi
Deputy City Attorney
Office of City Attorney Dennis Herrera
City Hall, Room 234
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., San Francisco, CA 94102 www.sfcityattorney.org

-----Original Message-----
From: Russi, Brad (CAT) On Behalf Of Supervisor Records (CAT)  
Sent: Thursday, April 15, 2021 1:22 PM  
To: 'Zach' < >
Cc: SOTF, (BOS) <sotf@sfgov.org>
Subject: RE: [SOTF Please Open Complaint] Re: Are we still getting a Disability Cultural Center? [Public records request]

Mr. Karnazes -

DAS/HSA indicated they will be responding to your request for emails. If DAS/HSA withholds or redacts records based on a legal exemption, we will look at whether they properly withheld or redacted the records. Thanks.

Bradley Russi
Deputy City Attorney
Office of City Attorney Dennis Herrera
City Hall, Room 234
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., San Francisco, CA 94102 www.sfcityattorney.org

-----Original Message-----
From: Zach < >  
Sent: Friday, April 9, 2021 2:50 PM  
To: Supervisor Records (CAT) <supervisor.records@SFCITYATTY.ORG>; CityAttorney (CAT) <cityattorney@SFCITYATTY.ORG>; SOTF, (BOS) <sotf@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: [SOTF Please Open Complaint] Re: Are we still getting a Disability Cultural Center? [Public records request]

I'm afraid I don't understand this email very clearly. Are you saying that you do not want to open a case?

The records Havenot been provided. How long must I wait before it's counted as "witholding" it?
On 4/8/21, Supervisor Records (CAT) <supervisor.records@sfcityatty.org> wrote:

> Mr. Karnazes -
>
> We understand that DAS/HSA is searching for records responsive to your request for email communications and intends to provide records by April 21.
> Under the Sunshine Ordinance (Section 67.21(d) of the Administrative Code), the Supervisor of Records is responsible for determining whether a City department has withheld a record, or any part of a record, without a lawful basis for doing so – for determining “whether the record requested, or any part of the record requested, is public.” The Supervisor of Records does not have jurisdiction to consider whether a department has timely complied with a request. If DAS/HSA withholds or redacts records when they produce the remaining records responsive to your request and you believe that they have acted unlawfully in doing so, please let us know and we will look into the issue. Thank you.
>
> Bradley Russi
> Deputy City Attorney
> Office of City Attorney Dennis Herrera City Hall, Room 234
> 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., San Francisco, CA 94102
> www.sfcityattorney.org
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Zach<br>
> Sent: Tuesday, March 30, 2021 7:17 AM
> To: CityAttorney (CAT) <cityattorney@SFcityatty.org>
> Cc: Russi, Brad (CAT) <Brad.Russi@sfcityatty.org>
> Subject: Re: [SOTF Please Open Complaint] Re: Are we still getting a Disability Cultural Center? [Public records request]
>
> Dear Odaya Buta,
>
>>> We understand you are filing a complaint with the Sunshine Task Force, and you are also filing a petition for review by the Supervisor of Records in the City Attorney’s Office. Is that correct?>>
>
> Yes that is correct, thank you.
>
> – Zach K.
>
> On 3/26/21, CityAttorney (CAT) <cityattorney@sfcityatty.org> wrote:

>> Dear Mr. Karnazes,
>> Thank you for your email. We are writing to clarify and make sure we understand what you are requesting from the City Attorney’s Office.
>> We understand you are filing a complaint with the Sunshine Task Force, and you are also filing a petition for review by the Supervisor of Records in the City Attorney’s Office. Is that correct?
>> Sincerely,  
>> [signature_540561676]Odaya Buta  
>> Paralegal  
>> Office of City Attorney Dennis J. Herrera  
>> www.sfcityattorney.org<applewebdata://354EB39C‐2368‐4201‐BE40‐DFCD2DA  
>> 8  
>> 1691/www.sfcityattorney.org>  
>>  
>> Find us on: Facebook<https://www.facebook.com/sfcityattorney/>  
>> Twitter<https://twitter.com/SFCityAttorney>  
>> Instagram<https://www.instagram.com/sfcityattorney/>  
>>  
>> This message and any attachments are solely for the intended  
>> recipient and may include privileged or confidential information. If  
>> you have received this communication in error, please notify the  
>> sender immediately, and permanently delete this message and any attachments.  
>>  
>> From: Zach  
>> Sent: Thursday, March 25, 2021 8:00 AM  
>> To: MOD, (ADM) <mod@sfgov.org>; Bohn, Nicole (ADM)  
>> <nicole.bohn@sfgov.org>; Alex M. Madrid <Personal Info.>; kwilliams@lighthouse‐sf.org; sfmayorsdl@gmail.com; Info, HRC (HRC)  
>> <hrc.info@sfgov.org>; McSpadden, Shireen (HSA)  
>> <shireen.mcspadden@sfgov.org>; HSA DAS, (HSA) (DSS) <daas@sfgov.org>;  
>> Paul K. Longmore Institute on Disability <pklinst@sfsu.edu>;  
>> CityAttorney (CAT) <cityattorney@SFCITYATTY.ORG>; SOTF,  
>> (BOS) <sotf@sfgov.org>  
>> Subject: [SOTF Please Open Complaint] Re: Are we still getting a  
>> Disability Cultural Center? [Public records request]  
>>  
>> Dear Sunshine Ordinance, Shireen McSpadden / DAS, HSA, MOD, City  
>> Attorney and MDC:  
>> I request assistance from the sunshine ordinance task force in the  
>> city attorney for accessing these records.  
>> 1. I request Sunshine Ordinance Staff Open a Complaint for this issue.  
>>  
>> 30 days have passed and I've yet to receive the public records I've  
>> requested.  
>>  
>> 2. This is in violation of the sunshine ordinance, and very  
>> concerning as a person with disabilities trying to find information  
>> on a cultural center that we were promised with the 2016 Dignity  
>> Fund<https://www.sfhsa.org/about/departments/department‐disability‐and‐aging‐services‐das/dignity‐fund>.  
>> Where is $38 million of our voters public money going??  
>>  
>> 3. So far have not received any records for 2016‐2018, emails,  
>> construction date info, and more, as the request of 2/19 specifically  
>> asks for (attached).  
>> Why do these departments continue to play games and only partially  
>> fill records requests?
My requests are always crystal-clear and numbered, and using the computer causes me pain and difficulty. It really is frustrating to have to repeat myself for simple public records request in numerous emails.

I request assistance from the sunshine ordinance task force in the city attorney for accessing these records.

I request a reasonable disability accommodation that the same subject line be used in any response here, and the numbering system used be provided to respond to each issue. I've many disabilities that make using the computer difficult, and the small accommodations enable me to have equal access to the communication here. If this ADA reasonable accommodation is to be denied, please provide a clear denial and a clear reason for the denial.

Thank you,

-Zach Karnazes

Dear Mr. Karnazes,

Attached please find the information we have about the documents you requested for the Disability Cultural Center.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks.

Ken Pang
Assistant Custodian of Records
Human Services Agency – Investigations City and County of San Francisco
1650 Mission St. Suite 500
San Francisco, CA 94103

All Sunshine/Public Records requests should be sent to THIS address, HSASunshine@sfgov.org.

From: HSASunshine, (HSA) (DSS)

Sent: Friday, February 26, 2021 9:58 AM
To:
Subject: Disability Cultural Center

Dear Mr. Karnazes,

My name is Ken Pang and I am the Assistant Custodian of Records, handling Sunshine Public Records requests and subpoenas on behalf of the Human Services Agency.

I’m writing to confirm receipt of your recent request regarding the Disability Cultural Center and for the following information:

1. All financial reports and accounting pertaining to the Disability Cultural Center (Planned by DAS and discussed at MOD meetings after the passage of the 2016 Dignity Fund).

2. The complete, full, unabridged email history of MOD's and DAS's employee email records in regards to any and all planning and discussions pertaining to the San Francisco Disability Cultural Center from 01/01/2016 - today's date (02/19/21).

3. The available remaining balance / funds from the 2016 dignity fund passed by voters in San Francisco

4. The construction start date, if any is available, for the disability cultural center. If no start date is currently available, any record of one that was previously planned would be helpful.

Your request was received in this office by the Department of Disability and Aging Services on Friday, February 19, 2021.

In the future, please direct all public records requests relating to any department within the Human Services Agency to this address and not to individual staff members. This email address is monitored by multiple individuals and helps to insure that your request is seen and responded to in a timely fashion.
You can expect a response to your request by the close of business, Monday, March 1, 2021.

Thank you for your cooperation and if you have any questions, I can be reached at (415)503-4889.

Ken Pang
Assistant Custodian of Records
Human Services Agency – Investigations

O: (415) 503-4889
F: (415) 355-2306

Office Address:
City and County of San Francisco
1650 Mission St. Suite
San Francisco, CA

94103<https://www.google.com/maps/search/1650+Mission+St.+Suite+500+San+Francisco,+CA+94103?entry=gmail&source=g>
San Francisco, CA

94103<https://www.google.com/maps/search/1650+Mission+St.+Suite+500+San+Francisco,+CA+94103?entry=gmail&source=g>
All Sunshine/Public Records requests should be sent to THIS address,

HSASunshine@sfgov.org<https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/h/1fmc01sl86qnu/?&cs=wh&v=b&to=HSASunshine@sfgov.org>.

On 2/26/21, MOD, (ADM) <mod@sfgov.org<mailto:mod@sfgov.org>> wrote:

Dear Zach:

We are confirming receipt of this public records request. The Disability Cultural Center is a Disability and Aging Services (DAS) program. It is our understanding that DAS will be providing any responsive records to this request.

Best,

Iman Alzaghari
ADA Grievance, Referral, and Training Coordinator Gender Pronouns:
She, Her, Hers Mayor’s Office on Disability

On 2/26/21, MOD, (ADM) <mod@sfgov.org<mailto:mod@sfgov.org>> wrote:

Dear Zach:

We are confirming receipt of this public records request. The Disability Cultural Center is a Disability and Aging Services (DAS) program. It is our understanding that DAS will be providing any responsive records to this request.

Best,

Iman Alzaghari
ADA Grievance, Referral, and Training Coordinator Gender Pronouns:
She, Her, Hers Mayor’s Office on Disability
From: Zach <mailto:zach@cityandcountyofsanfrancisco.org>
Sent: Thursday, February 25, 2021 5:35 PM
To: MOD, (ADM) <mailto:mod@sfgov.org>; Bohn, Nicole (ADM) <mailto:nbohn@sfgov.org>; Alex M. Madrid <mailto:alex.m.madrid@sfgov.org>; Stephen Herman <mailto:stephen.herman@sfgov.org>; Denise de S_CLOSED_ 
Subject: Re: Are we still getting a Disability Cultural Center?

[Public records request]

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

Can someone please confirm receipt of this public records request?

Tomorrow

will be a week with no reply.

Any assistance from the sunshine ordinance staff would be appreciated

Thanks,

Zach Karnazes
Disability Advocate | Journalist | Artist
zkarnazes.wixsite.com/access/<http://zkarnazes.wixsite.com/access>/

h
https://avanan.url-protection.com/v1?url=http%3A//zkarnazes.wixsite.com/access/&g=OG4MDYxZDcZzMyNjI3NQc=&h=NjQ3MTA3ODc2ZzMyNjI3OTYg
y
MjhiOGNMTk2Y2E5NjI2JmVlMjM2MDIyOTc2MDk0NzI1MjUzOTc2Y2E5NjI3NQc=&h=ZjQ3OTYg
n
NmZHQyOmF2YWJhbgp2MzYyY2UzNjIvZmF1MjM2MDh2MDIyOTc2MDk0NzI1MjUzOTc2Y2E5NjI3NQc=
J
INTY4NmU2ZDdkMDk0ZmF1MjUzOTc2Y2E5NjI3NQc=
>>> Please note: While technology has improved a lot, computer
accessibility aids are not a magic bullet for all chronic pain and
disability needs.
>>> Using the computer hurts for me, always.
>>> My replies can take a while sometimes, depending on my pain levels
and functional use of my hands. I appreciate your patience! Feel
free to follow up with me if you don’t get a reply.
>>> My aids may leave typos in my message(s). Please let me know in
your response if any part of my email needs clarifying or is confusing.
>>> To help with confusion and disability, I ask that you please
respond including the numbering system provided, if any is used.
>>> CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The contents of this email message and any
attachments are intended solely for the addressee(s) and may contain
confidential and/or privileged information and may be legally
protected from disclosure.

On Fri, Feb 19, 2021 at 2:16 PM Zach
wrote:
Dear MOD, DAS, MDC, City Attorney, and Longmore Institute:

Are we still going to have a disability cultural center built?

I’ve heard nothing about this project for years and wondering why
the community has not been kept up-to-date on it (even before Covid).

Please see the attached public records request for more information
about what is actually happening with the planned disability
le.com/url?q=https%253A%252F%252Flongmoreinstitute.sfsu.edu%252F

mention nothing about our announced and community agreed-upon planned cultural center? The funds allocated for this are now being used for other things it seems.

(This email is being resent to reflect the records request in the subject line)

– Zach Karnazes

Disability Advocate | Journalist | Artist

https://zkarnazes.wixsite.com/access/

*Please note: ** While technology has improved a lot, computer accessibility aids are not a magic bullet for all chronic pain and disability needs.  My replies can take a while sometimes, depending on my pain levels and functional use of my hands. I appreciate your patience! Feel free
to follow up with me if you don't get a reply.
My aids may leave typos in my message(s). Please let me know in
your response if any part of my email needs clarifying or is confusing.
To help with confusion and disability, I ask that you please
respond including the numbering system provided, if any is used.

*CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The contents of this email message and any
attachments are intended solely for the addressee(s) and may contain
confidential and/or privileged information and may be legally
protected from disclosure.*

> – Zach Karnazes
Disability Advocate | Journalist | Artist
https://zkarnazes.wixsite.com/access/

*Please note: ** While technology has improved a lot, computer accessibility aids are not a magic bullet for all chronic pain and disability needs.
*Using the computer hurts for me, always.
My replies can take a while sometimes, depending on my pain levels
and functional use of my hands. I appreciate your patience! Feel free
to follow up with me if you don't get a reply.
My aids may leave typos in my message(s). Please let me know in
your response if any part of my email needs clarifying or is confusing.
To help with confusion and disability, I ask that you please respond
including the numbering system provided, if any is used.

*CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The contents of this email message and any
attachments are intended solely for the addressee(s) and may contain
confidential and/or privileged information and may be legally
protected from disclosure.*

--
Zach Karnazes
Disability Advocate | Journalist | Artist https://zkarnazes.wixsite.com/access/

*Please note: ** While technology has improved a lot, computer accessibility aids are not a magic bullet for all chronic pain and disability needs. *Using the computer hurts for me, always.
My replies can take a while sometimes, depending on my pain levels and functional use of my hands. I appreciate your patience! Feel free to follow up with me if you don't get a reply.
My aids may leave typos in my message(s). Please let me know in your response if any part of my email needs clarifying or is confusing.
To help with confusion and disability, I ask that you please respond including the numbering system provided, if any is used.
*CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The contents of this email message and any attachments are intended solely for the addressee(s) and may contain confidential and/or privileged information and may be legally protected from disclosure.*
Dear Odaya Buta,

>> We understand you are filing a complaint with the Sunshine Task
>> Force, and you are also filing a petition for review by the
>> Supervisor of Records in the City Attorney’s Office. Is that
>> correct? >>

Yes that is correct, thank you.

-Zach K.

On 3/26/21, CityAttorney (CAT) <cityattorney@sfcityatty.org> wrote:
> Dear Mr. Karnazes,
> Thank you for your email. We are writing to clarify and make sure we
> understand what you are requesting from the City Attorney’s Office.
> We understand you are filing a complaint with the Sunshine Task Force,
> and you are also filing a petition for review by the Supervisor of
> Records in the City Attorney’s Office. Is that correct?
> Sincerely,
> 
> [signature_540561676]Odaya Buta
> Paralegal
> Office of City Attorney Dennis J. Herrera
> 1691/www.sfcityattorney.org>
> 
> Find us on: Facebook<https://www.facebook.com/sfcityattorney/>
> Twitter<https://twitter.com/SFCityAttorney>
> Instagram<https://www.instagram.com/sfcityattorney/>
>
> This message and any attachments are solely for the intended recipient
> and may include privileged or confidential information. If you have
> received this communication in error, please notify the sender
> immediately, and permanently delete this message and any attachments.
> 
> From: Zach <Personal Info.>
> Sent: Thursday, March 25, 2021 8:00 AM
> To: MOD, (ADM) <mod@sfgov.org>; Bohn, Nicole (ADM)
> <nicole.bohn@sfgov.org>; Alex M. Madrid <Personal Info.>
> denise <denisesadvocate@sbcglobal.net>;
> kwilliams@lighthouse-sf.org; sfmayorsdl@gmail.com; Info, HRC (HRC)
Dear Sunshine Ordinance, Shireen McSpadden / DAS, HSA, MOD, City Attorney and MDC:

I request assistance from the sunshine ordinance task force in the city attorney for accessing these records.

1. I request Sunshine Ordinance Staff Open a Complaint for this issue.

30 days have passed and I’ve yet to receive the public records I’ve requested.

2. This is in violation of the sunshine ordinance, and very concerning as a person with disabilities trying to find information on a cultural center that we were promised with the 2016 Dignity Fund. Where is $38 million of our voters public money going??

3. So far have not received any records for 2016-2018, emails, construction date info, and more, as the request of 2/19 specifically asks for (attached).

Why do these departments continue to play games and only partially fill records requests?

My requests are always crystal-clear and numbered, and using the computer causes me pain and difficulty. It really is frustrating to have to repeat myself for simple public records request in numerous emails.

I request assistance from the sunshine ordinance task force in the city attorney for accessing these records.

4. I request a reasonable disability accommodation that the same subject line be used in any response here, and the numbering system used be provided to respond to each issue. I've many disabilities that make using the computer difficult, and the small accommodations enable me to have equal access to the communication here. If this ADA reasonable accommodation is to be denied, please provide a clear denial and a clear reason for the denial.

Thank you,

-Zach Karnazes

Dear Mr. Karnazes,

Attached please find the information we have about the documents you requested for the Disability Cultural Center.

Please let me know if you have any questions.
Thanks.

Ken Pang
Assistant Custodian of Records
Human Services Agency – Investigations City and County of San Francisco
1650 Mission St. Suite
500 San Francisco, CA 94103
T. 415.503.4889 | F. 415.355.2306
All Sunshine/Public Records requests should be sent to THIS address,
HSASunshine@sfgov.org.

From: HSASunshine, (HSA) (DSS)
hsasunshine@sfgov.org
Sent: Friday, February 26, 2021 9:58 AM
To:
Cc: Brown, Patrice (HSA)
patrice.brown@sfgov.org

Subject: Disability Cultural Center

Dear Mr. Karnazes,

My name is Ken Pang and I am the Assistant Custodian of Records, handling Sunshine Public Records requests and subpoenas on behalf of the Human Services Agency.

I’m writing to confirm receipt of your recent request regarding the Disability Cultural Center and for the following information:

1. All financial reports and accounting pertaining to the Disability Cultural Center (Planned by DAS and discussed at MOD meetings after the passage of the 2016 Dignity Fund).
2. The complete, full, unabridged email history of MOD's and DAS's employee email records in regards to any and all planning and discussions pertaining to the San Francisco Disability Cultural Center from 01/01/2016 - today's date (02/19/21).

3. The available remaining balance / funds from the 2016 dignity fund passed by voters in San Francisco.

4. The construction start date, if any is available, for the disability cultural center. If no start date is currently available, any record of one that was previously planned would be helpful.

Your request was received in this office by the Department of Disability and Aging Services on Friday, February 19, 2021.

In the future, please direct all public records requests relating to any department within the Human Services Agency to this address and not to individual staff members. This email address is monitored by multiple individuals and helps to ensure that your request is seen and responded to in a timely fashion.

You can expect a response to your request by the close of business, Monday, March 1, 2021.

Thank you for your cooperation and if you have any questions, I can be reached at (415)503-4889.

Ken Pang
Assistant Custodian of Records
Human Services Agency – Investigations

O: (415) 503-4889
F: (415) 355-2306

Office Address:
City and County of San Francisco
1650 Mission St. Suite
San Francisco, CA
94103

All Sunshine/Public Records requests should be sent to THIS address,
On 2/26/21, MOD, (ADM) <mod@sfgov.org@mailto:mod@sfgov.org> wrote:

Dear Zach,

We are confirming receipt of this public records request. The Disability Cultural Center is a Disability and Aging Services (DAS) program. It is our understanding that DAS will be providing any responsive records to this request.

Best,

Iman Alzaghari
ADA Grievance, Referral, and Training Coordinator Gender Pronouns:
She, Her, Hers Mayor's Office on Disability<http://www.sfgov.org/mod>
1155 Market Street, 1st Floor
Office: (415) 554-6789
Fax: (415) 554-6159
[Mayor's Office on Disability logo - Mayor's Office on Disability
City and County of San Francisco with the City Seal]

From: Zach Personal Info. <mailto:Personal Info.>
Sent: Thursday, February 25, 2021 5:35 PM
To: MOD, (ADM) <mod@sfgov.org@mailto:mod@sfgov.org>; Bohn, Nicole (ADM) <nicole.bohn@sfgov.org@mailto:nicoled.bohn@sfgov.org>;
Alex M. Madrid <mailto:Alex M. Madrid>
Stephen Herman <mailto:Stephen Herman>
Personal Info. <mailto:Personal Info.>; Denise Personal Info. <mailto:Personal Info.>
<mailto:denisesadvocate@sbcglobal.net@mailto:denisesadvocate@sbcglobal.net>
; kwilliams@lighthouse-sf.org@mailto:kwilliams@lighthouse-sf.org>
; sfmayorsdl@gmail.com@mailto:sfmayorsdl@gmail.com>; Info, HRC (HRC)
<hrc.info@sfgov.org@mailto:hrc.info@sfgov.org>; McSpadden, Shireen (HSA)
<mailto:shireen.mcsppadden@sfgov.org@mailto:shireen.mcsppadden@sfgov.org>
HSA DAS, (HSA) (DSS) <mailto:daas@sfgov.org@mailto:daas@sfgov.org>; Paul K.
Longmore Institute on Disability <mailto:pkinst@sfsu.edu@mailto:pkinst@sfsu.edu>; Cityattorney
<Cityattorney@sfcityatty.org@mailto:Cityattorney@sfcityatty.org>; SOTF,
mailto:BOS.sotf@sfgov.org@mailto:BOS.sotf@sfgov.org
Subject: Re: Are we still getting a Disability Cultural Center?
[Public records request]

>
Can someone please confirm receipt of this public records request?

Tomorrow

will be a week with no reply.

Any assistance from the sunshine ordinance staff would be appreciated

Thanks,

- Zach Karnazes

Disability Advocate | Journalist | Artist

zkarnazes.wixsite.com/access/<http://zkarnazes.wixsite.com/access/>\n
Please note: While technology has improved a lot, computer

accessibility aids are not a magic bullet for all chronic pain and disability needs.

My replies can take a while sometimes, depending on my pain levels

and functional use of my hands. I appreciate your patience! Feel free

to follow up with me if you don't get a reply.

My aids may leave typos in my message(s). Please let me know in

your response if any part of my email needs clarifying or is confusing.

To help with confusion and disability, I ask that you please

respond including the numbering system provided, if any is used.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The contents of this email message and any

attachments are intended solely for the addressee(s) and may contain

confidential and/or privileged information and may be legally

protected from disclosure.

On Fri, Feb 19, 2021 at 2:16 PM Zach

Dear MOD, DAS, MDC, City Attorney, and Longmore Institute:

Are we still going to have a disability cultural center built?

I've heard nothing about this project for years and wondering why the

community has not been kept up-to-date on it (even before Covid).

Please see the attached public records request for more information

about what is actually happening with the planned disability cultural


e.com/url%3Fq%3Dhttps%253A%252F%252Flongmoreinstitute.sfsu.edu%252Fme

et-disability-cultural-center-leadership-committee%26amp%3Bsa%3DD%26%3D974>
Why does the 2020 2023 DAS report mention nothing about our announced and community agreed-upon planned cultural center? The funds allocated for this are now being used for other things it seems.

(This email is being resent to reflect the records request in the subject line)

– Zach Karnazes
Disability Advocate | Journalist | Artist
zkarnazes.wixsite.com/access

*Please note: ** While technology has improved a lot, computer accessibility aids are not a magic bullet for all chronic pain and disability needs. Using the computer hurts for me, always. My replies can take a while sometimes, depending on my pain levels and functional use of my hands. I appreciate your patience! Feel free to follow up with me if you don’t get a reply.

My aids may leave typos in my message(s). Please let me know in your response if any part of my email needs clarifying or is confusing. To help with confusion and disability, I ask that you please respond including the numbering system provided, if any is used.
*CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The contents of this email message and any attachments are intended solely for the addressee(s) and may contain confidential and/or privileged information and may be legally protected from disclosure.*

--

Zach Karnazes
Disability Advocate | Journalist | Artist https://zkarnazes.wixsite.com/access/

*Please note: ** While technology has improved a lot, computer accessibility aids are not a magic bullet for all chronic pain and disability needs. *Using the computer hurts for me, always. My replies can take a while sometimes, depending on my pain levels and functional use of my hands. I appreciate your patience! Feel free to follow up with me if you don't get a reply. My aids may leave typos in my message(s). Please let me know in your response if any part of my email needs clarifying or is confusing. To help with confusion and disability, I ask that you please respond including the numbering system provided, if any is used.*

*CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The contents of this email message and any attachments are intended solely for the addressee(s) and may contain confidential and/or privileged information and may be legally protected from disclosure.*
Sent via email (arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com)

Re: Petition to Supervisor of Records

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter responds to your petition to the Supervisor of Records dated April 15, 2021, concerning a document produced by the Department of Public Works (“DPW”). You contest DPW’s redaction of a personal cell phone number. We conclude that DPW properly redacted the cell phone number based on personal privacy. See Gov’t Code Secs. 6254(c), (k); Cal. Const. Art. I, Sec. 1.

Very truly yours,

DAVID CHIU
City Attorney

[Signature]

Bradley A. Russi
Deputy City Attorney

May 20, 2022
Please see the attached response to your petition. Thank you.

Bradley Russi  
Deputy City Attorney  
Office of City Attorney David Chiu  
City Hall, Room 234  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., San Francisco, CA 94102  
www.sfcityattorney.org

From: Anonymous Records Requester <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, April 15, 2021 12:33 PM  
To: Heckel, Hank (MYR) <hank.heckel@sfgov.org>; MayorSunshineRequests, MYR (MYR) <mayorsunshinerequests@sfgov.org>; Supervisor Records (CAT) <supervisor.records@SFCITYATTY.ORG>; Elsbernd, Sean (MYR) <sean.elsbernd@sfgov.org>; Bruss, Andrea (MYR) <andrea.bruss@sfgov.org>; CityAttorney (CAT) <cityattorney@SFCITYATTY.ORG>; Givner, Jon (CAT) <Jon.Givner@sfcityatty.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>  
Subject: RE: New phone number release - RE: Mayor's Office Texts - Immediate Disclosure Request / SOTF 21009 / 67.21(d)

Ladies and Gents,

On Tue, Apr 13, 2021 at 4:51 PM, Heckel, Hank (MYR) <hank.heckel@sfgov.org> wrote:

Please confirm that you will refrain from further publishing these files. I also understand from your email below that you will be asking DocumentCloud to take down these files.

As you know I don't volunteer restrictions on my future speech; and you cannot require me to make such commitments. DPW published the records; they were copied around by entities other than me. Someone informed me. I informed you - with absolutely no obligation to have done so. I'll make future decisions based on my own ethical judgments with legal advice as needed, and not your wishes.

Instead of prodding me - likely one of the only persons who would even bother to tell you - why not systematically improve records production across the City to make this less likely, not just for the Mayor but the public whose privacy you are required to protect? You all right here on this thread are the folks capable of doing so - if you wanted to.

And your second sentence's understanding is incorrect. My email never said anything related to that. MuckRock may be aware of the one URL that you for some reason removed from the below thread. However, whatever ultimately happens with these records is between you, DocumentCloud, MuckRock, and whoever else has may have the records, and not my responsibility.
I assume you will issue more takedowns, at which point I will request the takedowns as public records, and then publish them like last time: https://twitter.com/journo_anon/status/1382101459290890243?s=21
As always, other records may also have the number, they may be mirrored/cached all over the web, and so forth. You, not I, may want to search around and do some due diligence here - if this number is even one that you still want to censor.
I have no obligation to find any public records CCSF publishes or the copies thereof published by others, or to take any of them down, and I continue to refuse to undertake any such obligations.

(Aside: Your alteration of the below thread will be good evidence in the Walter Wong / parade float complaint. Producing a final email in a thread does not constitute a production of earlier messages or vice versa, as copied bodies can be altered.)

Finally, Supervisor of Records Herrera: Please determine the most recently redacted phone numbers public and order DPW to disclose them. I assume Breed is smart enough to have changed her phone number after her employees posted them online and they stayed up for days, so it shouldn't even be redacted anymore.

Sincerely,
Anonymous

IMPORTANT:
1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.
2. If you are NOT a public official: This communication is confidential and may contain unpublished information or confidential source information, protected by the California Shield Law, Evidence Code sec. 1070. I am a member of the electronic media and regularly publish information about the conduct of public officials.
3. I am not a lawyer. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.
4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sent from ProtonMail for iOS

On Tue, Apr 13, 2021 at 4:51 PM, Heckel, Hank (MYR) <hank.heckel@sfgov.org> wrote:

Anonymous,

The cell phone number you reference is a personal phone number. As you know, it was inadvertently produced by DPW and DPW subsequently recalled the documents you reference and replaced them with new copies in which this number was properly redacted. See the exchange below. We maintain that this personal contact information is properly withheld to avoid an unwarranted breach of personal privacy pursuant to Section 6254(c) and Section 6254(k) of the California Public Records Act and Article 1 and Section 1 of the California Constitution.
The original inadvertently produced files have been replaced on DPW’s NextRequest platform. Please confirm that you will refrain from further publishing these files. I also understand from your email below that you will be asking DocumentCloud to take down these files.

Regards,

Hank Heckel

Compliance Officer

Office of the Mayor

City and County of San Francisco

On April 12, 2021:
Subject: [External Message Added] City and County of San Francisco public records request #21-952
City and County of San Francisco

Hi there

A message was sent to you regarding record request #21-952:

It was brought to our attention that we inadvertently failed to redact certain private information, so we recalled those documents, properly redacted them (following the information we previously provided to you), and have re-released them.

Sorry for the confusion.

Regards,
Hi there

Documents have been released for record request #21-952:

* image001.jpg

Document links are valid for one month. After May 12, you will need to sign in to view the document(s).

From: Anonymous Records Requester <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 9:09 PM
To: MayorSunshineRequests, MYR (MYR) <mayorsunshinerequests@sfgov.org>; Records, Supervisor (CAT) <Supervisor.records@sfcityatty.org>; Elsbernd, Sean (MYR) <sean.elsbernd@sfgov.org>; Bruss, Andrea (MYR) <andrea.bruss@sfgov.org>; Cityattorney <Cityattorney@sfcityatty.org>; GIVNER, JON (CAT) <Jon.Givner@sfcityatty.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; Heckel, Hank (MYR) <hank.heckel@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: New phone number release - RE: Mayor's Office Texts - Immediate Disclosure Request
I guess y'all don't care. Very interesting.

**IMPORTANT:**

1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.

2. If you are NOT a public official: This communication is confidential and may contain unpublished information or confidential source information, protected by the California Shield Law, Evidence Code sec. 1070. I am a member of the electronic media and regularly publish information about the conduct of public officials.

3. I am not a lawyer. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.

4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

Sent with ProtonMail Secure Email.

Sent from ProtonMail for iOS

On Fri, Apr 9, 2021 at 11:09 AM, Anonymous Records Requester <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:

Someone recently informed me that the City has released what appears to be the Mayor’s phone number - ironically by releasing this very thread in some other records request:
Given who is on that thread, one of you must have released this document after this fiasco itself...

This whole trail of incidents will be documented in my currently pending SOTF complaint against Breed and Heckel for violating Gov Code 6254.21. It appears that your earlier demand (which you retracted only after I filed a complaint and threatened suit) was just some sort of legal scare tactics against me - made solely for the purpose of intimidating me away from my continued fight for transparency.

Either this number isn't really the Mayor's number (perhaps you responsibly changed it based on the last release?) or no one cares about keeping it from the public, effectively negating any argument you might have had even if you had perfected the demand (which you failed to do so, before retracting it).

As I said in my recent open letter to Herrera, the whole Sunshine Ordinance is treated like a joke by the City. This is just more evidence of that.

FYI - whatever takedowns you are about to issue to DocumentCloud, I will be requesting the takedowns too. I was in the process of reaching out to the Berkman Klein Center (fka Chilling Effects) regarding building up a database of public records takedowns in addition to their existing DMCA, patriot act, etc. orders. San Francisco will make a fine case study.

**IMPORTANT:**

1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.

2. If you are NOT a public official: This communication is confidential and may contain unpublished information or confidential source information, protected by the California Shield Law, Evidence Code sec. 1070. I am a member of the electronic media and regularly publish information about the conduct of public officials.

3. I am not a lawyer. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness.
In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.

4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

Sent from ProtonMail for iOS
From: Anonymous Records Requester <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 15, 2021 12:33 PM
To: Heckel, Hank (MYR); MayorSunshineRequests, MYR (MYR); Supervisor Records (CAT); Elsbernd, Sean (MYR); Bruss, Andrea (MYR); CityAttorney (CAT); Givner, Jon (CAT); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: RE: New phone number release - RE: Mayor’s Office Texts - Immediate Disclosure Request / SOTF 21009 / 67.21(d)

Ladies and Gents,

On Tue, Apr 13, 2021 at 4:51 PM, Heckel, Hank (MYR) <hank.heckel@sfgov.org> wrote:

Please confirm that you will refrain from further publishing these files. I also understand from your email below that you will be asking DocumentCloud to take down these files.

As you know I don't volunteer restrictions on my future speech; and you cannot require me to make such commitments. DPW published the records; they were copied around by entities other than me. Someone informed me. I informed you - with absolutely no obligation to have done so. I'll make future decisions based on my own ethical judgments with legal advice as needed, and not your wishes.

Instead of prodding me - likely one of the only persons who would even bother to tell you - why not systematically improve records production across the City to make this less likely, not just for the Mayor but the public whose privacy you are required to protect? You all right here on this thread are the folks capable of doing so - if you wanted to.

And your second sentence’s understanding is incorrect. My email never said anything related to that. MuckRock may be aware of the one URL that you for some reason removed from the below thread. However, whatever ultimately happens with these records is between you, DocumentCloud, MuckRock, and whoever else has may have the records, and not my responsibility.

I assume you will issue more takedowns, at which point I will request the takedowns as public records, and then publish them like last time: https://twitter.com/journanon/status/1382101459290890243?s=21
As always, other records may also have the number, they may be mirrored/cached all over the web, and so forth. You, not I, may want to search around and do some due diligence here - if this number is even one that you still want to censor.
I have no obligation to find any public records CCSF publishes or the copies thereof published by others, or to take any of them down, and I continue to refuse to undertake any such obligations.

(Aside: Your alteration of the below thread will be good evidence in the Walter Wong / parade float complaint. Producing a final email in a thread does not constitute a production of earlier messages or vice versa, as copied bodies can be altered.)

Finally, Supervisor of Records Herrera: Please determine the most recently redacted phone numbers public and order DPW to disclose them. I assume Breed is smart enough to have changed her phone number after her employees posted them online and they stayed up for days, so it shouldn't even be redacted anymore.

Sincerely,

Anonymous
IMPORTANT:
1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.
2. If you are NOT a public official: This communication is confidential and may contain unpublished information or confidential source information, protected by the California Shield Law, Evidence Code sec. 1070. I am a member of the electronic media and regularly publish information about the conduct of public officials.
3. I am not a lawyer. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.
4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sent from ProtonMail for iOS

On Tue, Apr 13, 2021 at 4:51 PM, Heckel, Hank (MYR) <hank.heckel@sfgov.org> wrote:

Anonymous,

The cell phone number you reference is a personal phone number. As you know, it was inadvertently produced by DPW and DPW subsequently recalled the documents you reference and replaced them with new copies in which this number was properly redacted. See the exchange below. We maintain that this personal contact information is properly withheld to avoid an unwarranted breach of personal privacy pursuant to Section 6254(c) and Section 6254(k) of the California Public Records Act and Article 1 and Section 1 of the California Constitution.

The original inadvertently produced files have been replaced on DPW’s NextRequest platform. Please confirm that you will refrain from further publishing these files. I also understand from your email below that you will be asking DocumentCloud to take down these files.

Regards,

Hank Heckel
Compliance Officer
Office of the Mayor
City and County of San Francisco
On April 12, 2021:
Subject: [External Message Added] City and County of San Francisco public records request #21-952
City and County of San Francisco

************************************************************************

Hi there

A message was sent to you regarding record request #21-952:

It was brought to our attention that we inadvertently failed to redact certain private information, so we recalled those documents, properly redacted them (following the information we previously provided to you), and have re-released them.

Sorry for the confusion.

Regards,

David A. Steinberg
Custodian of Records
San Francisco Public Works

************************************************************************

Questions about your request? Reply to this email or sign in to contact staff at City and County of San Francisco. Technical support: See our help page

---

On April 12, 2021:
Subject: [Document Released] City and County of San Francisco public records request #21-952
City and County of San Francisco

************************************************************************

Hi there
Documents have been released for record request #21-952:
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Document links are valid for one month.
After May 12, you will need to sign in to view the document(s).

Questions about your request? Reply to this email or sign in to contact staff at City and County of San Francisco.

Technical support: See our help page

---

From: Anonymous Records Requester <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 9:09 PM
To: MayorSunshineRequests, MYR (MYR) <mayorsunshinerequests@sfgov.org>; Records, Supervisor (CAT) <Supervisor.records@sfcityatty.org>; Elsbernd, Sean (MYR) <sean.elsbernd@sfgov.org>; Bruss, Andrea (MYR) <andrea.bruss@sfgov.org>; Cityattorney <Cityattorney@sfcityatty.org>; GIVNER, JON (CAT) <Jon.Givner@sfcityatty.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; Heckel, Hank (MYR) <hank.heckel@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: New phone number release - RE: Mayor's Office Texts - Immediate Disclosure Request

I guess y'all don't care. Very interesting.

**IMPORTANT:**

1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.

2. If you are NOT a public official: This communication is confidential and may contain unpublished information or confidential source information, protected by the California Shield Law, Evidence Code sec. 1070. I am a member of the electronic media and regularly publish information about the conduct of public officials.

3. I am not a lawyer. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.
4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

Sent with ProtonMail Secure Email.

Sent from ProtonMail for iOS

On Fri, Apr 9, 2021 at 11:09 AM, Anonymous Records Requester <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:

Someone recently informed me that the City has released what appears to be the Mayor's phone number - ironically by releasing this very thread in some other records request:

Given who is on that thread, one of you must have released this document after this fiasco itself...

This whole trail of incidents will be documented in my currently pending SOTF complaint against Breed and Heckel for violating Gov Code 6254.21. It appears that your earlier demand (which you retracted only after I filed a complaint and threatened suit) was just some sort of legal scare tactics against me - made solely for the purpose of intimidating me away from my continued fight for transparency.

Either this number isn't really the Mayor's number (perhaps you responsibly changed it based on the last release?) or no one cares about keeping it from the public, effectively negating any argument you might have had even if you had perfected the demand (which you failed to do so, before retracting it).
As I said in my recent open letter to Herrera, the whole Sunshine Ordinance is treated like a joke by the City. This is just more evidence of that.

FYI - whatever takedowns you are about to issue to DocumentCloud, I will be requesting the takedowns too. I was in the process of reaching out to the Berkman Klein Center (fka Chilling Effects) regarding building up a database of public records takedowns in addition to their existing DMCA, patriot act, etc. orders. San Francisco will make a fine case study.

**IMPORTANT:**

1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.

2. If you are NOT a public official: This communication is confidential and may contain unpublished information or confidential source information, protected by the California Shield Law, Evidence Code sec. 1070. I am a member of the electronic media and regularly publish information about the conduct of public officials.

3. I am not a lawyer. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.

4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous
Mr. Perkins –

I understand that Supervisor Mar’s office produced records yesterday and that they intend to continue to produce records on a rolling basis. This isn’t a situation where the department is failing or refusing to comply with the request. Thank you.

Bradley Russi  
Deputy City Attorney  
Office of City Attorney Dennis Herrera  
City Hall, Room 234  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., San Francisco, CA 94102  
www.sfcityattorney.org

Hello Mr. Russi--Following up here. Obviously, there can be situations where in the face of a public records request, a public official states "we need more time but are working on it," when, in fact, the official intends to never respond. And there definitely are situations where an actor, although otherwise able to respond, intentionally delays document production (a month, five months, a year), in bad faith, for an ulterior reason. An example of the latter might be that an election is coming up, or a vote of the Board of Supervisors, the documents may undermine the official's preferred outcome, so the official withholds the documents until after the election/vote, when it's too late to affect the outcome (undermining everything the public records laws stand for).

Again, what I'm hoping you shed light on is the point in time at which the City Attorney, as Supervisor of Records, would treat a nonproduction as a failed, refused, and/or incomplete compliance (something falling clearly within the Supervisor of Records section 67.21(e) jurisdiction)?

Again, all that is sought here is communications to Supervisor Mar from lobbyists, interest groups, constituents, etc. seeking to influence his position on the closure of the Great Highway to automobiles. The identities of persons and entities seeking to influence a public official and the substance of their communications epitomizes a type of information sunshine laws are designed to make public. At the very most, maybe the personal email address and phone number of an individual constituent (not an entity, interest group, or lobbyist) could be redacted, but even so, give me the documents and a black Sharpie and I could do that in two hours. Supervisor Mar's delay here is in bad faith. But circling back to my question, at what point would the Supervisor of Records deem delay to be failed/refused/incomplete production
Thank you,
Charles Perkins

On Sunday, May 2, 2021, 10:03:08 PM PDT, Charles Perkins wrote:

Thanks Mr. Russi,
I know the City Attorney is supposed to act when a city actor "refuses . . . to comply" with a public records request. If the public official just continues to give the requestor the blow off (e.g., "we're working on it, we're working on it, etc."), at what point does the City Attorney consider the failure to respond a refusal to comply
Charles Perkins

P.S. Mar didn't really produce anything. He waited until SFCTA posted something on its website that he otherwise had access to. And only then, when SFCTA already had made the document public, did Mar say "oh, here's what you asked for." Here's what his staff said:

When we returned yesterday, I checked with CTA to see if they had added the meeting recordings and Chats to their website. [https://www.sfcta.org/projects/district-4-mobility-study#panel-overview](https://www.sfcta.org/projects/district-4-mobility-study#panel-overview) They have not, but promised it would go up this week.

On Thursday, April 29, 2021, 05:17:36 PM PDT, Supervisor Records (CAT) wrote:

Mr. Perkins –

We understand that Supervisor Mar’s office has produced some records responsive to your request and is in the process of searching for and producing additional records. Under the Sunshine Ordinance (Section 67.21(d) of the Administrative Code), the Supervisor of Records is responsible for determining whether a City department has withheld a record, or any part of a record, without a lawful basis for doing so – for determining “whether the record requested, or any part of the record requested, is public.” The Supervisor of Records does not have jurisdiction to consider whether a department has timely complied with a request or properly invoked an extension. If Supervisor Mar’s office withholds or redacts records when they produce the remaining records responsive to your request and you believe that they have acted unlawfully in doing so, please let us know and we will look into the issue. Nonetheless, we will check in with the Supervisor’s office on the status of their response. Thank you.

Bradley Russi
Deputy City Attorney
Office of City Attorney Dennis Herrera
City Hall, Room 234
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., San Francisco, CA 94102
Good morning City Attorney Herrera,

I write to you in your capacity of Supervisor of Records for purposes of the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance, and ask that you take action, as set forth in section 67.27 of the Sunshine Ordinance, to compel production of records by Gordon Mar, who has refused to comply with his legal obligations.

Supervisor Mar is a partner with SFCTA, Rec and Parks, and other undisclosed interests in what has been a closed-door effort to secure the permanent closure of San Francisco's Great Highway to automobiles. Recently, his staff (Ralph Lane) advised a constituent (Shirley Garrett) in writing that the office had “received hundreds of emails asking [Supervisor Mar] to keep the GHW closed to cars, and hundreds asking to reopen it.” (Emphasis added.)

On April 12, 2021, I sent a simple public records request to the Supervisor as follows:

All correspondence, emails, text messages, or other communications received by you or your office stating a position or preference with regard to the ongoing closure of the Upper Great Highway to cars, whether sent by an individual, organization, interest group, other government official or employee, lobbyist, or other. Please do not redact the identity of any person or entity communicating with your office, as casting "sunshine" on the identity of persons seeking to influence public officials is one of the quintessential purposes of public records laws.

Last week I received a lengthy email from Supervisor Mar's staff citing Mayor Breed's emergency suspension of Sunshine Ordinance deadlines and stating: "Due to the broad nature of your request and large volume of potentially responsive records, this will take an inordinate level of effort and time to extract, review, and produce -- at least several weeks, and possibly a month or more." (Emphasis added.)

This is obstruction. Mayor Breed's emergency edicts, issued over a year ago, were designed to help overcome pandemic-created obstacles not to provide public "officials who feel more comfortable conducting public business away from the scrutiny of those who elect and employ them" "additional ways to hide the making of public policy from the public." (Admin. Code, sec. 67.1(c).) In this instance, Supervisor Mar has been able to attend to a full, regular agenda of activities and business,
with full staffing, for six months or more. According to his staff, the responsive communications the Supervisor has received are in electronic (email) format, so it is no barrier to compliance that folks may be working from home at present. And even if there are certain responsive documents in hardcopy letter format that are located in a physical office, necessitating additional steps requiring additional time to produce, that is no excuse for not promptly producing the responsive emails, which are readily available. (Admin. Code, sec. 67.25(d).)

The truth of the matter is that Supervisor Mar, along with the SFCTA, Recreation and Parks, and likely others have been advancing a hidden agenda to permanently close the Great Highway to cars at least since shortly after the pandemic began. Their activities have been shrouded in secrecy, and the information they have shared has been provably (and, frankly, laughably) misleading if not downright false. In the last several months, however, a public outcry against the permanent closure has begun and is growing, and issues are starting to be investigated and exposed, such as the devastating impact the closure has on climate change, the inevitability of additional deaths, personal injuries, and property damage due 18k-20k cars each day being rerouted through residential streets, the lost quality of life to residents whose streets have become new thoroughfares, and frustrated drivers forced to spend more time behind the wheel and away from other activities, and the huge cost to taxpayers of efforts designed to try to mitigate some of the issues the closure causes. In the face of this growing resistance, Supervisor Mar spoke one only time at the last meeting of the SFCTA, to say that he would like to schedule the permanent closure question asap. I can only interpret his delay in producing documents in response to my simple request as an obstructive effort that is part of a design to push the permanent closure through as quickly as possible and without the public becoming fully informed on what has happened in secrecy to date and the many negative effects of the closure, and before the false and misleading information that has been proffered to date—something unconscionable for any public employee or official—can be fact-checked and corrected.

I ask that you exercise your authority and responsibility under the Sunshine Ordinance to ensure that Supervisor Mar immediately complies with his past-due legal obligations. And because there are a number of other outstanding Sunshine Ordinance requests pending with the Supervisor, I would ask too that you take the opportunity to advise him of his ongoing obligations under the law, in hopes of avoiding having to petition you again.

Thank you very much,

Charles Perkins

San Francisco
----- Forwarded Message -----  

From: Charles Perkins <Personal Info.>  
To: gordon.mar@sfgov.org <gordon.mar@sfgov.org> Marstaff (BOS) <marstaff@sfgov.org>  
Sent: Friday, April 16, 2021, 09:29:40 AM PDT  
Subject: Re: Public Records Act: IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE RE UEST  

P.S. I can't imagine that the delay is attributable to confusion over my reference to the Ralph M. Brown Act--an open meetings law--given that it clearly seeks records and cites specific records provisions of the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. But lest there be any confusion, the Brown Act cite should have been to the California Public Records Act (Gov. Code, sec. 6250 et seq.). Thank you.  

Charles Perkins  

On Friday, April 16, 2021, 08:26:46 AM PDT, Charles Perkins <Personal Info.> wrote:  

Hello,  

I have received no response to this request for public records. This is a simple request for communications related to the ongoing closure of the Great Highway and public comments submitted in connection with to meetings Supervisor Mar hosted, and I should have received a response at least by Tuesday. (Admin. Code, sec. 67.25) I do not believe there can be any ambiguity as to your disclosure obligations, but if there is any confusion, I suggest you review sections 67.1, 67.21 and 67.25 of the Administrative Code.  

Please note that I will have no choice but to seek writ relief if necessary, and you will responsible for all attorney fees and costs. (Id., sec. 67.35.) Additionally, failure to comply is willful misconduct, and I will need to report this to the Ethics Commission. (Id., sec. 67.34.)  

At the very minimum, please touch base with me today and provide a status update. If I do not hear from you, I will begin pursuing my remedies on Monday.  

Thank you,  

Charles Perkins
On Monday, April 12, 2021, 10:22:47 PM PDT, Charles Perkins wrote:

Supervisor Mar:

This is a request for records made pursuant to the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance (chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code) and the Ralph M. Brown Act (Gov. Code, sec. 54950 et seq.). It is an "immediate disclosure request" per section 67.25 of the Administrative Code.

Please produce, by close of business April 14, 2020:

1. All correspondence, emails, text messages, or other communications received by you or your office stating a position or preference with regard to the ongoing closure of the Upper Great Highway to cars, whether sent by an individual, organization, interest group, other government official or employee, lobbyist, or other. Please do not redact the identity of any person or entity communicating with your office, as casting "sunshine" on the identity of persons seeking to influence public officials is one of the quintessential purposes of public records laws.

2. All of the comments and questions submitted through the "chat" function at the March 27 virtual open house, which the presenters said, a minimum of three times, would be made available after the event. Also, please produce all questions and comments submitted in advance by separate email or other means.

Please produce the same (questions/comment submitted in real time through chat or separately) from the November 21, 2020, virtual town on related to the mobility study.

Please note: As to this second category of documents, this is the third request I have made for them. They should have been produced within 10 days, maximum, of the first request, but it's been three weeks without production. This third effort is now an Immediate Disclosure Request. Please know that a government official does not get to decide what documents should be seen by the public (Admin. Code, sec. 67.1(b)), although a politician may prefer to operate in secret, this cannot happen (id., subd. (c)), and the policy of disclosure "trumps" whatever may motivate any effort to conceal (id., subd. (d)).
Thank you very much,

Charles Perkins
Sunset District
Buta, Odaya (CAT)

From: Russi, Brad (CAT) on behalf of Supervisor Records (CAT)
Sent: Thursday, April 29, 2021 5:07 PM
To: ‘Sam Wong’
Subject: RE: Immediate Disclosure Request: Vaccine Eligibility

Mr. Wong –

We understand that Supervisor Haney has now produced the records responsive to your request. Thus, we consider any issue before the Supervisor of Records related to your email below resolved. Thank you.

Best,

Bradley Russi
Deputy City Attorney
Office of City Attorney Dennis Herrera
City Hall, Room 234
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., San Francisco, CA 94102
www.sfcityattorney.org

From: Sam Wong < >
Sent: Monday, April 26, 2021 7:52 AM
To: Haney, Matt (BOS) <matt.haney@sfgov.org>
Cc: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Supervisor Records (CAT) <supervisor.records@SFCITYATTY.ORG>; SOTF, (BOS) <sotf@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: Immediate Disclosure Request: Vaccine Eligibility

It has now been 13 days without a response to this request.

On Thu, Apr 22, 2021 at 6:48 AM Sam Wong < > wrote:
Hello,

It has now been nine days without a response. The required response for an immediate disclosure request is 24 hours.

I am cc’ing the City Attorney and the Clerk of the Board to hopefully facilitate a timely response.

On Tue, Apr 13, 2021 at 3:08 PM Sam Wong < > wrote:
This is an immediate disclosure request for all records, including but not limited to emails, text messages, twitter direct messages, instagram direct messages, formal letters, or any kind of written correspondence between Supervisor Matt Haney and any employee of the City and County of San Francisco relating to the expansion of eligibility for vaccines for San Francisco residents.

Relevant key words to search include:

MyTurn
"My Turn"
Eligible
16+
16 and older
santa clara
alameda
vaccine
vaccinated
vaccination

Please note that the Supervisor has said that he has been texting with city officials so these records should be readily available: (https://twitter.com/MattHaneySF/status/1381743408209829890 ; https://twitter.com/MattHaneySF/status/1381736163942129664)

I am requesting all records between the date of April 5th through the end of April 13th, 2021.
It has now been 13 days without a response to this request.

On Thu, Apr 22, 2021 at 6:48 AM Sam Wong <Personal Info.> wrote:

Hello,

It has now been nine days without a response. The required response for an immediate disclosure request is 24 hours.

I am cc'ing the City Attorney and the Clerk of the Board to hopefully facilitate a timely response.

On Tue, Apr 13, 2021 at 3:08 PM Sam Wong <Personal Info.> wrote:

This is an immediate disclosure request for all records, including but not limited to emails, text messages, twitter direct messages, instagram direct messages, formal letters, or any kind of written correspondence between Supervisor Matt Haney and any employee of the City and County of San Francisco relating to the expansion of eligibility for vaccines for San Francisco residents.

Relevant key words to search include:

MyTurn
"My Turn"
Eligible
16+
16 and older
santa clara
alameda
vaccine
vaccinated
vaccination

Please note that the Supervisor has said that he has been texting with city officials so these records should be readily available: [https://twitter.com/MattHaneySF/status/1381743408209829890](https://twitter.com/MattHaneySF/status/1381743408209829890); [https://twitter.com/MattHaneySF/status/1381736163942129664](https://twitter.com/MattHaneySF/status/1381736163942129664)

I am requesting all records between the date of April 5th through the end of April 13th, 2021.
To Whom It May Concern:

We understand the City Attorney’s Office produced records responsive to this request in June 2021 and July 2021. Accordingly, we consider this petition closed.

Bradley Russi  
Deputy City Attorney  
Office of City Attorney David Chiu  
City Hall, Room 234  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
www.sfcityattorney.org

---

Anonymous Records Requester <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 9, 2021 5:25 PM

To: SOTF, (BOS) <sotf@sfgov.org>; Supervisor Records (CAT) <supervisor.records@SFCITYATTY.ORG>

Cc: CityAttorney (CAT) <cityattorney@SFCITYATTY.ORG>

Subject: SOTF Complaint & 67.21(d) petition - RE: Your Own Kelly Records - Immediate Disclosure Request - 8a,b

Supervisor of Records: This is a petition under 67.21(d) that the records requested below be determined in writing to be public, and an order for their disclosure.

SOTF: Please file a complaint Anonymous v Dennis Herrera, John Cote, Brad Russi, Jon Givner, Randy Parent, Brittany Feitelberg, and the Office of the City Attorney, for 67.21 incomplete response, 67.27 withholding without justification, 67.26 non-minimal withholding, Gov Code 6253(c) failure to notify existence of disclosable public records or explanation and an unreasonable delay, 67.34 willful violation and official misconduct.

Please include this thread which is Exhibit A (the actual request thread), and the attached complaint body. As explained in the complaint, the 67.34 allegation is because Herrera is retaliating against me for the act of filing complaints against him.

Regards,

Anonymous  
Twitter @journo_anon

**IMPORTANT:**  
1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.
2. If you are NOT a public official: This communication is confidential and may contain unpublished information or confidential source information, protected by the California Shield Law, Evidence Code sec. 1070. I am a member of the electronic media and regularly publish information about the conduct of public officials.

3. I am not a lawyer. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.

4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sent from ProtonMail for iOS

**EXHIBIT A**

On Mon, Mar 15, 2021 at 10:32 AM, CityAttorney (CAT) <cityattorney@SFCITYATTY.ORG> wrote:

Dear Anonymous,

I am responding on behalf of the City Attorney’s Office to your below request. We are working on your request; however, we currently anticipate needing an additional two weeks to respond.

Please send replies to cityattorney@sfcityatty.org

Best,

Elizabeth A. Coolbrith
Paralegal
Office of City Attorney Dennis Herrera

(415) 554-4685 Direct

www.sfcityattorney.org

---

From: Coolbrith, Elizabeth (CAT) On Behalf Of CityAttorney (CAT)
Sent: Monday, March 1, 2021 1:31 PM
To: 'Anonymous' <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Cc: CityAttorney (CAT) <cityattorney@SFCITYATTY.ORG>
Subject: RE: Your Own Kelly Records - Immediate Disclosure Request - 8a,b
Dear requester,

I am writing on behalf of the City Attorney’s Office in response to your below request. Please note that we are invoking an extension of time under Government Code section 6253(c) due to the need to search for, collect, and appropriately examine a voluminous amount of separate and distinct records. We will endeavor to process your request as quickly as possible and anticipate responding by March 15, 2021.

Please send replies to cityattorney@sfcityatty.org

Best,

Elizabeth A. Coolbrith
Paralegal
Office of City Attorney Dennis Herrera
(415) 554-4685 Direct
www.sfcityattorney.org

From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2021 7:32 PM
To: Supervisor Records (CAT) <supervisor.records@SFCITYATTY.ORG>; Carlin, Michael (PUC) <mcarlin@sfwater.org>; Brad Russi (Deputy City Attorney, SF) <brad.russi@sfgov.org>; Givner, Jon (CAT) <Jon.Givner@sfcityatty.org>; Dennis Herrera (City Attorney, SF) <dennis.herrera@sfgov.org>; Cote, John (CAT) <John.Cote@sfcityatty.org>; Parent, Randy (CAT) <Randy.Parent@sfcityatty.org>; CityAttorney (CAT) <cityattorney@SFCITYATTY.ORG>; Feitelberg, Brittany (CAT) <Brittany.Feitelberg@sfcityatty.org>
Subject: Re: Your Own Kelly Records - Immediate Disclosure Request - 8a,b

Given that none of you are turning over any records the next question is what ties each of you have to Mr. Kelly and what incentives you may have to protect him.

This is the 8th of 8 of this set of requests - for all requests 1a through 8b - please provide rolling responses.
All requests below include City of San Jose v Superior Court searches of ALL accounts/servers/devices, regardless of whether they are owned by the City or not. Preserve all records until the final adjudication of all appeals. Justify every redaction or withholding to a specific legal citation in writing. We may appeal all withholdings of any information.

The "Former Officials" are Harlan Kelly Jr., Juliet Ellis, and Naomi Kelly.

The "Financially Interested Parties" are defined as (READ CAREFULLY THIS ONE IS DIFFERENT THAN THE OTHERS):

- Derived from FPPC filings: Jim Rally, SF Community Investment Fund, University of San Francisco, 2018 San Francisco Inaugural Fund, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, Drew School, Soha Engineers
- Others: Walter Wong, Florence Kong, W. Wong Construction Co. Inc.; Jaidin International Ventures, LLC; Jaidin Consulting Group, LLC; Sfl & W Partnership; Center Cafe; Construction Center, Inc.; Pacific Star Capital, LLC; Recology Inc. and its affiliates.
- **Herrera parties: San Francisco Parks Alliance**

The "Subject Parties" are defined as: the Former Officials and the Financially Interested Parties.

**To Mr. Cote ("You"):**

8a) This is an immediate disclosure request for all phone call logs (including metadata such as date/time/duration/direction (outgoing vs incoming) of call), phone call or meeting recordings, voicemails, emails, calendar invites, meeting entries, texts, chats, IMs, or communications in any physical or electronic form sent or received by you where any of the Subject Parties is any party in the communication and another party is YOU, including after anyone left city employment. YOU MUST PRODUCE EXACT COPIES OF ALL ELECTRONIC RECORDS, preserving all hyperlinks, urls, To/From/Cc AND Bcc email addresses, images, participants in all conversations, timestamps, attachments, invitee lists, attendee statuses, and all other non-exempt parts of the record. See SOTF Orders 19044, 19047, 19097, 19098, and 19119. Consult Dept of Technology on how to produce exact electronic records.

8b) This is an immediate disclosure request for all payments, offers of pay, invoices, promissory notes, or evidence of indebtedness, regardless of whether the document is merely a draft and not executed or unpaid, where any party is one of the Subject Parties and another party is either YOU or any LLC, trust, partnership, unincorporated association, or corporation (whether or not for profit) that you have any financial interest in, or that has ever provided you with a W-2 or a 1099-MISC, or for which you are on the board - excluding publicly-traded corporations - without time limitation. You must produce records in your constructive possession, which includes records by your contractors which you have the legal or contractual right to access (see Community Youth Athletic Center v City of National City). YOU MUST PRODUCE EXACT COPIES OF ALL ELECTRONIC RECORDS, preserving all hyperlinks, urls, To/From/Cc AND Bcc email addresses, images, participants in all conversations, timestamps, attachments, invitee lists, attendee statuses, and all other non-exempt parts of the record. See SOTF Orders 19044, 19047, 19097, 19098, and 19119. Consult Dept of Technology on how to produce exact electronic records.
The City will soon receive additional requests to others for similar records. Each of the requests must get a distinct determination under Gov Code 6253(c) of whether or not you have responsive records.

**NOTE:** 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

--------- Original Message ---------

On Wednesday, February 17th, 2021 at 7:18 PM, Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:

Given that none of you are turning over any records the next question is what ties each of you have to Mr. Kelly and what incentives you may have to protect him.

All requests below include City of San Jose v Superior Court searches of ALL accounts/servers/devices, regardless of whether they are owned by the City or not. Preserve all records until the final adjudication of all appeals. Justify every redaction or withholding to a specific legal citation in writing. We may appeal all withholdings of any information.

The "Former Officials" are Harlan Kelly Jr., Juliet Ellis, and Naomi Kelly.

The "Financially Interested Parties" are defined as (READ CAREFULLY THIS ONE IS DIFFERENT THAN THE OTHERS):
- Derived from FPPC filings: Jim Rally, SF Community Investment Fund, University of San Francisco, 2018 San Francisco Inaugural Fund, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, Drew School, Soha Engineers
- Others: Walter Wong, Florence Kong, W. Wong Construction Co. Inc.; Jaidin International Ventures, LLC; Jaidin Consulting Group, LLC; SF & W Partnership; Center Cafe; Construction Center, Inc.; Pacific Star Capital, LLC; Recology Inc. and its affiliates.
- Herrera parties: San Francisco Parks Alliance

The "Subject Parties" are defined as: the Former Officials and the Financially Interested Parties.

**To Ms. Feitelberg ("You"):**

Although Feitelberg is officially some sort of claims investigator, it appears that she actually routes Herrera's electronic communications through her accounts for whatever reasons, per prior records disclosures.

7a) This is an immediate disclosure request for all phone call logs (including metadata such as date/time/duration/direction (outgoing vs incoming) of call), phone call or meeting recordings, voicemails, emails, calendar invites, meeting entries, texts, chats, IMs, or communications in any physical or electronic form sent or received by you where any of the Subject Parties is any party in the communication and another party is YOU, including after anyone left city employment. YOU MUST PRODUCE EXACT COPIES OF ALL ELECTRONIC RECORDS, preserving all hyperlinks, urls, To/From/Cc AND Bcc email addresses, images, participants in all conversations, timestamps, attachments, invitee lists, attendee statuses, and all other non-exempt parts of the record. See SOTF Orders 19044, 19047, 19097, 19098, and 19119. Consult Dept of Technology on how to produce exact electronic records.

7b) This is an immediate disclosure request for all payments, offers of pay, invoices, promissory notes, or evidence of indebtedness, regardless of whether the document is merely a draft and not executed or unpaid, where any party is one of the Subject Parties and another party is either YOU or any LLC, trust, partnership, unincorporated association, or corporation (whether or not for profit) that you have any financial interest in, or that has ever provided you with a W-2 or a 1099-MISC, or for which you are on the board - excluding publicly-traded corporations - without time limitation. You must produce records in your constructive possession, which includes records by your contractors which you have the legal or contractual right to access (see Community Youth Athletic
Center v City of National City). YOU MUST PRODUCE EXACT COPIES OF ALL ELECTRONIC RECORDS, preserving all hyperlinks, urls, To/From/Cc AND Bcc email addresses, images, participants in all conversations, timestamps, attachments, invitee lists, attendee statuses, and all other non-exempt parts of the record. See SOTF Orders 19044, 19047, 19097, 19098, and 19119. Consult Dept of Technology on how to produce exact electronic records.

The City will soon receive additional requests to others for similar records. Each of the requests must get a distinct determination under Gov Code 6253(c) of whether or not you have responsive records.

NOTE: 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

-------- Original Message --------

On Wednesday, February 17th, 2021 at 7:04 PM, Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:

Given that none of you are turning over any records the next question is what ties each of you have to Mr. Kelly and what incentives you may have to protect him.
All requests below include City of San Jose v Superior Court searches of ALL accounts/servers/devices, regardless of whether they are owned by the City or not. Preserve all records until the final adjudication of all appeals. Justify every redaction or withholding to a specific legal citation in writing. We may appeal all withholdings of any information.

The "Former Officials" are Harlan Kelly Jr., Juliet Ellis, and Naomi Kelly.

The "Financially Interested Parties" are defined as (READ CAREFULLY THIS ONE IS DIFFERENT THAN THE OTHERS):

- Derived from FPPC filings: Jim Rally, SF Community Investment Fund, University of San Francisco, 2018 San Francisco Inaugural Fund, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, Drew School, Soha Engineers
- Others: Walter Wong, Florence Kong, W. Wong Construction Co. Inc.; Jaidin International Ventures, LLC; Jaidin Consulting Group, LLC; Sfl & W Partnership; Center Cafe; Construction Center, Inc.; Pacific Star Capital, LLC; Recology Inc. and its affiliates.
- **Herrera parties: San Francisco Parks Alliance**

The "Subject Parties" are defined as: the Former Officials and the Financially Interested Parties.

**To City Attorney Herrera ("You"):**

6a) This is an immediate disclosure request for all phone call logs (including metadata such as date/time/duration/direction (outgoing vs incoming) of call), phone call or meeting recordings, voicemails, emails, calendar invites, meeting entries, texts, chats, IMs, or communications in any physical or electronic form sent or received by you where any of the Subject Parties is any party in the communication and another party is YOU, including after anyone left city employment. YOU MUST PRODUCE EXACT COPIES OF ALL ELECTRONIC RECORDS, preserving all hyperlinks, urls, To/From/Cc AND Bcc email addresses, images, participants in all conversations, timestamps,
attachments, invitee lists, attendee statuses, and all other non-exempt parts of the record. See SOTF Orders 19044, 19047, 19097, 19098, and 19119. Consult Dept of Technology on how to produce exact electronic records.

6b) This is an immediate disclosure request for all payments, offers of pay, invoices, promissory notes, or evidence of indebtedness, regardless of whether the document is merely a draft and not executed or unpaid, where any party is one of the Subject Parties and another party is either YOU or any LLC, trust, partnership, unincorporated association, or corporation (whether or not for profit) that you have any financial interest in, or that has ever provided you with a W-2 or a 1099-MISC, or for which you are on the board - excluding publicly-traded corporations - without time limitation. You must produce records in your constructive possession, which includes records by your contractors which you have the legal or contractual right to access (see Community Youth Athletic Center v City of National City). YOU MUST PRODUCE EXACT COPIES OF ALL ELECTRONIC RECORDS, preserving all hyperlinks, urls, To/From/Cc AND Bcc email addresses, images, participants in all conversations, timestamps, attachments, invitee lists, attendee statuses, and all other non-exempt parts of the record. See SOTF Orders 19044, 19047, 19097, 19098, and 19119. Consult Dept of Technology on how to produce exact electronic records.

The City will soon receive additional requests to others for similar records. Each of the requests must get a distinct determination under Gov Code 6253(c) of whether or not you have responsive records.

NOTE: 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.
The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

------- Original Message -------

On Wednesday, February 17th, 2021 at 6:53 PM, Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:

Given that none of you are turning over any records the next question is what ties each of you have to Mr. Kelly and what incentives you may have to protect him.

All requests below include City of San Jose v Superior Court searches of ALL accounts/servers/devices, regardless of whether they are owned by the City or not. Preserve all records until the final adjudication of all appeals. Justify every redaction or withholding to a specific legal citation in writing. We may appeal all withholdings of any information.

The "Former Officials" are Harlan Kelly Jr., Juliet Ellis, and Naomi Kelly.

The "Financially Interested Parties" are defined as:

- Derived from FPPC filings: Jim Rally, SF Community Investment Fund, University of San Francisco, 2018 San Francisco Inaugural Fund, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, Drew School, Soha Engineers
- Others: Walter Wong, Florence Kong, W. Wong Construction Co. Inc.; Jaidin International Ventures, LLC; Jaidin Consulting Group, LLC; Sfl & W Partnership; Center Cafe; Construction
Center, Inc.; Pacific Star Capital, LLC; Recology Inc. and its affiliates.

The "Subject Parties" are defined as: the Former Officials and the Financially Interested Parties.

To City Attorney Herrera ("You"):

5a) This is an immediate disclosure request for all phone call logs (including metadata such as date/time/duration/direction (outgoing vs incoming) of call), phone call or meeting recordings, voicemails, emails, calendar invites, meeting entries, texts, chats, IMs, or communications in any physical or electronic form sent or received by you where any of the Subject Parties is any party in the communication and another party is YOU, including after anyone left city employment. YOU MUST PRODUCE EXACT COPIES OF ALL ELECTRONIC RECORDS, preserving all hyperlinks, urls, To/From/Cc AND Bcc email addresses, images, participants in all conversations, timestamps, attachments, invitee lists, attendee statuses, and all other non-exempt parts of the record. See SOTF Orders 19044, 19047, 19097, 19098, and 19119. Consult Dept of Technology on how to produce exact electronic records.

5b) This is an immediate disclosure request for all payments, offers of pay, invoices, promissory notes, or evidence of indebtedness, regardless of whether the document is merely a draft and not executed or unpaid, where any party is one of the Subject Parties and another party is either YOU or any LLC, trust, partnership, unincorporated association, or corporation (whether or not for profit) that you have any financial interest in, or that has ever provided you with a W-2 or a 1099-MISC, or for which you are on the board - excluding publicly-traded corporations - without time limitation. You must produce records in your constructive possession, which includes records by your contractors which you have the legal or contractual right to access (see Community Youth Athletic Center v City of National City). YOU MUST PRODUCE EXACT COPIES OF ALL ELECTRONIC RECORDS, preserving all hyperlinks, urls, To/From/Cc AND Bcc email addresses, images, participants in all conversations, timestamps,
attachments, invitee lists, attendee statuses, and all other non-exempt parts of the record. See SOTF Orders 19044, 19047, 19097, 19098, and 19119. Consult Dept of Technology on how to produce exact electronic records.

The City will soon receive additional requests to others for similar records. Each of the requests must get a distinct determination under Gov Code 6253(c) of whether or not you have responsive records.

**NOTE:** 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

-------- Original Message --------

On Wednesday, February 17th, 2021 at 6:47 PM, Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:

Given that none of you are turning over any records the next question is what ties each of you have to Mr. Kelly and what incentives you may have to protect him.
All requests below include City of San Jose v Superior Court searches of ALL accounts/servers/devices, regardless of whether they are owned by the City or not. Preserve all records until the final adjudication of all appeals. Justify every redaction or withholding to a specific legal citation in writing. We may appeal all withholdings of any information.

The "Former Officials" are Harlan Kelly Jr., Juliet Ellis, and Naomi Kelly.

The "Financially Interested Parties" are defined as:

- Derived from FPPC filings: Jim Rally, SF Community Investment Fund, University of San Francisco, 2018 San Francisco Inaugural Fund, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, Drew School, Soha Engineers
- Others: Walter Wong, Florence Kong, W. Wong Construction Co. Inc.; Jaidin International Ventures, LLC; Jaidin Consulting Group, LLC; Sf&L W Partnership; Center Cafe; Construction Center, Inc.; Pacific Star Capital, LLC; Recology Inc. and its affiliates.

The "Subject Parties" are defined as: the Former Officials and the Financially Interested Parties.

To DCA Givner ("You"):

4a) This is an immediate disclosure request for all phone call logs (including metadata such as date/time/duration/direction (outgoing
vs incoming) of call), phone call or meeting recordings, voicemails, emails, calendar invites, meeting entries, texts, chats, IMs, or communications in any physical or electronic form sent or received by you where any of the Subject Parties is any party in the communication and another party is YOU, including after anyone left city employment. YOU MUST PRODUCE EXACT COPIES OF ALL ELECTRONIC RECORDS, preserving all hyperlinks, urls, To/From/Cc AND Bcc email addresses, images, participants in all conversations, timestamps, attachments, invitee lists, attendee statuses, and all other non-exempt parts of the record. See SOTF Orders 19044, 19047, 19097, 19098, and 19119. Consult Dept of Technology on how to produce exact electronic records.

4b) This is an immediate disclosure request for all payments, offers of pay, invoices, promissory notes, or evidence of indebtedness, regardless of whether the document is merely a draft and not executed or unpaid, where any party is one of the Subject Parties and another party is either YOU or any LLC, trust, partnership, unincorporated association, or corporation (whether or not for profit) that you have any financial interest in, or that has ever provided you with a W-2 or a 1099-MISC, or for which you are on the board - excluding publicly-traded corporations - without time limitation. You must produce records in your constructive possession, which includes records by your contractors which you have the legal or contractual right to access (see Community Youth Athletic Center v City of National City). YOU MUST PRODUCE EXACT COPIES OF ALL ELECTRONIC RECORDS, preserving all hyperlinks, urls, To/From/Cc AND Bcc email addresses, images, participants in all conversations, timestamps,
attachments, invitee lists, attendee statuses, and all other non-exempt parts of the record. See SOTF Orders 19044, 19047, 19097, 19098, and 19119. Consult Dept of Technology on how to produce exact electronic records.

The City will soon receive additional requests to others for similar records. Each of the requests must get a distinct determination under Gov Code 6253(c) of whether or not you have responsive records.

**NOTE:**
1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

------- Original Message -------
On Wednesday, February 17th, 2021 at 6:45 PM, Anonymous
<arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:

Given that none of you are turning over any records the next question is what ties each of you have to Mr. Kelly and what incentives you may have to protect him.

All requests below include City of San Jose v Superior Court searches of ALL accounts/servers/devices, regardless of whether they are owned by the City or not. Preserve all records until the final adjudication of all appeals. Justify every redaction or withholding to a specific legal citation in writing. We may appeal all withholdings of any information.

The "Former Officials" are Harlan Kelly Jr., Juliet Ellis, and Naomi Kelly.

The "Financially Interested Parties" are defined as:

- Derived from FPPC filings: Jim Rally, SF Community
The "Subject Parties" are defined as: the Former Officials and the Financially Interested Parties.

To DCA Russi ("You"):

3a) This is an immediate disclosure request for all phone call logs (including metadata such as date/time/duration/direction (outgoing vs
incoming) of call), phone call or meeting recordings, voicemails, emails, calendar invites, meeting entries, texts, chats, IMs, or communications in any physical or electronic form sent or received by you where any of the Subject Parties is any party in the communication and another party is YOU, including after anyone left city employment. YOU MUST PRODUCE EXACT COPIES OF ALL ELECTRONIC RECORDS, preserving all hyperlinks, urls, To/From/Cc AND Bcc email addresses, images, participants in all conversations, timestamps, attachments, invitee lists, attendee statuses, and all other non-exempt parts of the record. See SOTF Orders 19044, 19047, 19097, 19098, and 19119. Consult Dept of Technology on how to produce exact electronic records.

3b) This is an immediate disclosure request for all payments, offers of pay, invoices, promissory notes, or evidence of indebtedness, regardless of whether the document is merely a draft and not executed or unpaid,
where any party is one of the Subject Parties and another party is either YOU or any LLC, trust, partnership, unincorporated association, or corporation (whether or not for profit) that you have any financial interest in, or that has ever provided you with a W-2 or a 1099-MISC, or for which you are on the board - excluding publicly-traded corporations - without time limitation. You must produce records in your constructive possession, which includes records by your contractors which you have the legal or contractual right to access (see Community Youth Athletic Center v City of National City). YOU MUST PRODUCE EXACT COPIES OF ALL ELECTRONIC RECORDS, preserving all hyperlinks, urls, To/From/Cc AND Bcc email addresses, images, participants in all conversations, timestamps, attachments, invitee lists, attendee statuses, and all other non-exempt parts of the record. See SOTF Orders 19044, 19047, 19097, 19098, and 19119. Consult Dept of Technology on how to produce exact electronic records.
The City will soon receive additional requests to others for similar records. Each of the requests must get a distinct determination under Gov Code 6253(c) of whether or not you have responsive records.

**NOTE:**
1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.
2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness.
3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.
4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,
Supervisor of Records: This is a petition under 67.21(d) that the records requested below be determined in writing to be public, and an order for their disclosure.

SOTF: Please file a complaint Anonymous v Dennis Herrera, John Cote, Brad Russi, Jon Givner, Randy Parent, Brittany Feitelberg, and the Office of the City Attorney, for 67.21 incomplete response, 67.27 withholding without justification, 67.26 non-minimal withholding, Gov Code 6253(c) failure to notify existence of disclosable public records or explanation and an unreasonable delay, 67.34 willful violation and official misconduct.

Please include this thread which is Exhibit A (the actual request thread), and the attached complaint body. As explained in the complaint, the 67.34 allegation is because Herrera is retaliating against me for the act of filing complaints against him.

Regards,

Anonymous

Twitter @journo_anon

IMPORTANT:
1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.
2. If you are NOT a public official: This communication is confidential and may contain unpublished information or confidential source information, protected by the California Shield Law, Evidence Code sec. 1070. I am a member of the electronic media and regularly publish information about the conduct of public officials.
3. I am not a lawyer. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.
4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

EXHIBIT A

On Mon, Mar 15, 2021 at 10:32 AM, CityAttorney (CAT) wrote:

Dear Anonymous,
I am responding on behalf of the City Attorney’s Office to your below request. We are working on your request; however, we currently anticipate needing an additional two weeks to respond.

Please send replies to cityattorney@sfcityatty.org

Best,

Elizabeth A. Coolbrith
Paralegal
Office of City Attorney Dennis Herrera

(415) 554-4685 Direct

www.sfcityattorney.org

From: Coolbrith, Elizabeth (CAT) On Behalf Of CityAttorney (CAT)
Sent: Monday, March 1, 2021 1:31 PM
To: 'Anonymous' <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Cc: CityAttorney (CAT) <cityattorney@SFCITYATTY.ORG>
Subject: RE: Your Own Kelly Records - Immediate Disclosure Request - 8a,b

Dear requester,

I am writing on behalf of the City Attorney’s Office in response to your below request. Please note that we are invoking an extension of time under Government Code section 6253(c) due to the need to search for, collect, and appropriately examine a voluminous amount of separate and distinct records. We will endeavor to process your request as quickly as possible and anticipate responding by March 15, 2021.

Please send replies to cityattorney@sfcityatty.org

Best,
From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2021 7:32 PM
To: Supervisor Records (CAT) <supervisor.records@SFCITYATTY.ORG>; Carlin, Michael (PUC) <mcarlin@sfwater.org>; Brad Russi (Deputy City Attorney, SF) <brad.russi@sfgov.org>; Givner, Jon (CAT) <Jon.Givner@sfcityatty.org>; Dennis Herrera (City Attorney, SF) <dennis.herrera@sfgov.org>; Cote, John (CAT) <John.Cote@sfcityatty.org>; Parent, Randy (CAT) <Randy.Parent@sfcityatty.org>; CityAttorney (CAT) <cityattorney@SFCITYATTY.ORG>; Feitelberg, Brittany (CAT) <Brittany.Feitelberg@sfcityatty.org>
Subject: Re: Your Own Kelly Records - Immediate Disclosure Request - 8a,b

Given that none of you are turning over any records the next question is what ties each of you have to Mr. Kelly and what incentives you may have to protect him.

This is the 8th of 8 of this set of requests - for all requests 1a through 8b - please provide rolling responses.

All requests below include City of San Jose v Superior Court searches of ALL accounts/servers/devices, regardless of whether they are owned by the City or not. Preserve all records until the final adjudication of all appeals. Justify every redaction or withholding to a specific legal citation in writing. We may appeal all withholdings of any information.

The "Former Officials" are Harlan Kelly Jr., Juliet Ellis, and Naomi Kelly.

The "Financially Interested Parties" are defined as (READ CAREFULLY THIS ONE IS DIFFERENT THAN THE OTHERS):

- Derived from FPPC filings: Jim Rally, SF Community Investment Fund, University of San Francisco, 2018 San Francisco Inaugural Fund, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, Drew School, Soha Engineers
- Others: Walter Wong, Florence Kong, W. Wong Construction Co. Inc.; Jaidin International Ventures, LLC; Jaidin Consulting Group, LLC; SfI & W Partnership; Center Cafe; Construction Center, Inc.; Pacific Star Capital, LLC; Recology Inc. and its affiliates.
- Herrera parties: San Francisco Parks Alliance
The "Subject Parties" are defined as: the Former Officials and the Financially Interested Parties.

To Mr. Cote ("You"):

8a) This is an immediate disclosure request for all phone call logs (including metadata such as date/time/duration/direction (outgoing vs incoming) of call), phone call or meeting recordings, voicemails, emails, calendar invites, meeting entries, texts, chats, IMs, or communications in any physical or electronic form sent or received by you where any of the Subject Parties is any party in the communication and another party is YOU, including after anyone left city employment. YOU MUST PRODUCE EXACT COPIES OF ALL ELECTRONIC RECORDS, preserving all hyperlinks, urls, To/From/Cc AND Bcc email addresses, images, participants in all conversations, timestamps, attachments, invitee lists, attendee statuses, and all other non-exempt parts of the record. See SOTF Orders 19044, 19047, 19097, 19098, and 19119. Consult Dept of Technology on how to produce exact electronic records.

8b) This is an immediate disclosure request for all payments, offers of pay, invoices, promissory notes, or evidence of indebtedness, regardless of whether the document is merely a draft and not executed or unpaid, where any party is one of the Subject Parties and another party is either YOU or any LLC, trust, partnership, unincorporated association, or corporation (whether or not for profit) that you have any financial interest in, or that has ever provided you with a W-2 or a 1099-MISC, or for which you are on the board - excluding publicly-traded corporations - without time limitation. You must produce records in your constructive possession, which includes records by your contractors which you have the legal or contractual right to access (see Community Youth Athletic Center v City of National City). YOU MUST PRODUCE EXACT COPIES OF ALL ELECTRONIC RECORDS, preserving all hyperlinks, urls, To/From/Cc AND Bcc email addresses, images, participants in all conversations, timestamps, attachments, invitee lists, attendee statuses, and all other non-exempt parts of the record. See SOTF Orders 19044, 19047, 19097, 19098, and 19119. Consult Dept of Technology on how to produce exact electronic records.

The City will soon receive additional requests to others for similar records. Each of the requests must get a distinct determination under Gov Code 6253(c) of whether or not you have responsive records.

NOTE: 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,
Anonymous

-------- Original Message --------

On Wednesday, February 17th, 2021 at 7:18 PM, Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:

Given that none of you are turning over any records the next question is what ties each of you have to Mr. Kelly and what incentives you may have to protect him.

All requests below include City of San Jose v Superior Court searches of ALL accounts/servers/devices, regardless of whether they are owned by the City or not. Preserve all records until the final adjudication of all appeals. Justify every redaction or withholding to a specific legal citation in writing. We may appeal all withholdings of any information.

The "Former Officials" are Harlan Kelly Jr., Juliet Ellis, and Naomi Kelly.

The "Financiably Interested Parties" are defined as (READ CAREFULLY THIS ONE IS DIFFERENT THAN THE OTHERS):

- Derived from FPPC filings: Jim Rally, SF Community Investment Fund, University of San Francisco, 2018 San Francisco Inaugural Fund, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, Drew School, Soha Engineers
- Others: Walter Wong, Florence Kong, W. Wong Construction Co. Inc.; Jaidin International Ventures, LLC; Jaidin Consulting Group, LLC; Sfl & W Partnership; Center Cafe; Construction Center, Inc.; Pacific Star Capital, LLC; Recology Inc. and its affiliates.
- Herrera parties: San Francisco Parks Alliance

The "Subject Parties" are defined as: the Former Officials and the Financially Interested Parties.

To Ms. Feitelberg ("You"): 
Although Feitelberg is officially some sort of claims investigator, it appears that she actually routes Herrera's electronic communications through her accounts for whatever reasons, per prior records disclosures.

7a) This is an immediate disclosure request for all phone call logs (including metadata such as date/time/duration/direction (outgoing vs incoming) of call), phone call or meeting recordings, voicemails, emails, calendar invites, meeting entries, texts, chats, IMs, or communications in any physical or electronic form sent or received by you where any of the Subject Parties is any party in the communication and another party is YOU, including after anyone left city employment. YOU MUST PRODUCE EXACT COPIES OF ALL ELECTRONIC RECORDS, preserving all hyperlinks, urls, To/From/Cc AND Bcc email addresses, images, participants in all conversations, timestamps, attachments, invitee lists, attendee statuses, and all other non-exempt parts of the record. See SOTF Orders 19044, 19047, 19097, 19098, and 19119. Consult Dept of Technology on how to produce exact electronic records.

7b) This is an immediate disclosure request for all payments, offers of pay, invoices, promissory notes, or evidence of indebtedness, regardless of whether the document is merely a draft and not executed or unpaid, where any party is one of the Subject Parties and another party is either YOU or any LLC, trust, partnership, unincorporated association, or corporation (whether or not for profit) that you have any financial interest in, or that has ever provided you with a W-2 or a 1099-MISC, or for which you are on the board - excluding publicly-traded corporations - without time limitation. You must produce records in your constructive possession, which includes records by your contractors which you have the legal or contractual right to access (see Community Youth Athletic Center v City of National City). YOU MUST PRODUCE EXACT COPIES OF ALL ELECTRONIC RECORDS, preserving all hyperlinks, urls, To/From/Cc AND Bcc email addresses, images, participants in all conversations, timestamps, attachments, invitee lists, attendee statuses, and all other non-exempt parts of the record. See SOTF Orders 19044, 19047, 19097, 19098, and 19119. Consult Dept of Technology on how to produce exact electronic records.

The City will soon receive additional requests to others for similar records. Each of the requests must get a distinct determination under Gov Code 6253(c) of whether or not you have responsive records.

NOTE: 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of
your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

-------- Original Message --------

On Wednesday, February 17th, 2021 at 7:04 PM, Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:

Given that none of you are turning over any records the next question is what ties each of you have to Mr. Kelly and what incentives you may have to protect him.

All requests below include City of San Jose v Superior Court searches of ALL accounts/servers/devices, regardless of whether they are owned by the City or not. Preserve all records until the final adjudication of all appeals. Justify every redaction or withholding to a specific legal citation in writing. We may appeal all withholdings of any information.

The "Former Officials" are Harlan Kelly Jr., Juliet Ellis, and Naomi Kelly.

The "Financially Interested Parties" are defined as (READ CAREFULLY THIS ONE IS DIFFERENT THAN THE OTHERS):
- Derived from FPPC filings: Jim Rally, SF Community Investment Fund, University of San Francisco, 2018 San Francisco Inaugural Fund, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, Drew School, Soha Engineers
- Others: Walter Wong, Florence Kong, W. Wong Construction Co. Inc.; Jaidin International Ventures, LLC; Jaidin Consulting Group, LLC; Sfl & W Partnership; Center Cafe; Construction Center, Inc.; Pacific Star Capital, LLC; Recology Inc. and its affiliates.
- Herrera parties: San Francisco Parks Alliance

The "Subject Parties" are defined as: the Former Officials and the Financially Interested Parties.

To City Attorney Herrera ("You"):

6a) This is an immediate disclosure request for all phone call logs (including metadata such as date/time/duration/direction (outgoing vs incoming) of call), phone call or meeting recordings, voicemails, emails, calendar invites, meeting entries, texts, chats, IMs, or communications in any physical or electronic form sent or received by you where any of the Subject Parties is any party in the communication and another party is YOU, including after anyone left city employment. YOU MUST PRODUCE EXACT COPIES OF ALL ELECTRONIC RECORDS, preserving all hyperlinks, urls, To/From/Cc AND Bcc email addresses, images, participants in all conversations, timestamps, attachments, invitee lists, attendee statuses, and all other non-exempt parts of the record. See SOTF Orders 19044, 19047, 19097, 19098, and 19119. Consult Dept of Technology on how to produce exact electronic records.

6b) This is an immediate disclosure request for all payments, offers of pay, invoices, promissory notes, or evidence of indebtedness, regardless of whether the document is merely a draft and not executed or unpaid, where any party is one of the Subject Parties and another party is either YOU or any LLC, trust, partnership, unincorporated association, or corporation (whether or not for profit) that you have any financial interest in, or that has ever provided you with a W-2 or
a 1099-MISC, or for which you are on the board - excluding publicly-traded corporations - without time limitation. You must produce records in your constructive possession, which includes records by your contractors which you have the legal or contractual right to access (see Community Youth Athletic Center v City of National City). YOU MUST PRODUCE EXACT COPIES OF ALL ELECTRONIC RECORDS, preserving all hyperlinks, urls, To/From/Cc AND Bcc email addresses, images, participants in all conversations, timestamps, attachments, invitee lists, attendee statuses, and all other non-exempt parts of the record. See SOTF Orders 19044, 19047, 19097, 19098, and 19119. Consult Dept of Technology on how to produce exact electronic records.

The City will soon receive additional requests to others for similar records. Each of the requests must get a distinct determination under Gov Code 6253(c) of whether or not you have responsive records.

**NOTE:** 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

------- Original Message -------
On Wednesday, February 17th, 2021 at 6:53 PM, Anonymous
<arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:

Given that none of you are turning over any records the next question is what ties each of you have to Mr. Kelly and what incentives you may have to protect him.

All requests below include City of San Jose v Superior Court searches of ALL accounts/servers/devices, regardless of whether they are owned by the City or not. Preserve all records until the final adjudication of all appeals. Justify every redaction or withholding to a specific legal citation in writing. We may appeal all withholdings of any information.

The "Former Officials" are Harlan Kelly Jr., Juliet Ellis, and Naomi Kelly.

The "Financially Interested Parties" are defined as:

- Derived from FPPC filings: Jim Rally, SF Community Investment Fund, University of San Francisco, 2018 San Francisco Inaugural Fund, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, Drew School, Soha Engineers
- Others: Walter Wong, Florence Kong, W. Wong Construction Co. Inc.; Jaidin International Ventures, LLC; Jaidin Consulting Group, LLC; Sfl & W Partnership; Center Cafe; Construction Center, Inc.; Pacific Star Capital, LLC; Recology Inc. and its affiliates.

The "Subject Parties" are defined as: the Former Officials and the Financially Interested Parties.

To City Attorney Herrera ("You"):

5a) This is an immediate disclosure request for all phone call logs (including metadata such as date/time/duration/direction (outgoing vs incoming) of call), phone call or meeting recordings, voicemails, emails, calendar invites, meeting entries, texts, chats,
IMs, or communications in any physical or electronic form sent or received by you where any of the Subject Parties is any party in the communication and another party is YOU, including after anyone left city employment. YOU MUST PRODUCE EXACT COPIES OF ALL ELECTRONIC RECORDS, preserving all hyperlinks, urls, To/From/Cc AND Bcc email addresses, images, participants in all conversations, timestamps, attachments, invitee lists, attendee statuses, and all other non-exempt parts of the record. See SOTF Orders 19044, 19047, 19097, 19098, and 19119. Consult Dept of Technology on how to produce exact electronic records.

5b) This is an immediate disclosure request for all payments, offers of pay, invoices, promissory notes, or evidence of indebtedness, regardless of whether the document is merely a draft and not executed or unpaid, where any party is one of the Subject Parties and another party is either YOU or any LLC, trust, partnership, unincorporated association, or corporation (whether or not for profit) that you have any financial interest in, or that has ever provided you with a W-2 or a 1099-MISC, or for which you are on the board - excluding publicly-traded corporations - without time limitation. You must produce records in your constructive possession, which includes records by your contractors which you have the legal or contractual right to access (see Community Youth Athletic Center v City of National City). YOU MUST PRODUCE EXACT COPIES OF ALL ELECTRONIC RECORDS, preserving all hyperlinks, urls, To/From/Cc AND Bcc email addresses, images, participants in all conversations, timestamps, attachments, invitee lists, attendee statuses, and all other non-exempt parts of the record. See SOTF Orders 19044, 19047, 19097, 19098, and 19119. Consult Dept of Technology on how to produce exact electronic records.

The City will soon receive additional requests to others for similar records. Each of the requests must get a distinct determination under Gov Code 6253(c) of whether or not you have responsive records.

**NOTE:** 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I
will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

-------- Original Message --------
On Wednesday, February 17th, 2021 at 6:47 PM, Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:

Given that none of you are turning over any records the next question is what ties each of you have to Mr. Kelly and what incentives you may have to protect him.

All requests below include City of San Jose v Superior Court searches of ALL accounts/servers/devices, regardless of whether they are owned by the City or not. Preserve all records until the final adjudication of all appeals. Justify every redaction or withholding to a specific legal citation in writing. We may appeal all withholdings of any information.

The "Former Officials" are Harlan Kelly Jr., Juliet Ellis, and Naomi Kelly.
The "Financially Interested Parties" are defined as:

- Derived from FPPC filings: Jim Rally, SF Community Investment Fund, University of San Francisco, 2018 San Francisco Inaugural Fund, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, Drew School, Soha Engineers
- Others: Walter Wong, Florence Kong, W. Wong Construction Co. Inc.; Jaidin International Ventures, LLC; Jaidin Consulting Group, LLC; Sf & W Partnership; Center Cafe; Construction Center, Inc.; Pacific Star Capital, LLC; Recology Inc. and its affiliates.

The "Subject Parties" are defined as: the Former Officials and the Financially Interested Parties.

To DCA Givner ("You"):

4a) This is an immediate disclosure request for all phone call logs (including metadata such as date/time/duration/direction (outgoing vs incoming) of call), phone call or meeting recordings, voicemails, emails, calendar invites, meeting entries, texts, chats, IMs, or communications in any physical or electronic form sent or received by you where any of the Subject Parties is any party in the communication and another party is YOU, including after anyone left city employment. YOU MUST PRODUCE EXACT COPIES OF ALL ELECTRONIC RECORDS, preserving all hyperlinks, urls, To/From/Cc AND Bcc email addresses, images, participants in all conversations, timestamps, attachments, invitee lists, attendee statuses, and all other non-exempt
4b) This is an immediate disclosure request for all payments, offers of pay, invoices, promissory notes, or evidence of indebtedness, regardless of whether the document is merely a draft and not executed or unpaid, where any party is one of the Subject Parties and another party is either YOU or any LLC, trust, partnership, unincorporated association, or corporation (whether or not for profit) that you have any financial interest in, or that has ever provided you with a W-2 or a 1099-MISC, or for which you are on the board - excluding publicly-traded corporations - without time limitation. You must produce records in your constructive possession, which includes records by your contractors which you have the legal or contractual right to access (see Community Youth Athletic Center v City of National City). YOU MUST PRODUCE EXACT COPIES OF ALL ELECTRONIC RECORDS, preserving all hyperlinks, urls, To/From/Cc AND Bcc email addresses, images, participants in all conversations, timestamps, attachments, invitee lists, attendee statuses, and all other non-exempt parts of the record. See SOTF Orders 19044, 19047, 19097, 19098, and 19119. Consult Dept of Technology on how to produce exact electronic records.

The City will soon receive additional requests to others for similar records. Each of the requests must get a distinct determination under Gov Code 6253(c) of whether or not you have responsive records.
NOTE: 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

------- Original Message -------

On Wednesday, February 17th, 2021 at 6:45 PM, Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:

Given that none of you are turning over any records the next question is what ties each of you have to Mr. Kelly and what incentives you may have to protect him.
All requests below include City of San Jose v Superior Court searches of ALL accounts/servers/devices, regardless of whether they are owned by the City or not. Preserve all records until the final adjudication of all appeals. Justify every redaction or withholding to a specific legal citation in writing. We may appeal all withholdings of any information.

The "Former Officials" are Harlan Kelly Jr., Juliet Ellis, and Naomi Kelly.

The "Financially Interested Parties" are defined as:

- Derived from FPPC filings: Jim Rally, SF Community Investment Fund, University of San Francisco, 2018 San Francisco Inaugural Fund, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, Drew School, Soha Engineers
Ventures, LLC; Jaidin Consulting Group, LLC; Sfl & W Partnership; Center Cafe; Construction Center, Inc.; Pacific Star Capital, LLC; Recology Inc. and its affiliates.

The "Subject Parties" are defined as: the Former Officials and the Financially Interested Parties.

To DCA Russi ("You"):

3a) This is an immediate disclosure request for all phone call logs (including metadata such as date/time/duration/direction (outgoing vs incoming) of call), phone call or meeting recordings, voicemails, emails, calendar invites, meeting entries, texts, chats, IMs, or communications in any physical or electronic form sent or received by you where any of the Subject Parties is any party in the communication and another party is YOU, including after anyone left city employment. YOU MUST PRODUCE EXACT COPIES OF ALL
ELECTRONIC RECORDS, preserving all hyperlinks, urls, To/From/Cc AND Bcc email addresses, images, participants in all conversations, timestamps, attachments, invitee lists, attendee statuses, and all other non-exempt parts of the record. See SOTF Orders 19044, 19047, 19097, 19098, and 19119. Consult Dept of Technology on how to produce exact electronic records.

3b) This is an immediate disclosure request for all payments, offers of pay, invoices, promissory notes, or evidence of indebtedness, regardless of whether the document is merely a draft and not executed or unpaid, where any party is one of the Subject Parties and another party is either YOU or any LLC, trust, partnership, unincorporated association, or corporation (whether or not for profit) that you have any financial interest in, or that has ever provided you with a W-2 or a 1099-MISC, or for which you are on the board - excluding publicly-traded corporations - without time limitation. You
must produce records in your *constructive possession*, which includes records by your contractors which you have the legal or contractual right to access (see *Community Youth Athletic Center v City of National City*). YOU MUST PRODUCE EXACT COPIES OF ALL ELECTRONIC RECORDS, preserving all hyperlinks, urls, To/From/Cc AND Bcc email addresses, images, participants in all conversations, timestamps, attachments, invitee lists, attendee statuses, and all other non-exempt parts of the record. See SOTF Orders 19044, 19047, 19097, 19098, and 19119. Consult Dept of Technology on how to produce exact electronic records.

The City will soon receive additional requests to others for similar records. Each of the requests must get a distinct determination under Gov Code 6253(c) of whether or not you have responsive records.

**NOTE:** 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be
disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.

2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness.

3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.

4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

On Wednesday, February 17th, 2021 at 6:39 PM, Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:
Complaint Anonymous v Herrera, et al., May 9, 2021

Sunshine Ordinance Task Force:

Please file a complaint Anonymous v Dennis Herrera, John Cote, Brad Russi, Jon Givner, Randy Parent, Brittany Feitelberg, Office of the City Attorney. Allegations: violation of CPRA Gov Code 6253(c) for failing to provide a notice of disclosable public records within 24 days of a request and unreasonable delay; SFAC §67.21 for an untimely and incomplete response to a records request; SFAC §67.27 for withholding information without an appropriate written legal justification; SFAC §67.26 for withholding more than the minimum exempt information; SFAC §67.34 official misconduct by willfully violating the Ordinance. You should take as proven any allegation not specifically denied by the Respondents. (Supervisor of Records: This is also a petition under Admin Code §67.21(d) to determine in writing that any records not provided are are public, and to order them disclosed.)

1. As of May 8, the City Attorney’s office has not responded to any of the Feb 17, 2021 requests attached in Exhibit A, regarding certain potential financial ties between their employees and various parties directly or indirectly related to the ongoing corruption investigation, requests I issued due to their refusal to order the Harlan Kelly-Walter Wong texts disclosed for over half a year (though, of course, by law I am not required to have any particular reason to receive any records). After these requests were filed, Herrera did finally respond to my earlier Harlan Kelly petition (denying the petition). Note that none of the requests in Exhibit A have had a notice of determination of disclosable public records as required in Gov Code 6253(c).

2. Moreover, as detailed in paragraphs 10 through 20, Respondents have not responded in order to retaliate against me for filing complaints against them and to coerce me not to file complaints, and so I also allege willful violation and official misconduct (Admin Code 67.34).
3. Herrera’s global invocation of the rule of reason is retaliatory and in-

3. April 13, 2021. Susan Dyer Reynolds (Marina Times). “BREAKING: In Oct. 2020, Harlan Kelly and Juliet Ellis personally asked the City Controller to conduct an audit of the SFPUC Community Benefits program. But Rosenfield had accepted gifts from Harlan, including a private movie screening;” “BREAKING: Most disturbing, Harlan invited the City Controller and his family to join his family for a ‘weekend’ at Hetch Hetchy, and offered him $20-$30 a night stays in the cabins reserved for top brass — all paid for by the ratepayers.” https://twitter.com/TheMarinaTimes/status/138201916105572352 and https://twitter.com/TheMarinaTimes/status/1382013242055122945
6. April 21, 2021. HDizz. “Here are text messages from @LondonBreed comparing homeless people to "zombies" and calling them "crazy" and @SFPDChief Scott calling them "addicts." Is it any surprise business owners and wealthy residents feel emboldened to treat them as inhuman? Here is @LondonBreed demanding @SFPDChief Scott and disgraced DPW head Nuru sweep homeless people out of sight explicitly to support businesses, tourism and conventions to avoid being "embarrassed." Thanks to @journo_anon for the records request, full dump here including a ton more sweeps as Breed goes about her day seeing poor people to remove from sight.” https://twitter.com/dizz_h/status/1384948658043502596
7. May 25, 2020. HDizz. “Here’s a bunch of texts SF Mayor @LondonBreed sent to the chief of police personally telling him to conduct homeless sweeps to cater to businesses, and seemingly because she didn’t want to see them while eating lunch? Full text dump here: https://ibb.co/NLHWwDx Source including searchable PDFs: https://twitter.com/dizz_h/status/1384948658043502596
valid: Herrera claims a global rule of reason invocation to arbitrarily delay all responses, past, present and future, to any of my records requests beyond the legal time limits set by the CPRA or Sunshine Ordinance, without limitation to any specific requests, timespans, volume of records, or any other particularized reason (though they are not even certain which requests are mine, as they are all anonymous, and they cannot force a requester to identify themselves).

4. **Merit and Intent of Requests and Complaints:** Herrera cites in the invocation of the rule of reason his personal beliefs about the unimportance of my work and his opinion that it does not serve the “core goals” of the PRA/Sunshine Ordinance. Though I have no obligation to defend myself, unfortunately for Herrera, there is in fact broad public interest in my work:

A. My requests, the records produced in response, and the way the City treats my requests have been widely cited\(^1\), \(^2\), \(^3\), \(^4\), \(^5\), \(^6\), \(^7\), \(^8\), \(^9\), \(^10\), \(^11\), \(^12\), \(^13\) and reported on by at least *KQED, KTVU, Marina Times, Mission Local, San Francisco Chronicle, The San Francisco Examiner, SFist, and Westside Observer* for repeatedly exposing public officials acting in ways they would rather keep hidden. My “audit” that Herrera pooh-poohs directly furthers the purpose of the Sunshine Ordinance.\(^14\)

B. In at least one instance, the content of public records I retrieved\(^15\) are directly referenced in a federal criminal complaint\(^16\) alleging corruption by a senior City official – but my records request exposed the allegedly incriminating material to

---

\(^1\) Admin Code 67.1(c): “Although California has a long tradition of laws designed to protect the public’s access to the workings of government, every generation of governmental leaders includes officials who feel more comfortable conducting public business away from the scrutiny of those who elect and employ them. New approaches to government constantly offer public officials additional ways to hide the making of public policy from the public.”

\(^2\) [https://www.documentcloud.org/app?q=%2Bdata__mr_request%3A%2294992%22](https://www.documentcloud.org/app?q=%2Bdata__mr_request%3A%2294992%22); records which I caused to be released in July 2020. See also SOTF 20084 *Anonymous v Harlan Kelly Jr. and Public Utilities Commission*


For example, Para 12: “KELLY communicated by text with WONG about KELLY’s efforts to delay the deadline for bidding on the LED contract, stating in one text to WONG, as WONG was trying to prepare his bid, that the PUC was delaying the deadline. Ten days later, as WONG was still preparing his bid, KELLY texted: “You told me []that you had everything? I don’t know what to do? I don’t know how to stop the process anymore.” KELLY used his cell phone for these texts to WONG, rather than his official email, despite the fact that the subject matter related to official PUC business.”

Para 31: “Four days before proposals were due under the amended RFP, on January 5, 2015, KELLY texted WONG: “We are going to postpone the LED light date.” He also provided WONG with a name and number of an individual in the East Bay who had attended the pre-proposal conference in December. WONG replied “Till when,” to which KELLY responded: “Weeks.” (The due date for the RFP was in fact delayed, as noted below.) Later that night, WONG and KELLY again exchanged text messages, and WONG informed KELLY “we also submit the LBE paper hope this can be final review from them hope u can help to check if they got a require Document.”
the public many months prior to the criminal charges. Moreover, my requests for personal-property communications of officials prior to their resignation or termination have preserved those records, which otherwise would no longer be available to the public post-termination.

C. According to KQED, Supervisor Haney has stated that one set of records I requested and then (successfully) fought for months to get Herrera to release “is an example of the incestuous relationships at the highest reaches of government,” Supervisor Mar believed they were “concerning new evidence of the culture of casual corruption that is unfortunately not limited to one agency or individual,” and Supervisor Peskin said the records raised “very serious questions not only about what the general manager of the PUC knew, and favors he appears to be taking, but what the city administrator of San Francisco, who is his spouse and cohabitant, knew,” were “deeply troubling,” and had “the appearance of, if not the fact of, a government contract funded by the taxpayers being given to a vendor who is giving cut-rate services to a government employee for said favors.”

D. Public records I released were later cited that same day by the public to the Board of Supervisors to oppose proposed legislation during public comment.

E. In another instance, my records request and argument made therein convinced an agency to voluntarily correct an erroneous determination by this Task Force against a different complainant that records of internal staff meetings (which are not “public meetings”) were not public records.

F. In yet another instance, another SOTF complainant fighting for over 1.5 years for records of a financial paper trail for failed Green Benefits Districts received at least some of the missing records through my persistent requests.

G. My request to verify compliance with the then-current ruling in Knight First Amendment Institute v Trump, caused District Attorney Boudin to cease block-

---

17 See footnote 4
18 April 21, 2021, Budget Committee of the Board of Supervisors, Public comment, Hearing on file 201187 (Safe Sleeping Sites Program)
19 SOTF 19114 Anderies v Public Defender. Even after an Order of Determination for violation of SFAC 67.26, SOTF Compliance committee refused to require respondents to minimally redact emails about their internal meetings, accepting respondents’ incorrect argument. I requested the same records from the Public Defender with further argument and they then correctly produced the records, which I forwarded along to Anderies and his client.
20 SOTF 19061 Hooper v OEWD, SOTF 19062 Hooper v Public Works. On April 22, 2021, OEWD produced to me certain records that existed as of Hooper’s original requests that they had failed to provide Hooper. It took dozens of records requests from me – most of which had no responsive records – to finally find a portion of the previously-missing financial paper trail. https://www.documentcloud.org/app?q=%2Bproject%3Agbdhooper-202915%20 Apparently there remains one financial system known as “TGS” that they have not yet searched.
ing members of the public on Twitter.\textsuperscript{21}

H. The chief executive of MuckRock, a news non-profit, has cited the Mayor’s Office now-retracted attempt to gag me under CPRA Gov Code 6254.21 (which occurred after an alert from me) as an example of how “using the law to threaten requesters over agency mistakes is bullying that violates 1st Amendment.”\textsuperscript{22} In fact, in at least a dozen instances, I have, without any legal obligation to do so, alerted the City that its records releases endanger either personal privacy or the City’s cybersecurity.\textsuperscript{23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34}

I. In 18 out of my 19 complaints so far adjudicated by your Task Force (as of May 8, 2021), you have determined that the City violated the law. In addition to Dept of Technology’s development of the metadata tool, my complaints have resulted in:

i. retraining, by the agencies’ own admission, of at least the Police Commission\textsuperscript{35} and Sheriff’s Office\textsuperscript{36} (the latter of which had been citing locally-prohibited draft, deliberative process, balancing test, and non-existent exemptions to each and every requester for at least a year prior),

\textsuperscript{21}DA’s March 25, 2021 response to my March 24, 2021 records request
\textsuperscript{22}https://twitter.com/morisy/status/1382115879240994816
\textsuperscript{23}Oct 31, 2019 email to CIO/CISO regarding improperly applied redactions in DT records
\textsuperscript{24}Jan 17, 2020 email to Mayor’s Office, CIO, CISO regarding release of internal IP address info in City contract records
\textsuperscript{25}Jan 22, 2020 email to City Attorney’s Office, CIO, CISO regarding release of employee addresses and phone numbers on a Board of Appeals record
\textsuperscript{26}Jan 30, 2020 email to CIO/CISO regarding release of a person’s Social Security Number, drivers license, and birth date on a City website
\textsuperscript{27}July 8, 2020 email to PUC regarding release of a lock box code in the Harlan Kelly-Walter Wong records
\textsuperscript{28}July 16, 2020 email to SFPD regarding their release of Bryan Carmody’s drivers license number
\textsuperscript{29}repeated warnings in July and December 2020 and January 2021 (and associated SOTF complaint) to the City Attorney’s Office that they too had released Bryan Carmody’s drivers license information, with no acknowledgment until March 2021
\textsuperscript{30}Dec 18, 2020 voluntary redaction of Sean Elsbernd’s phone numbers and familial affairs as released by Police Commission
\textsuperscript{31}Dec 21, 2020 email to Public Works and Mayor’s Office regarding Public Works’ release of the Mayor’s personal phone number – for which I was thanked with an illegal (imperfected) and unconstitutional (see \textit{Publius v Boyer-Vine}) demand by the Mayor’s Office not to communicate the number to others (a demand which the City later had to retract)
\textsuperscript{32}Feb 25, 2021 email to City Attorney’s Office disclosing the URLs of Herrera’s release of his personal email address to a different records requester that I found online
\textsuperscript{33}Mar 15, 2021 email to CIO, CISO, and City Attorney’s Office regarding potential for widespread release of unredacted email attachment information occurring through NextRequest’s email tools.
\textsuperscript{34}April 9, 2021 email to Mayor and City Attorney’s Office regarding a second release of the Mayor’s phone number
\textsuperscript{35}SOTF 19121 \textit{Anonymous v Police Commission} committee hearing
\textsuperscript{36}SOTF 19143 and 20009 \textit{Anonymous v Sheriff’s Office} committee hearing
ii. a City-wide change in Herrera deeming officials’ future calendars disclosable (overturning his own prior rulings on the matter only after this Task Force ruled repeatedly in my favor),\(^{37}\)

iii. multiple signed consent agreements\(^{38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43}\) by city officials to comply with various provisions of the Sunshine Ordinance, and

iv. retooling of the City’s police agencies’ disclosure of SB 1421 police misconduct records – which are of the highest public importance – to comply with Sunshine.\(^{44}\)

Perhaps Herrera should have done his job “to protect and secure the rights of the people of San Francisco to access public information”\(^{45}\) instead of putting all of the above on myself and SOTF. Agencies themselves have even thanked me for doing this.\(^{46, 47, 48}\)

\(^{37}\) Herrera’s earlier determinations against me ruling that future calendars were entirely non-disclosable: Petitions 17, 19, 28, and 29 of <https://www.documentcloud.org/documents/20512730-20th-annualreport-of-the-supervisor-of-records>; SOTF rulings that future calendars are disclosable: SOTF 19103, 19112, and 19131; Herrera’s later determination that the calendars are in fact disclosable: <https://www.documentcloud.org/documents/20508643>

\(^{38}\) Mayor’s Office March 4, 2020 agreement to produce WhatsApp records <https://www.documentcloud.org/documents/6796301-Revised-Letter-Re-WhatsApp-Files.html>

\(^{39}\) Mayor’s Office May 5, 2021 agreement to produce email records as exact copies and with header metadata <https://www.documentcloud.org/documents/20699602-mayors-office-agreement-to-produce-email-metadata-letter-to-anonymous-and-sotf-re-sotf-file-no-20006-plus-attachments>

\(^{40}\) Department of Police Accountability March 30, 2021 agreement to produce audio records in SB 1421 records <https://www.documentcloud.org/documents/20699588-2021-03-30-response_anonymous_audio-files>

\(^{41}\) Department of Police Accountability May 8, 2021 agreement to produce video and index records in SB 1421 records <https://www.documentcloud.org/documents/20701369-2021-05-08-letter_anonymous_0870-09-video-and-index-records>

\(^{42}\) Department on Status of Women March 6, 2020 agreement to comply with Proposition G calendar requirements <https://www.documentcloud.org/documents/6797219-DOSW-Response-to-File-No-20043-SIGNED.html>

\(^{43}\) SFPD March 9, 2020 agreement to disclose previously-secret Gang Task Force agreements with the FBI <https://www.documentcloud.org/documents/6807695-P1034220-202020-3-920sfpd20response-pdf.html>

\(^{44}\) SOTF 19144 Anonymous v Dept of Police Accountability; SOTF 19124 Anonymous v SFPD; SOTF 20066 Anonymous v Police Commission

\(^{45}\) Admin Code 67.21(i)

\(^{46}\) April 14, 2021 email of Tyler Vu (Public Defender's Office) to me on SB 1421 records: “Again, thank you for your work in keeping government transparent. As a person working for the public good, you keep us on our toes. As a private citizen worried about democracy, I am grateful you keep us on our toes.”

\(^{47}\) March 6, 2020 email of Emily Murase (Status of Women) to SOTF on Prop G calendar requirements: “… thank you and "Anonymous" for helping to make government more transparent, an important endeavor.”

\(^{48}\) December 31, 2020 email of Linda Gerull (Chief Information Officer) to SFPD and Mayor’s Office on metadata disclosure: “I also very much appreciate and respect Anonymous’s help to be accurate, (cont.)
5. But more importantly, Herrera has no authority to pick and choose which records to provide based on his view on the merits of a request, or of a requester, or the purpose of a request or complaints. Even if no one else cared about my requests (many do, see above), courts have held that every person individually has a right to access public records, without regard to the intent or purpose of the request or purpose of suit appealing the response, even if the government believes the purpose is to “harass” the government. Public access is a right, not a privilege.

6. Volume: The sole legitimate purpose for invoking the rule of reason would be a volume of records that prevents a City agency from performing their other duties. If the City Attorney’s office itself had in fact provided a massive volume of records, the rule of reason may have been legitimate during the specific timeframe when there was in fact an overwhelming volume of records to produce, but still not perpetually and without any particularized reasoning. For example, Public Works also declared a rule of reason, but in DPW’s case they have consistently provided in a rolling fashion a very large number of records (and continue to do so even after invoking the rule of reason), and thus Public Works’ invocation of the rule of reason, but not Herrera’s, was reasonable (on the basis of volume, but not any complete and build a solid understanding of why we would and would not release certain meta data fields.”

49 Admin Code 67.1(b): “The people do not cede to [elected officials] the right to decide what the people should know about the operations of local government.”

50 “Under the CPRA, there are “no limitations on access to a public record based upon the purpose for which the record is being requested, if the record is otherwise subject to disclosure.” (§ 6257.5.) Generally, “unless exempted, all public records may be examined by any member of the public, often the press, but conceivably any person with no greater interest than idle curiosity.” (Marylander v. Superior Court (2000) 81 Cal.App.4th 1119, 1125, 97 Cal.Rptr.2d 439.)” (Weaver v. Superior Court, 224 Cal.App.4th 746, 749 n.2 (Cal. Ct. App. 2014))

51 “The CPRA makes clear that "every person" has a right to inspect any public record (§ 6253, subd. (a)), for any purpose (§ 6257.5), subject to certain exemptions, including those found in sections 6254 and 6255.” (Los Angeles v. Superior Court, 82 Cal.App.4th 819, 825 (Cal. Ct. App. 2000))

52 The Court of Appeal points out the following (Harrell v. Superior Court, C085484, 15-16 (Cal. Ct. App. Jul. 27, 2018), unpublished, regarding whether a petitioner is a prevailing party in PRA litigation, and thus should win costs and fees):

“The fact that petitioners may have been motivated to make their record requests and even to file actions under the Act to harass the District does not change our conclusion. Indeed, Government Code section 6257.5 provides: "This chapter does not allow limitations on access to a public record based upon the purpose for which the record is being requested, if the record is otherwise subject to disclosure." "[T]he motive of the particular requester is irrelevant; the question instead is whether disclosure serves the public interest. "The Public Records Act does not differentiate among those who seek access to public information." " (County of Santa Clara v. Superior Court (2009) 170 Cal.App.4th 1301, 1324.) "The purpose of the requesting party in seeking disclosure cannot be considered." (City of San Jose v. Superior Court (1999) 74 Cal.App.4th 1008, 1018.) ... Rather, the proper determination is whether the District should have released the requested materials without litigation, and whether it eventually did disclose documents due to the suit. Here, the answer to both questions is yes.”

53 The other Supreme Court-defined justifications for the rule of reason, destruction or mutilation of records, have no relevance here.
other basis). The SFPD, Police Commission, and DPA also invoked the rule of reason in the case of SB 1421 records requests because the volume of such records is enormous and the records must be provided in rolling fashion across months and years to everyone – again this is reasonable and valid.

7. But the City Attorney’s office has not actually provided much in the way of volume of records and thus their invocation of the rule of reason is not valid.54

8. In the case of this complaint, not only have they not provided any records in over 2.5 months, they have not even informed me whether any responsive disclosable public records exist with an explanation as required by Gov Code 6253(c). Respondents’ own estimate on March 15 (almost one full month after the request) stated “We are working on your request; however, we currently anticipate needing an additional two weeks to respond.” Respondents have said nothing at all since March 15, as of May 8.

9. Unlike the other agencies declaring a rule of reason, Herrera also does not provide rolling responses under 67.25(d), holding all records hostage until the entire request (or in this case separate requests) can be responded to whenever he feels like it. Admin Code 67.25(d) is very specific: it requires that records be provided by the end of the business day they are reviewed, without waiting for all the rest of records. Consider the last genuinely-voluminous response provided by the City Attorney’s office to me (which was in 2019, a response you found nevertheless violated the law in SOTF 19120): all records were provided at once even though it defies common sense to believe that roughly 2000 pages could have been reviewed and redacted in a single business day.

10. Retaliation against Complaints: But Herrera already knows all of this, as the City Attorney’s permanent invocation of the rule of reason against all requests I have filed that are in progress and may ever file in the future explicitly cites my filing of complaints and my insistence that they strictly comply with all the provisions of the Ordinance, as valid reasons to reduce my rights of public access (not the volume of records produced) – which is nothing less than retaliation based on the exercise of a constitutionally protected right to access records and legally protected right of appeal. Note I am not inferring this intent – Herrera explicitly

54As an example, this Task Force unanimously found the Fine Arts Museums in violation in SOTF 18049 Smith v FAMSF, directing FAMSF to produce 7,000 documents (not 7,000 pages) to Smith within one month of your order, as an incremental response to a single records request with 70,000 documents to review. That was narrowed down from an original volume of 250,000 records – even then FAMSF states it considered (but did not) invoke the rule of reason, and SOTF did not accept any such excuse. Even if you summed up every request I have ever issued to the City Attorney’s Office across a span of 2 years the volume could not come close to that one Smith-FAMSF request, and moreover Herrera has not provided any meaningful volume at all in 2021.
cites this basis in his invocation of the rule of reason.

11. Herrera has no right to demand that I do not file complaints against him or refrain from enforcing the entirety of the Ordinance, no right to coerce me to stop filing complaints by manipulating records release on that basis, and cannot punish me for doing either.

12. If SOTF upholds arbitrary delays on records requests based on the filing of complaints (instead of the sole valid reasons: the destruction or mutilation, or overwhelming volume of records), SOTF will set a precedent that agencies can lawfully retaliate against complainants. Consider, analogously, another city agency using complaints as a basis to reduce their lawfully required services: If you file complaints against a police officer, does SFPD now have the right not to keep your neighborhood patrolled? If you claim a DBI inspector is harassing you, do they get to slow walk your permits?

13. To Herrera, the City’s perpetual violations of the law (in which he is complicit, as his advice to agencies and own decisions are often deemed wrong by SOTF) are mere “minor errors” to be handled without SOTF; yet the Sunshine Ordinance states: “Public officials who attempt to conduct the public’s business in secret should be held accountable for their actions. Only a strong Open Government and Sunshine Ordinance, enforced by a strong Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, can protect the public’s interest in open government.”

14. Moreover, many of my wins have been hard fought, and rarely are agencies willing to comply without the perpetual threat of enforcement, Herrera least of all. I will continue to hold each and every public official to the legal standards defined in the Ordinance. Herrera’s sole appropriate option is to correct non-compliance. As an Office that advertises on its website as being “one of the most aggressive ... city law departments in the nation,”[^55] they can hardly complain that I am just as aggressive as them – but in defending the Ordinance instead of chipping away at it. And no one, not Herrera, nor the Ethics Commission, nor the District Attorney, is willing to hold officials accountable for violating the Ordinance, except SOTF (I also give officials the option of signing consent agreements to hold themselves accountable; Herrera has rejected this option).

15. The Sunshine Ordinance’s requirements for justification, keys, minimal redactions, electronic formats, recording calendar info, and more are not mere suggestions available only to members of the public who fight tooth and nail for them. They are the law for every request and every City public record, and the City Attorney’s office needs to accept that and change their procedures to fully comply, like all other agencies, instead of retaliating against me for holding them to the legal standard.

[^55]: [https://www.sfcityattorney.org/aboutus/](https://www.sfcityattorney.org/aboutus/)
16. They insist that I help resolve their violations of the law without going through the complaint process. But I have no obligation to entertain their follies – they, not I, have the obligation to learn the Sunshine Ordinance and follow it completely. They, not I, have the obligation under the Ordinance to train all the other agencies on how to comply.\textsuperscript{56} – apparently they did not do their job so members of the public have to instead. They, not I, should thus be experts in following the Ordinance.

17. I do in fact on occasion give other agencies the benefit of the doubt and a chance to correct their violations, but I do not do so, and will not do so, for the City Attorney’s office (and have absolutely no obligation to do so according to the Ordinance). The City Attorney, not the others, is specifically given the responsibility to defend the right of public access\textsuperscript{57} and to train the rest of the City to comply. And yet this Office, moreso than the others, treats the Ordinance as a series of word games to find (non-existent) loopholes in, instead of a law created by the people with the stated intent of regulating their government.\textsuperscript{58} Herrera deserves no plaudits or sympathy for eventually following the law – that he swore to uphold – after having to be dragged into compliance by SOTF for straightforward requirements of the Ordinance months or years after a request is made.

18. Moreover, Herrera does not simply immediately comply as soon as an issue is pointed out and admit the error of his ways (which one would expect when one is demanding that I should “informally” resolve complaint issues). Instead he presents excuses not to comply, why he should never had to have complied, or why he was right all along, even though he is now complying and reserving the right not to comply in the future. Most other agencies do not engage in such perpetual legal sophistry.

19. For example, the City Attorney published legal opponent and journalist Bryan Carmody’s drivers license number and other personal information, in alleged violation of a CPRA requirement that prohibits the City from disclosing DMV identifiers.\textsuperscript{59} It took over half a year for his office to acknowledge the repeated alerts I sent them about this issue – they never even replied to any of my emails. As soon as SOTF administration served them with my formal complaint, then they took action. Why should anyone give Herrera any benefit of the doubt when his attitude towards Sunshine compliance is antagonistic and begrudging at best?

20. Moreover, unlike for example Public Works, SFPD, or the Treasurer which immediately started correcting their records to comply with SOTF’s rulings, the City Attorney’s office does not actually comply with your rulings when you make them the first time, and forces repeated complaints on the same topics over and over.

\textsuperscript{56}Admin Code 67.33
\textsuperscript{57}Admin Code 67.21(i)
\textsuperscript{58}Admin Code 67.1
\textsuperscript{59}SOTF 21004 Anonymous v Herrera
again to draw out the process and beat down the public’s will until we give up or give in – I certainly will not give up.

21. Their having been brought repeatedly before you (I believe more often than any other agency) is a result of the City Attorney playing word games instead of following exactly what SOTF directs or the Sunshine Ordinance plainly says. In just my cases, you have found that Herrera and his staff violated the law on three different occasions. They are neither willing to straight-forwardly comply nor properly file for reconsideration/appeal.

22. In one instance (SOTF 19108), Herrera was personally unanimously found to have violated the law by SOTF for not recording the locations and issues discussed at his meetings in his required daily calendar. Herrera claimed that he only had to comply with the rules of Prop G when requesters tell him to clarify his meeting entries – a position completely unsupported by any legal authority. Even this issue required the filing of a complaint as he would not accept the plain meaning of the law.

23. In another instance (SOTF 19044), Herrera’s office refused to provide the approximately 5 pages you unanimously determined public for almost one year, not because it was not possible to do so, but because they simply disagreed with SOTF’s decision. Then, immediately before the hearing deadline, they provided the record. They did not file for rehearing which would follow the appropriate process when they believe SOTF is wrong. In fact, they have more recently repeated the same exact violations again, even after all their purported arguments of difficulty of manual redaction (which this Task Force had nevertheless rejected as an excuse) have been eliminated by DT’s metadata tool, forcing additional months and years more of complaint procedures for issues you already decided in my favor and against them, simply to force every such request of mine to go through SOTF and thus ensure I cannot get the information I am entitled to without unreasonable delays, all while Herrera can dodge willful violation referrals to Ethics Commission.

24. In a third instance (SOTF 19120), Respondents did not key redactions and they changed their story on the justifications for withholding before and after the complaint. You unanimously ruled against them. But Respondents claim that since you have simply voted for a motion for violations and haven’t yet copied those meeting minutes into an Order of Determination, they don’t have to comply. This delay serves absolutely no purpose.

25. VIOLATIONS:

26. Respondents have never provided the required notice of determination of disclosable public records to any of the Feb 17 requests. Violation of Gov Code 6253(c).
27. Respondents have never provided any records and thus this is an incomplete response. Violation of Admin Code 67.21(b). Note that each of the Respondents is a custodian of their own records, and I specifically made requests to each of them by email, so they are all in violation. “Custodian of a public record” is not, contrary to the City’s occasional belief, a special title that applies only to a specific person in an agency. It is defined in the ordinance as “Every person having custody of any public record or public information, as defined herein, (hereinafter referred to as a custodian of a public record)” Each of the individual respondents is a “person having custody of [ ] public record[s] or public information” and must comply.

28. Because no records have been provided, the records have been effectively withheld without written legal justification in their entirety. Violation of Admin Code 67.26 and 67.27.

29. Respondents bear the burden of proving that the records sought are NOT public. Admin Code 67.21(g), states “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.”

30. REQUEST FOR RELIEF

31. Please find that Respondents violated CPRA Gov Code 6253(c), SF Admin Code 67.21, 67.26, and/or 67.27.

32. Please order disclosed all public records not yet provided.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

60"The effect of the City’s inability or unwillingness to locate the records had the same effect as withholding requested information from the public." (Community Youth Athletic Center v. City of National City (2013) 220 Cal.App.4th 1385, 1425)

61"The City correctly states there is no evidence it intentionally withheld known responsive documents. At the hearing on the fee motion, even Sukumar’s attorney admitted there was no evidence City representatives acted in bad faith. However, bad faith is not the test. The effect of the City’s inability or unwillingness to locate and produce these documents until court-ordered discovery ensued after March 8, 2016, is tantamount to withholding requested information from a PRA request." (Sukumar v. City of San Diego (2017), 14 Cal.App.5th 451, 466; internal citations omitted)
Sent via email (88338-81670794@requests.muckrock.com)

Re: Petition to Supervisor of Records

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter responds to your petition to the Supervisor of Records dated May 28, 2021, concerning a request to the City Attorney’s Office. You contend the City Attorney’s Office unlawfully redacted information from two emails produced in response to your request.

We find that the City Attorney’s Office properly redacted portions of the emails reflecting information obtained in confidence on the basis of the official information privilege. See Gov’t Code § 6254(k); Evid. Code § 1040.

Very truly yours,

DAVID CHIU
City Attorney

Bradley A. Russi
Deputy City Attorney
To Whom It May Concern:

Please see the attached response to your petition.

Bradley Russi
Deputy City Attorney
Office of City Attorney David Chiu
City Hall, Room 234
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA 94102
www.sfcityattorney.org

San Francisco City Attorney
PRA Office
Room 234
1 Doctor Carlton B Goodlett Place
SF, CA 94102

May 28, 2021

This is a follow up to a previous request:

Supervisor of Records Herrera,

This is a petition under Admin Code 67.21(d) to determine the attached redactions public and order them disclosed.

Your office redacted this information under the Official Information Privilege.
Your office has not proven that any of this convo is prohibited from disclosure by state or federal law (EC 1040(b)(1)).
Your office also has not shown that the public interest in non-disclosure clearly outweighs the public interest in disclosure in the interests of justice (EC 1040(b)(2)).
Remember: neither Cote's, nor Herrera's, nor Tucker/Chronicle's private interests are what is measured.

And merely the apparent promise by Cote to Tucker to "not share with anyone" is not sufficient to make public records exempt. Confidential acquisition is only ONE of the requirements needed to be privileged. Also, what is redacted is BOTH Cote's message to Tucker, and Tucker's message to Cote.

How exactly is the *public* and the interests of justice harmed by this disclosure?

--Anonymous

View request history, see one related attachment, upload responsive documents, and report problems here: https://accounts.muckrock.com/accounts/login/?next=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.muckrock.com%2Faccounts%2Flogin%2F%3Fnext%3D%252Faccounts%252FAgency_login%252Fsan-francisco-city-attorney-797%252Fpublic-integrity-communications-sf-city-attorney-immediate-disclosure-request-88338%252F%253Femail%253Dsupervisor.records%252540sfcityatty.org&url_auth_token=AAAuFCORweM1NfQd1jfaYvfawl%4%3A1lmm2M%3A94Uvtw8OYeNjQUIAehh65oWJIMxM

Attachments:
- P131-132-responsive-records_redacted.pdf

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 88338-81670794@requests.muckrock.com

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 88338
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.

---

On May 27, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Public Integrity Communications (SF City Attorney) - Immediate Disclosure Request
Dear requester,

It appears that the automated tool prepared by DT is automatically redacting some information in the Description section as security information. We are continuing to work with DT to give the department feedback on the tool. In response to future requests for calendar entries with metadata, we can provide you two separate documents—the PDF calendar entry and the version produced using the DT tool.

Please send replies to cityattorney@sfcityatty.org

Best,

[signature]Elizabeth A. Coolbrith
Paralegal
Office of City Attorney Dennis Herrera
(415) 554-4685 Direct
On May 26, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Public Integrity Communications (SF City Attorney) - Immediate Disclosure Request

As mentioned in the other calendar request, you have withheld the description in https://cdn.muckrock.com/foia_files/2021/05/26/Responsive_Records_redacted.pdf as an info sec record. It isn't. If you provide the normal PDF this doesn't really matter but you haven't provided those here.

Please provide the Prop G calendar entries showing ALL meetings - telephonic, virtual, or in person or any other form - wherein Herrera and Breed discussed Breed's nomination of Herrera for PUC GM. Herrera cannot have secret meetings of any kind with Breed due to Prop G. And this issue is NOT a legal issue nor is it attorney-client privileged. This issue and its meeting(s) thus must have been recorded and must be disclosed.

Secret meetings to protect the deliberation of a government decision do not exist in San Francisco.

--Anonymous

---

On May 26, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Public Integrity Communications (SF City Attorney) - Immediate Disclosure Request

Dear requester,

I am responding on behalf of the City Attorney’s Office to your below records request. Attached please find the responsive records. Please note that we have redacted the document based on security concerns in consultation with DT pursuant to Cal. Gov't Code 6254.19. In the alternative, Cal. Evid. Code section 1040 and Cal. Gov't Code sections 6255 would also apply to these redactions.

Please send replies to cityattorney@sfcityatty.org

Best,

Elizabeth A. Coolbrith
Paralegal
Office of City Attorney Dennis Herrera
(415) 554-4685 Direct
www.sfcityattorney.org

---

On May 26, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Public Integrity Communications (SF City Attorney) - Immediate Disclosure Request

1. This is a new request: provide exact PDF copies of all emails or chats (with all embedded attachments) between your office and Heather Knight or Jill Tucker before Feb 1, 2021 of any discussion about the (then-not-yet-filed) SFUSD lawsuit AND all convos with either of them from Jan 1 2021 to Feb 1 2021. This latter clause is to avoid any argument that is made that you cannot identify each no-context messages are indeed about the SFUSD suit.

2. What follows is NOT a new request, and was required to be disclosed in https://cdn.muckrock.com/foia_files/2021/05/25/Responsive_Records_Redacted.pdf

You have provided a copy of a document starting on p. 496 above labeled a “CONFIDENTIAL DRAFT.” Please provide - without any alterations whatsoever - including the name of the file - the original document as you shared it with the
media of that document. I am asking for an exact copy of the file (i.e. the version produced to the media), in the format you previously shared it, with all the metadata - since you previously shared it, none of that metadata can be withheld from me. Note that the name of a file is a "writing" and by combining all these records into one PDF - again for reasons that are unclear, you are withholding the distinct names of each of these records. It's also unclear to me who received that confidential draft and which email it is an attachment to. Again for reasons that are unclear, in this PDF you have stripped embedded attachments - you don't normally do that. I can guess that it is "SFUSD Petition 02.02 HK.pdf" but it is unclear as it is in different order. And I don't have to guess.

Please provide an exact PDF copy of all communications with persons who are not City employees that attached or included that CONFIDENTIAL DRAFT - I want to know who got it and when.

Also, for reasons that I cannot understand you appear to have again stripped all of the hyperlinks. As I have now argued many times (and won), this unlawfully withholds the URLs - for example the many in your press releases that I cannot click on and thus cannot know what you are referring to. URLs are information. You cannot withhold any public information without a justification.

And finally, we will be challenging the EC 1040 invocation - as always you must specify which of the two exemptions you used, and neither of them allow you to hide info being traded in a "favor" between John Cote and a reporter...

None of the above in #2 is a new request - it is all information that should have been provided.

---

On May 25, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Public Integrity Communications (SF City Attorney) - Immediate Disclosure Request
Dear requester,

I am responding on behalf of the City Attorney's Office to your below records request. Attached please find the responsive records in our custody. Please note we redacted confidential information on pages 131 and 325 based on Evidence Code section 1040. Please note we also redacted personal contact information on pages 10-15, 20-25, 29-34, 38-43, 49-54, 61-66, 72-77, 138, 244-250, 255-261, 270, 288, 292, 317, 393, 395, 398, 451, 527-529, and 558 due to privacy reasons. See Cal Const., Article I, section 1; Cal. Government Code Section 6254(c), (k); Admin. Code Section 67.1(g). In addition, we redacted information that was non-responsive on pages 550 and 552-553.

Please send replies to cityattorney@sfcityatty.org<mailto:cityattorney@sfcityatty.org>

Best,

[Image010]Elizabeth A. Coolbrith
Paralegal
Office of City Attorney Dennis Herrera
(415) 554-4685 Direct
www.sfcityattorney.org

---

On Feb. 18, 2020:
Subject: California Public Records Act Request: Public Integrity Communications (SF City Attorney) - Immediate Disclosure Request
City Attorney's Office:

NOTE: THE EMAIL ADDRESS Sending THIS REQUEST IS A PUBLICLY-VIEWABLE MAILBOX. Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. All of your responses
Below are new Immediate Disclosure Requests (SF Admin Code 67.25(a)) directed to your agency and its department head.
Your initial response is required by Feb 20, 2020. Rolling records responses are requested (SFAC 67.25(d)) if you are unable to immediately produce records.

Exact copies of every responsive record are requested (Gov Code 6253(b)) - do not: provide mere URLs, print and scan electronic records, convert native files to PDFs, or provide black and white versions of any color record. Provide only copies of records not requiring fees and in-person inspection of all other records (GC 6253).

Your non-exhaustive obligations:
- All withholding of any information must be justified in writing by specific statutory authority (SFAC 67.27).
- All withholdings by masking or deletion (aka redactions) must be keyed by footnote or other clear reference to the specific justification for that redaction, and only the minimal exempt portion of any record may be withheld (SFAC 67.26).
- You must respond to emailed requests (SFAC 67.21(b)).
- You must notify us of whether or not responsive records exist and/or were withheld for each below request (Gov Code 6253(c), 6255(b)).
- You must state the name and title of each person responsible for withholding any information (Gov Code 6253(d)).
- Do not impose any end-user restrictions upon me (Santa Clara Co. vs Superior Ct, 170 Cal.App 4th 1301); so if you use a third-party website to publish records, please make them completely public without any login or sign-in.

Your agency must do all of the above things in your response, and you cannot wait until we file complaints.

****** We have no duty to, and we will not again, remind the City of its obligations. Instead, we will file complaints for every Sunshine Ordinance or CPRA violation. We will continue to file complaints until the City’s procedures are modified to fully comply with the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA, without caveat or exception. ******

1. All communications sent to the publicintegrity@sfgov.org email address since Jan 21, 2020 until present.
2. Please also provide an SFAC 67.21(c) written statement of the existence or quantity of these emails in #1 (even if you believe their contents to be exempt) within 7 days (no extensions)

Do not destroy or discard any responsive records - we will appeal all withholdings or Sunshine violations.

Thank you for your anticipated cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,
Anonymous

Attachments:
• P131-132-responsive-records_redacted.pdf

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 88338-81670794@requests.muckrock.com

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 88338
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.
Buta, Odaya (CAT)

From: 88338-81670794@requests.muckrock.com on behalf of '88338-81670794@requests.muckrock.com' <88338-81670794@requests.muckrock.com>
Sent: Friday, May 28, 2021 4:37 PM
To: Supervisor Records (CAT)
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Public Integrity Communications (SF City Attorney) - Immediate Disclosure Request
Attachments: P131-132-responsive-records_redacted.pdf

San Francisco City Attorney
PRA Office
Room 234
1 Doctor Carlton B Goodlett Place
SF, CA 94102

May 28, 2021

This is a follow up to a previous request:

Supervisor of Records Herrera,

This is a petition under Admin Code 67.21(d) to determine the attached redactions public and order them disclosed.

Your office redacted this information under the Official Information Privilege. Your office has not proven that any of this convo is prohibited from disclosure by state or federal law (EC 1040(b)(1)). Your office also has not shown that the public interest in non-disclosure clearly outweighs the public interest in disclosure in the interests of justice (EC 1040(b)(2)).

Remember: neither Cote's, nor Herrera's, nor Tucker/Chronicle's private interests are what is measured.

And merely the apparent promise by Cote to Tucker to "not share with anyone" is not sufficient to make public records exempt. Confidential acquisition is only ONE of the requirements needed to be privileged. Also, what is redacted is BOTH Cote's message to Tucker, and Tucker's message to Cote.

How exactly is the *public* and the interests of justice harmed by this disclosure?

--Anonymous

fawL4%3A1lmm2M%3A94Uvtw8OpYeNjqU1Aeh65oWJxM

Attachments:
• P131-132-responsive-records_redacted.pdf
On May 27, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Public Integrity Communications (SF City Attorney) - Immediate Disclosure Request
Dear requester,

It appears that the automated tool prepared by DT is automatically redacting some information in the Description section as security information. We are continuing to work with DT to give the department feedback on the tool. In response to future requests for calendar entries with metadata, we can provide you two separate documents—the PDF calendar entry and the version produced using the DT tool.

Please send replies to cityattorney@sfcityatty.org

Best,

[Image]

Elizabeth A. Coolbrith
Paralegal
Office of City Attorney Dennis Herrera
(415) 554-4685 Direct
www.sfcityattorney.org

---

On May 26, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Public Integrity Communications (SF City Attorney) - Immediate Disclosure Request
As mentioned in the other calendar request, you have withheld the description in https://cdn.muckrock.com/foia_files/2021/05/26/Responsive_Records_redacted.pdf as an info sec record. It isn't. If you provide the normal PDF this doesn't really matter but you haven't provided those here.

Please provide the Prop G calendar entries showing ALL meetings - telephonic, virtual, or in person or any other form - wherein Herrera and Breed discussed Breed's nomination of Herrera for PUC GM. Herrera cannot have secret meetings of any kind with Breed due to Prop G. And this issue is NOT a legal issue nor is it attorney-client privileged. This issue and its meeting(s) thus must have been recorded and must be disclosed.

Secret meetings to protect the deliberation of a government decision do not exist in San Francisco.

--Anonymous

---
On May 26, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Public Integrity Communications (SF City Attorney) - Immediate Disclosure Request
Dear requester,

I am responding on behalf of the City Attorney’s Office to your below records request. Attached please find the responsive records. Please note that we have redacted the document based on security concerns in consultation with DT pursuant to Cal. Gov’t Code 6254.19. In the alternative, Cal. Evid. Code section 1040 and Cal. Gov’t Code sections 6255 would also apply to these redactions.
Please send replies to cityattorney@sfcityatty.org
Best,

[image010]Elizabeth A. Coolbrith
Paralegal
Office of City Attorney Dennis Herrera
(415) 554-4685 Direct
www.sfcityattorney.org

---

On May 26, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Public Integrity Communications (SF City Attorney) - Immediate Disclosure Request

1. This is a new request: provide exact PDF copies of all emails or chats (with all embedded attachments) between your office and Heather Knight or Jill Tucker before Feb 1, 2021 of any discussion about the (then-not-yet-filed) SFUSD lawsuit AND all convos with either of them from Jan 1 2021 to Feb 1 2021. This latter clause is to avoid any argument that is made that you cannot identify each no-context messages are indeed about the SFUSD suit.

2. What follows is NOT a new request, and was required to be disclosed in https://cdn.muckrock.com/foia_files/2021/05/25/Responsive_Records_Redacted.pdf

You have provided a copy of a document starting on p. 496 above labeled a "CONFIDENTIAL DRAFT." Please provide - without any alterations whatsoever - including the name of the file - the original document as you shared it with the media of that document. I am asking for an exact copy of the file (i.e. the version produced to the media), in the format you previously shared it, with all the metadata - since you previously shared it, none of that metadata can be withheld from me. Note that the name of a file is a "writing" and by combining all these records into one PDF - again for reasons that are unclear, you are withholding the distinct names of each of these records. It's also unclear to me who received that confidential draft and which email it is an attachment to. Again for reasons that are unclear, in this PDF you have stripped embedded attachments - you don't normally do that. I can guess that it is "SFUSD Petition 02.02 HK.pdf" but it is unclear as it is in different order. And I don't have to guess.

Please provide an exact PDF copy of all communications with persons who are not City employees that attached or included that CONFIDENTIAL DRAFT - I want to know who got it and when.

Also, for reasons that I cannot understand you appear to have again stripped all of the hyperlinks. As I have now argued many times (and won), this unlawfully withholds the URLs - for example the many in your press releases that I cannot click on and thus cannot know what you are referring to. URLs are information. You cannot withhold any public information without a justification.

And finally, we will be challenging the EC 1040 invocation - as always you must specify which of the two exemptions you used, and neither of them allow you to hide info being traded in a "favor" between John Cote and a reporter...

None of the above in #2 is a new request - it is all information that should have been provided.
On May 25, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Public Integrity Communications (SF City Attorney) - Immediate Disclosure Request
Dear requester,

I am responding on behalf of the City Attorney's Office to your below records request. Attached please find the responsive records in our custody. Please note we redacted confidential information on pages 131 and 325 based on Evidence Code section 1040. Please note we also redacted personal contact information on pages 10-15, 20-25, 29-34, 38-43, 49-54, 61-66, 72-77, 138, 244-250, 255-261, 270, 288, 292, 317, 393, 395, 398, 451, 527-529, and 558 due to privacy reasons. See Cal Const., Article I, section 1; Cal. Government Code Section 6254(c), (k); Admin. Code Section 67.1(g). In addition, we redacted information that was non-responsive on pages 550 and 552-553.

Please send replies to cityattorney@sfcityatty.org

Best,

[Signature]
Elizabeth A. Coolbrith
Paralegal
Office of City Attorney Dennis Herrera
(415) 554-4685 Direct
www.sfcityattorney.org

---

On Feb. 18, 2020:
Subject: California Public Records Act Request: Public Integrity Communications (SF City Attorney) - Immediate Disclosure Request
City Attorney's Office:

NOTE: THE EMAIL ADDRESS SENDING THIS REQUEST IS A PUBLICLY-VIEWABLE MAILBOX. Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Below are new Immediate Disclosure Requests (SF Admin Code 67.25(a)) directed to your agency and its department head. Your initial response is required by Feb 20, 2020. Rolling records responses are requested (SFAC 67.25(d)) if you are unable to immediately produce records. Exact copies of every responsive record are requested (Gov Code 6253(b)) - do not: provide mere URLs, print and scan electronic records, convert native files to PDFs, or provide black and white versions of any color record. Provide only copies of records not requiring fees and in-person inspection of all other records (GC 6253).

Your non-exhaustive obligations:
- All withholding of any information must be justified in writing by specific statutory authority (SFAC 67.27).
- All withholdings by masking or deletion (aka redactions) must be keyed by footnote or other clear reference to the specific justification for that redaction, and only the minimal exempt portion of any record may be withheld (SFAC 67.26).
- You must respond to emailed requests (SFAC 67.21(b)).
- You must notify us of whether or not responsive records exist and/or were withheld for each below request (Gov Code 6253(c), 6255(b)).
- You must state the name and title of each person responsible for withholding any information (Gov Code 6253(d)).
- Do not impose any end-user restrictions upon me (Santa Clara Co. vs Superior Ct, 170 Cal.App 4th 1301); so if you use a third-party website to publish records, please make them completely public without any login or sign-in.

Your agency must do all of the above things in your response, and you cannot wait until we file complaints.

****** We have no duty to, and we will not again, remind the City of its obligations. Instead, we will file complaints for every Sunshine Ordinance or CPRA violation. We will continue to file complaints until the City's procedures are modified to fully comply with the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA, without caveat or exception. ******

1. All communications sent to the publicintegrity@sfgov.org email address since Jan 21, 2020 until present.
2. Please also provide an SFAC 67.21(c) written statement of the existence or quantity of these emails in #1 (even if you believe their contents to be exempt) within 7 days (no extensions)

Do not destroy or discard any responsive records - we will appeal all withholdings or Sunshine violations.

Thank you for your anticipated cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,
Anonymous

View request history, see one related attachment, upload responsive documents, and report problems here:
https://accounts.muckrock.com/accounts/login/?next=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.muckrock.com%2Faccounts%2Flogin%2F%3Fnext%3D%253Faccounts%252Fagency_login%252Fsan-francisco-city-attorney-797%252Fpublic-integrity-communications-sf-city-attorney-immediate-disclosure-request-88338%252F%253Femail%253Dsupervisor.records%2540sfcityatty.org&url_auth_token=AAAuFCORweM1NfQd1jfaYvfwL4%3A1ImmM%3A94Uvtw8OpYeNJqU1Aeh65oWJMxM

Attachments:
• P131-132-responsive-records_redacted.pdf

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 88338-81670794@requests.muckrock.com

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 88338
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.
This is super helpful. Thank you! I will not share with anyone.

John Coté
Communications Director
Office of City Attorney Dennis Herrera
(415) 972-9779 Mobile
www.sfcityattorney.org
Find us on: Facebook Twitter Instagram

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information. It is solely for the use of the intended recipient(s). If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the content is prohibited.

From: Tucker, Jill <jtucker@sfchronicle.com>
Sent: Monday, February 1, 2021 2:43 PM
To: Cote, John (CAT) <John.Cote@sfcityatty.org>
Subject: RE: Favor

I’m collecting that now, actually for a broader piece on mental health and distance learning. It’s really bad in SF and Oakland.

From: Cote, John (CAT) <John.Cote@sfcityatty.org>
Sent: Monday, February 1, 2021 1:52 PM
To: Tucker, Jill <jtucker@sfchronicle.com>
Subject: [EXT] Favor

Tucker!

Hope you’re surviving this madness. You’ve been doing a great job on the SFUSD stuff. Quick question for you. I like this line – *Research is increasingly showing that, despite the best efforts of teachers, many students are struggling with distance learning, while their mental and emotional health are at greater risk.* -- from one of your recent stories: https://www.sfchronicle.com/education/article/Calling-all-billionaires-S-F-plans-to-ask-15862836.php

It would help me out if you could point me to a study or two that talks about the mental health toll on kids from distancing learning.

Thank you and stay safe!

John Coté
Communications Director
Office of City Attorney Dennis Herrera
(415) 972-9779 Mobile
www.sfcityattorney.org
Find us on: Facebook Twitter Instagram

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information. It is solely for the use of the intended recipient(s). If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the content is prohibited.
Buta, Odaya (CAT)

From: Russi, Brad (CAT) on behalf of Supervisor Records (CAT)
Sent: Wednesday, June 16, 2021 7:51 AM
To: 'Jeremy Jessup'
Subject: RE: Supervisor of Records_ Dolan Firm dated 5-28-2021

Mr. Jessup –

We understand that the Police Department has now produced the photos that you requested. If you continue to contest the department’s response to your request, please let us know. Otherwise, we consider your petition closed. Thank you.

Bradley Russi
Deputy City Attorney
Office of City Attorney Dennis Herrera
City Hall, Room 234
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., San Francisco, CA 94102
www.sfcityattorney.org

From: Jeremy Jessup <jeremy.jessup@dolanlawfirm.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 3, 2021 9:06 AM
To: Supervisor Records (CAT) <supervisor.records@SFCITYATTY.ORG>
Subject: RE: Supervisor of Records_ Dolan Firm dated 5-28-2021

Thank you.

Jeremy M. Jessup
Sr. Litigation Attorney
DOLAN LAW FIRM PC
1438 Market Street
San Francisco, CA 94102
Tel: (415) 421-2800
Fax: (415) 421-2830
Email: jeremy.jessup@dolanlawfirm.com

From: Buta, Odaya (CAT) <Odaya.Buta@sfcityatty.org> On Behalf Of Supervisor Records (CAT)
Sent: Wednesday, June 2, 2021 4:20 PM
To: 'jeremy.jessup@dolanlawfirm.com' <jeremy.jessup@dolanlawfirm.com>
Subject: Supervisor of Records_ Dolan Firm dated 5-28-2021

Mr. Jessup:

I write to confirm receipt of the attached petition to the Supervisor of Records. We will look into the issues raised in your petition and get back to you.

Sincerely,
This message and any attachments are solely for the intended recipient and may include privileged or confidential information.
If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately, and permanently delete this message and any attachments.

Privileged and Confidential:
This electronic message contains information that may be confidential or protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or the work product doctrine and is intended solely for the use of the addressee listed above. If you are neither the intended recipient nor the employee or agent responsible for delivering this electronic message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or the use of the content of this electronic message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this electronic message in error, please immediately notify us by replying to this message and delete the original message.
Via Fax
Office of the City Attorney
Attention: Supervisor of Records
Fax. No. (415) 554-4745

May 28, 2021

Dear Supervisor of Records:

We would like to request a review of the denial of the San Francisco Police Dept. to provide photos of our client’s accident. The Traffic Collision Report No. is 210185288. The purpose of this letter is to again request access to the photo evidence depicting the facts and circumstances of the subject collision involving Mr. Juan Fuentes which are in the possession of San Francisco Police Department. The evidence is requested for the purpose of inspection and copying pursuant to the California Public Records Act (Government Code Section 6250 et. seq.) and Article I, Section 3 of the California Constitution. Attached is our request to the SFPD and their response.

Pursuant to Government Code Section 6253(b), we ask that all photo evidence are made “promptly available,” for inspection and copying, based on my payment of “fees covering direct costs of duplication, or statutory fee, if applicable.” The SFPD denied our request and cited to Cal. Gov. code section 6254(f), however, they must produce the documents “unless the disclosure would endanger the safety of a witness or other person involved in the investigation, or unless disclosure would endanger the successful completion of the investigation or a related investigation.” We do not see how photographs of the collision scene and property damage would endanger the completion of the investigation. Given the completed traffic collision report, it appears the investigation has been completed.

Withholding this photographic evidence is preventing Mr. Fuentes from pursuing compensation for his injuries caused by the subject collision. Without this evidence, Mr. Fuentes is unable to complete his investigation into how the collision occurred.
If a portion of the information I have requested is exempt from disclosure by express provisions of law, Government Code Section 6253(a) additionally requires segregation and deletion of that material in order that the remainder of the information may be released. If you determine that an express provision of law exists to exempt from disclosure all or a portion of the material I have requested, Government Code Section 6253(c) requires notification to me of the reasons for the determination not later than 10 days from your receipt of this request. Government Code Section 6253(d) prohibits the use of the 10-day period, or any provisions of the Public Records Act “to delay access for purposes of inspecting public records.”

If you still maintain that the requested photographs are exempt from disclosure, please provide a full written explanation.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this important matter.

Sincerely,

Jeremy M. Jessup
Sr. Litigation Attorney
DOLAN LAW FIRM PC
1438 Market Street
San Francisco, CA 94102
Tel: (415) 421-2800
Fax: (415) 421-2830
San Francisco Police Public Records Request :: P034124-042721

1 message

San Francisco Police Records Portal <sanfranciscopd@mycusthelp.net>  
To: "maryleen.razo@dolanlawfirm.com" <maryleen.razo@dolanlawfirm.com>

Dear Maryleen Razo:

Thank you for your interest in public records of the San Francisco Police Department ("SFPD").

The San Francisco Police Department ("SFPD") received your request, dated April 27, 2021 and given the reference number P034124-042721 for tracking purposes.

Record(s) Requested: All Photos taken at the scene of the accident.

Your request is being forwarded to the appropriate department(s) for processing and you will be notified once the request is complete.

You can monitor request progress at the link below. Thank you for using the San Francisco Public Records Center.

San Francisco Police Department

To monitor the progress or update this request please log into the SFPD Public Records Center.
April 28, 2021

Maryleen Razo
1438 Market St
San Francisco, CA 94102-6004

RE: Public Records Request, dated April 27, 2021, Reference # P034124-042721

Dear Maryleen Razo:

The San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) received your Public Records Act request, dated April 27, 2021.

You requested, "All Photos taken at the scene of the accident."

Generally, SFPD declines to release records to an open investigation under California Government Code Section 6254(f), which exempts from disclosure records of complaints to, investigations conducted by, intelligence information or security procedures of, and investigatory or security files compiled by local police agencies. As such, we are unable to provide you with the information you seek, as disclosure of information may endanger successful completion of the investigation.

If you have any questions, please contact Victoria Sullivan at 415-837-7481.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,

Lieutenant Arran Pera #531
Officer in Charge
Risk Management - Legal Division
DA’s Office:

Thank you for your now complete response. The complaint and petition are withdrawn. Please remember for all requests - by anyone - to provide exact copies of all records.

Regards,

Anonymous
Twitter @journo_anon

IMPORTANT:
1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.
2. If you are NOT a public official: This communication is confidential and may contain unpublished information or confidential source information, protected by the California Shield Law, Evidence Code sec. 1070. I am a member of the electronic media and regularly publish information about the conduct of public officials.
3. I am not a lawyer. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.
4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sent with ProtonMail Secure Email.

-------- Original Message --------
On Monday, June 28th, 2021 at 2:18 PM, SFDA Public Records <SFDA.PublicRecords@sfgov.org> wrote:

Dear Anonymous,

Thank you for your follow-up. I have attached an updated response detailing the redactions in the records as well as the original version of the excel spreadsheet and the email sent to DA Boudin. Please let me know if you need anything else or have any other questions.

Best,

SFDA Public Records
From: Anonymoose 🦌🔍 <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Reply-To: Anonymoose 🦌🔍 <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Date: Thursday, June 24, 2021 at 9:30 PM
To: "Supervisor of Records (City Attorney, SF)" <supervisor.records@SFCITYATTY.ORG>, "SOTF (SF)" <sotf@sfgov.org>
Cc: "Mikaela.Rabinowitz@sfgov.org" <Mikaela.Rabinowitz@sfgov.org>, "Boudin, Chesa (DAT)" <chesa@sfgov.org>, "Marshall, Rachel (DAT)" <rachel.marshall@sfgov.org>
Subject: 67.21(d) petition / SOTF complaint - Govt Code 6254.5 violation by DA's office

Supervisor of Records Herrera:

Please determine in writing that the records described below are public and order Chesa Boudin, Mikaela Rabinowitz, and the DA's Office to disclose them. I requested "all correspondence between anyone in your office and Megan Cassidy from June 5 2021 to present" on June 17, 2021.

SOTF - please file a complaint on the below basis. Anonymous v Chesa Boudin, Mikaela Rabinowitz, District Attorney's Office. Violations: Admin Code 67.21(b) failure to provide copy of a record, 67.26 non-minimal withholding, 67.27 failure to justify withholding in writing, 67.26 failure to key redactions, 67.29-7(a) failure to preserve all correspondence, CPRA Govt Code 6254.5 failure to disclose records already disclosed to others. Response letter (with request inside) and relevant records attached as well.

The SFDA's office has failed to provide an Excel file containing crime data that it earlier disclosed to the SF Chronicle. Because the DA's office sent outside of the City to the SF Chronicle this Excel file, I am entitled to an exact bit-for-bit copy - with all the history, metadata, calculations, raw data, or whatever else is in that Excel file - exactly as the Chronicle received it. Any privilege or confidentiality that did exist (though I do not concede that any did ever exist) in any part of that file was waived by the DA's Office's emailing of that native Excel file to the Chronicle's Megan Cassidy on June 15 as seen in the attachment (Govt Code 6254.5). The DA instead only provided a part of that Excel file to me by disclosing a PDF instead. This withholds not only the metadata that the Chronicle received, but also the data and formulae that result in the outputs. Even if any attorney work-product exists in that file, that privilege too was waived by disclosure to Cassidy.

The DA's office also failed to provide each communication requested. Providing a copy of a forward (or reply) of an email is not a copy of the original email, see ruling in SOTF 19121 Anonymous v Police Commission. The forward (or reply) of an email is a new distinct public record that happens to contain within an in-exact copy of an earlier public record. Anyone in a forwarded email can change the "inline text" of an earlier email, and it is not evident in each part of a thread what attachments were sent in each email in the original thread, or who was BCC-ed.

The DA also withheld portions of the email thread without any written justification or keyed redactions.
The DA's office also failed to provide Chesa Boudin's copy of this thread - only providing Rabinowitz's and Rachel Marshall's - though Boudin was clearly CC-ed. If he has destroyed the record, consider a violation of Admin Code 67.29-7(a) as well.

Regards,

Anonymous

Twitter @journo_anon

**IMPORTANT:**

1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.

2. If you are NOT a public official: This communication is confidential and may contain unpublished information or confidential source information, protected by the California Shield Law, Evidence Code sec. 1070. I am a member of the electronic media and regularly publish information about the conduct of public officials.

3. I am not a lawyer. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.

4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sent with ProtonMail Secure Email.
Supervisor of Records Herrera:
Please determine in writing that the records described below are public and order Chesa Boudin, Mikaela Rabinowitz, and the DA's Office to disclose them. I requested "all correspondence between anyone in your office and Megan Cassidy from June 5 2021 to present" on June 17, 2021.

SOTF - please file a complaint on the below basis. Anonymous v Chesa Boudin, Mikaela Rabinowitz, District Attorney's Office. Violations: Admin Code 67.21(b) failure to provide copy of a record, 67.26 non-minimal withholding, 67.27 failure to justify withholding in writing, 67.26 failure to key redactions, 67.29-7(a) failure to preserve all correspondence, CPRA Govt Code 6254.5 failure to disclose records already disclosed to others. Response letter (with request inside) and relevant records attached as well.

The SFDA's office has failed to provide an Excel file containing crime data that it earlier disclosed to the SF Chronicle. Because the DA's office sent outside of the City to the SF Chronicle this Excel file, I am entitled to an exact bit-for-bit copy - with all the history, metadata, calculations, raw data, or whatever else is in that Excel file - exactly as the Chronicle received it. Any privilege or confidentiality that did exist (though I do not concede that any did ever exist) in any part of that file was waived by the DA's Office's emailing of that native Excel file to the Chronicle's Megan Cassidy on June 15 as seen in the attachment (Govt Code 6254.5). The DA instead only provided a part of that Excel file to me by disclosing a PDF instead. This withholds not only the metadata that the Chronicle received, but also the data and formulae that result in the outputs. Even if any attorney work-product exists in that file, that privilege too was waived by disclosure to Cassidy.

The DA's office also failed to provide each communication requested. Providing a copy of a forward (or reply) of an email is not a copy of the original email, see ruling in SOTF 19121 Anonymous v Police Commission. The forward (or reply) of an email is a new distinct public record that happens to contain within at an in-exact copy of an earlier public record. Anyone in a forwarded email can change the "inline text" of an earlier email, and it is not evident in each part of a thread what attachments were sent in each email in the original thread, or who was BCC-ed.

The DA also withheld portions of the email thread without any written justification or keyed redactions.

The DA's office also failed to provide Chesa Boudin's copy of this thread - only providing Rabinowitz's and Rachel Marshall's - though Boudin was clearly CC-ed. If he has destroyed the record, consider a violation of Admin Code 67.29-7(a) as well.

Regards,

Anonymous
Twitter @journo_anon

IMPORTANT:
1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.

2. If you are NOT a public official: This communication is confidential and may contain unpublished information or confidential source information, protected by the California Shield Law, Evidence Code sec. 1070. I am a member of the electronic media and regularly publish information about the conduct of public officials.

3. I am not a lawyer. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.

4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sent with ProtonMail Secure Email.
From: Rabinowitz, Mikaela (DAT)  
Sent: Thursday, June 17, 2021 11:30 AM  
To: Burke, Robyn (DAT)  
Subject: FW: Drug & other crime numbers  
Attachments: SFDA_Drugs-and-crime-trends.xlsx

This is my only email to Megan Cassidy.

---------
Mikaela Rabinowitz, PhD  
Director of Data, Research, and Analytics  
San Francisco District Attorney’s Office  
Cell: [redacted]  
Email: mikaela.rabinowitz@sfgov.org

From: Rabinowitz, Mikaela (DAT)  
Sent: Tuesday, June 15, 2021 2:13 PM  
To: megan.cassidy@sfchronicle.com  
Cc: Boudin, Chesa (DAT) <chesa@sfgov.org>; Marshall, Rachel (DAT) <rachel.marshall@sfgov.org>  
Subject: Drug & other crime numbers

Hi Megan,

I’m sending you numbers on drug-related arrest presented, prosecutions, and case outcomes. In addition, as we discussed, I am sending updated crime trends based on statute codes. I’m available if you have any questions or want to discuss.

Thanks,

---------
Mikaela Rabinowitz, PhD  
Director of Data, Research, and Analytics  
San Francisco District Attorney’s Office  
Cell: [redacted]  
Email: mikaela.rabinowitz@sfgov.org
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Daniel Cauich - immediate disclosure request

Please also as a separate immediate disclosure request: please provide all correspondence between anyone in your office and Megan Cassidy from June 5 2021 to present.

Provide rolling response to all requests from this email address.
June 24, 2021

114094-50404735@requests.muckrock.com

Re: Your Public Record Act request received on June 17, 2021.

To Whom it May Concern:

This letter is in response to your Public Record Act request received by our office via email on June 17, 2021, making the following request:

"Please provide all correspondence between anyone in your office and Megan Cassidy from June 5 2021 to present."

Under the Public Records Act and the Sunshine Ordinance, a “public record” is broadly defined to include “any writing containing information relating to the conduct of the public’s business prepared, owned, used or retained by any state or local agency, regardless of the physical form or characteristics.” Cal. Govt. Code §6252(c). If the department has no records responsive to the specific request, the department has no duty to create or recreate one.

Please see the attached responsive records to request.

Sincerely,
San Francisco District Attorney’s Public Records
July 30, 2021

Sent via email (vbaranetsky@revealnews.org)

D. Victoria Baranetsky
The Center for Investigative Reporting
1400 65th Street, Suite 200
Emeryville, CA 94608

Re: Petition to Supervisor of Records

Dear Ms. Baranetsky:

This letter responds to your petition to the Supervisor of Records sent via email on July 2, 2021. The petition concerns a request for public records submitted to the San Francisco Police Department (“SFPD”) by Melissa Lewis of The Center for Investigative Reporting. Ms. Lewis requested “data for all arrests made by the [SFPD] from 2011 to present,” including the name, race, gender, date of birth, and address of the arrestee. Ms. Lewis submitted an attestation to SFPD under Section 6254(f)(3) of the California Government Code, stating that she sought arrestee address information for journalistic purposes. SFPD withheld records responsive to the request reflecting arrests that occurred more than 90 days before the date of the request. We conclude that SFPD properly withheld records responsive to these requests under Sections 6254(f) and (k) of the California Government Code.

Response to Petition

In your petition to the Supervisor of Records, you contend that SFPD improperly withheld the information you requested, because in your view the plain language of Sections 6254(f)(1) and (3) require disclosure of historical arrest information, and the court in Fredericks v. Superior Court, 233 Cal. App. 4th 209 (2015), concluded that there is no implicit time limitation governing whether records not contemporaneous with an arrest must be disclosed under Section 6254(f). You argue that the court in Fredericks overruled the decision in County of Los Angeles v. Superior Court (Kusar), 18 Cal. App. 4th 588 (1993), to the extent Kusar stands for the proposition that only contemporaneous information must be disclosed under Section 6254(f). We respectfully disagree.

Section 6254(f) provides an exemption from disclosure for records of “investigations” conducted by local police agencies. Nonetheless, there are three limitations on that exemption – requiring disclosure of certain information, but not records as such – that are relevant to the public records request here.

Section 6254(f)(1) requires a local police agency to disclose the following information pertaining to arrests, unless disclosure would endanger the safety of a person involved in an investigation or the successful completion of an investigation:
The full name and occupation of every individual arrested by the agency, the individual’s physical description including date of birth, color of eyes and hair, sex, height and weight, the time and date of arrest, the time and date of booking, the location of the arrest, the factual circumstances surrounding the arrest, the amount of bail set, the time and manner of release or the location where the individual is currently being held, and all charges the individual is being held upon, including any outstanding warrants from other jurisdictions and parole or probation holds.

Section 6254(f)(2) provides another limitation on the exemption, though not pertaining to arrests. Rather, Section 6254(f)(2) requires disclosure of certain information concerning “complaints or requests for assistance received” by the police agency, including information regarding victims. In relevant part, and “[s]ubject to the restrictions imposed by Section 841.5 of the Penal Code,” Section 6254(f)(2) requires disclosure of:

… the time, substance, and location of all complaints or requests for assistance received by the agency and the time and nature of the response thereto, including, to the extent the information regarding crimes alleged or committed or any other incident investigated is recorded, the time, date, and location of occurrence, the time and date of the report, the name and age of the victim, the factual circumstances surrounding the crime or incident, and a general description of any injuries, property, or weapons involved. The name of a victim of any crime defined by [specified sections] of the Penal Code may be withheld at the victim’s request, or at the request of the victim’s parent or guardian if the victim is a minor….

Finally, Section 6254(f)(3), which was enacted after Sections 6254(1) and (2), provides that the police agency shall also produce the “current address” of arrestees, as well as victims, where the request is made for a journalistic or scholarly purpose, among others, and not for commercial purposes. Under Section 6253(f)(3), “[s]ubject to the restrictions of Section 841.5 of the Penal Code and this subdivision,” disclosure is required of:

… the current address of every individual arrested by the agency and the current address of the victim of a crime, if the requester declares under penalty of perjury that the request is made for a scholarly, journalistic, political, or governmental purpose, or that the request is made for investigation purposes by a licensed private investigator…. However, the address of the victim of any crime defined by [specified sections] of the Penal Code shall remain confidential. Address information obtained pursuant to this paragraph shall not be used directly or indirectly, or furnished to another, to sell a product or service to any individual or group of individuals, and the requester shall execute a declaration to that effect under penalty of perjury. This paragraph shall not be construed to prohibit or limit a scholarly, journalistic, political, or government use of address information obtained pursuant to this paragraph.

In Kusar, the court addressed a request for all available information under subsections (f)(1) and (f)(2), as they were then worded, regarding arrests completed by two deputy sheriffs for a ten-year period. 18 Cal. App. 4th at 591. The county argued that it was only required to disclose information contemporaneous with the arrests. The court found these subsections
ambiguous, reviewed their legislative history, and agreed with the county, concluding that subsections (f)(1) and (f)(2) require only disclosure of information contemporaneous to an incident. *Id.* at 599. The court based its rationale, in part, on language in subsection (f)(1) that required the disclosure of the “current” address of the arrestee. *Id.* at 595. But it also relied on legislative history indicating the Legislature’s intent “to continue the common law tradition of contemporaneous disclosure of individualized information in order to prevent secret arrests and to mandate the continued disclosure of customary and basic law enforcement information to the press.” *Id.* at 598.

While *Kusar* involved a request for arrest information under subsection (f)(1), in *Fredericks*, the requester sought information under subsection (f)(2) regarding “complaints and/or requests for assistance” for a six-month period. 233 Cal. App. 4th at 215-16. Following the court’s decision in *Kusar*, the Legislature had amended Section 6254(f) to remove the term “current address” from subsections (f)(1) and (f)(2). The purpose of those amendments was to ease the burden on law enforcement agencies that were receiving an increasing number of requests for address information from marketing organizations. *Id.* at 232. The court in *Fredericks* examined the amended language of subsection (f)(2) which no longer included the word “current,” and distinguished the request at issue from *Kusar*, which dealt primarily with a request for information under (f)(1). *Id.* at 233-34. The court concluded that for purposes of the amended subsection (f)(2), there was “no basis in the plain language of the statute to read into it any 60-day limitation on access to discloseable information.” *Id.* at 234.

For purposes of this Supervisor of Records determination, we assume *Fredericks* was correctly decided. Nevertheless, based on our review of *Fredericks*, we conclude that there continues to be a “contemporaneous” element to the subsection (f)(1) exception involving arrest information.

First, as noted above, the court in *Fredericks* based its holding regarding subsection (f)(2) on the Legislature’s removal of the word “current” before “address” in a post-*Kusar* amendment of both subsections. But even with the removal of the word “current” from subsection (f)(1), there continues to be language in that subsection indicating that there must be a temporal connection between the arrest and the request for information. Gov’t Code § 6254(f)(1) (“the location where the individual is currently being held, and all charges the individual is being held upon”) (emphasis added).

Second, as noted in *Kusar*, the legislative history of subsection (f)(1) indicates an intent to formalize a common law tradition of police departments providing arrest information regarding recent arrests to the press, in part to prevent the police from making secret arrests. The legislative history for the amendments to subsection (f)(1) to remove the word “current” indicates only that the Legislature wanted to ease the burden on police departments that were being inundated with requests from marketing companies for address information. If the current address of arrestees was no longer available, the barrage of records requests that were being made to advance such marketing schemes directed at arrestees would come to a virtual halt. There is no indication that the Legislature intended the amendments to overrule *Kusar* or to have any effect other than reducing the number of information requests to departments. Thus, the Legislature’s original intent in enacting the subsection (f)(1) exception – to provide a check against police making secret arrests – persists, and it supports the conclusion that the arrest information sought by a requestor must be close in time to the arrest.
Third, the disclosure requirement of subsection (f)(1) serves a different purpose and raises different concerns than the disclosure requirement of subsection (f)(2). Subsection (f)(1) calls for the disclosure of identifying information for the arrests of specific individuals, raising significant privacy concerns for arrestees and implicating other statutory protections for criminal offender record information. The Legislature chose to balance these concerns by requiring disclosure only for contemporaneous arrests, to memorialize in statute an ongoing practice of police departments that serves a compelling transparency purpose – providing the check against secret arrests. Subsection (f)(2), on the other hand, involves more general information about calls for service and complaints that may not disclose personal information about arrestees and that raises less of a concern for the privacy of arrestees.

Fourth, while the two exceptions were discussed together in Kusar, the court’s conclusion focused almost entirely on subsection (f)(1). The removal of the term “current” from subsection (f)(2) should not require that these two exceptions be construed together or construed identically, and the court in Fredericks did not make such an effort. This further supports the conclusion that the holding regarding the contemporaneity of the information sought under subsection (f)(2) in Fredericks – that subsection (f)(2) is not limited in scope to contemporaneous information – does not extend to subsection (f)(1), which is limited in scope to contemporaneous information.

Fifth, and finally, the request in Fredericks was not made under subsection (f)(1), and the holding in Fredericks does not explicitly apply to subsection (f)(1). It explicitly applies only to subsection (f)(2). Therefore Fredericks does not contradict Kusar’s conclusion regarding subsection (f)(1)’s requirement of contemporaneity. And even if there were a conflict between these opinions, Fredericks could not overrule Kusar, because the Fredericks court was not superior in authority to the Kusar court. Both decisions are Court of Appeal decisions; only a court of superior jurisdiction has authority to overrule Kusar. Garza v. Asbestos Corp., Ltd., 161 Cal. App. 4th 651, 659 n.5 (2008).

With this understanding of the relationship between Kusar and Fredericks, and between subsections (f)(1) and (f)(2), we address subsection (f)(3). We conclude that Section 6254(f)(3) does not provide greater access to historical arrest information than is available under subsection (f)(1). When the Legislature amended Section 6254(f)(1) to remove the requirement that police agencies produce address information of arrestees, it added subsection (f)(3) to provide a procedure for scholars and journalists, among others, to continue to obtain “current” address information for arrestees if they declare under penalty of perjury that such information would not be used “to sell a product or service to any individual or group.” Nothing in the legislative history for these amendments suggests the Legislature intended to alter the common law understanding that the availability of arrest information is time limited, and indeed the inclusion of the word “current” in subsection (f)(3) supports this conclusion. In a sense, Fredericks does as well, indirectly, given its emphasis on the removal of “current address” from subsection (f)(2) as the basis for concluding there is no contemporaneous requirement under subsection (f)(2). By parity of reasoning, the inclusion of “current address” in subsection (f)(3) raises the contrary inference.

Additionally, SFPD properly withheld non-contemporaneous arrest records under Government Code Section 6254(k), which provides an exemption for records “the disclosure of which is exempted by or prohibited pursuant to . . . state law.” Under Penal Code Sections 11105, et seq., criminal offender record information, including arrest information is confidential. See Penal Code Secs. 11064, 11076, 11080, 11081; Younger v. Berkeley City Counsel, 45 Cal. App. 3d 825, 834 (1975) (“restrictions upon release of such information are so carefully set out
in the [Penal Code] . . . that it is inconceivable that the general terms of the Public Records Act were intended to render them void.”).

You also contend that SFPD must produce arrest information concerning juveniles, because such information is not confidential under Section 827 of the Welfare and Institutions Code. We respectfully disagree. Juvenile criminal history information, including information regarding arrests, is covered by the broad confidentiality provision of Section 827, and SFPD cannot release it without a court order. See Wescott v. County of Yuba, 104 Cal. App. 3d 103, 106-09 (1980).

Finally, while San Francisco Administrative Code Section 67.24(d) generally requires disclosure of arrest information when no prosecution will be sought or the statute of limitations has expired, where disclosure would constitute an unwarranted invasion of privacy – as it would here – the information may be withheld if the public interest in non-disclosure outweighs the public interest in disclosure. S.F. Admin. Code § 67.24(d)(2). Kusar did not directly address the privacy concerns attendant to disclosure of non-contemporaneous arrest data because it was able otherwise to determine that subsection (f)(1) was limited in scope to contemporaneous arrest data. 18 Cal. App. 4th at 600 n.17, 602. The privacy concerns are significant, and courts have recognized that privacy interests extend to the disclosure of criminal history information, including arrests. Westbrook v. County of Los Angeles, 27 Cal. App. 4th 157 (1994); Center for Investigative Reporting v. U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, 2019 WL 6498817, at *5 (D.D.C. Dec. 3, 2019).

The request calls for information that is not contemporaneous with the arrest. It seeks information about all arrests that occurred since 2011. Thus, we conclude that SFPD properly determined that Sections 6254(f)(1) and (3) do not require disclosure of historical arrest information. SFPD properly withheld the information under Government Code Section 6254(f). Further, SFPD properly withheld the information under Government Code Section 6254(k), as confidential criminal offender record information, and any juvenile information is confidential under Section 827 of the Welfare and Institutions Code. Further, Section 67.24(d) of the Administrative Code does not require disclosure due to the privacy interests involved.

For the reasons stated above, we deny your petition and consider it closed.

Very truly yours,

DENNIS J. HERRERA
City Attorney

Bradley A. Russi
Deputy City Attorney
Ms. Baranetsky – Please see the attached response to your petition. Thank you.

Best,

Bradley Russi
Deputy City Attorney
Office of City Attorney Dennis Herrera
City Hall, Room 234
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., San Francisco, CA 94102
www.sfcityattorney.org

From: Victoria Baranetsky <vbaranetsky@revealnews.org>
Sent: Wednesday, July 21, 2021 10:24 AM
To: Supervisor Records (CAT) <supervisor.records@sfcityatty.org>
Cc: Alexandra Gutierrez <agutierrez@revealnews.org>; Melissa Lewis <mlewis@revealnews.org>
Subject: Re: Petition to the Supervisor of Records Re: Partial Denial of Request No. P028478-030121

Dear Mr. Russi,

Ms. Gutierrez has completed her fellowship at Reveal. Can you please confirm your receipt of this email and send any agency response to my email address?

Regards,
Victoria

On Wed, Jul 7, 2021 at 7:54 PM Supervisor Records (CAT) <supervisor.records@sfcityatty.org> wrote:

Ms. Gutierrez –

I write to acknowledge receipt of your petition. We will look into the issues raised in your petition and get back to you. Thank you.

Bradley Russi
Deputy City Attorney
Dear Supervisor of Records,

Enclosed is a petition challenging the partial denial of Request No. P028478-030121. An appendix is also attached.

We look forward to your determination.

Sincerely,

Alexandra M. Gutierrez
First Amendment Fellow
Dear Supervisor of Records,

Enclosed is a petition challenging the partial denial of Request No. P028478-030121. An appendix is also attached.

We look forward to your determination.

Sincerely,

Alexandra M. Gutierrez
First Amendment Fellow
VIA ELECTRONIC DELIVERY

Petition to the Supervisor of Records Re: Partial Denial of Request No. P028478-030121

Dear Supervisor of Records:

The Center for Investigative Reporting ("CIR"), on behalf of requester Melissa Lewis and pursuant to the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance, S.F. Admin. Code § 67.21(d), petitions for reconsideration of the San Francisco Police Department’s ("SFPD") partial denial of Record Request No. P028478-030121 filed on March 1, 2021. Specifically, the Supervisor of Records should determine that arrest data beyond 90 days must be disclosed both under the Sunshine Ordinance, S.F. Admin. Code § 67 et seq., and under the California Public Records Act, Gov’t Code § 6250 et seq. and does not qualify as Criminal Offender Record Information ("CORI").

I. Background

Melissa Lewis is a data reporter for CIR, the oldest non-profit investigative newsroom in the country and a non-profit established under the laws of the State of California. CIR has commenced litigation in other jurisdictions in order to enforce state-level public records laws, and is prepared to do so in this case if the matter cannot be brought to a satisfactory resolution.

On March 1, 2021, Ms. Lewis submitted sent in a public records request to the SFPD via electronic delivery. Specifically, Ms. Lewis requested, “[p]ursuant to the California Public Records Act, Gov’t Code § 6250 et seq., and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance, S.F. Admin Code § 67, . . . data for all arrests made by the San Francisco Police Department from 2011 to the present.” (App’x at 2.) In this request, Ms. Lewis enumerated various fields of data that she sought,
such as “Name,” “Race,” “Gender,” “Date of Birth,” and “Address recorded at time of arrest” (hereinafter “arrest data”).

As to the “Address recorded at time of arrest,” Ms. Lewis emphasized in her request the importance of this specific data by stating that “housing status will be a key variable” to her reporting and provided examples of news articles demonstrating that “analyses of crime statistics [over time] by housing status are in the public interest.” She also declared that the requested “addresses will never be published, will not be stored online unless password-protected, and will only be accessible to a reporter who analyzes the data.”

On March 24, 2021, Ms. Lewis received an email response from SFPD Media Relations official Michael Andraychak that “Under advice of [the] SF City Attorney, we can only provide arrestee name and identifying information for arrests within 90 days of your request. Arrests prior to 90 days are considered CORI (Criminal Offender Record Information) and that information is confidential under law.” Mr. Andraychak’s response did not cite any statute to support the determination that the request information qualified as CORI, nor did he elaborate on the rationale for the determination. Mr. Andraychak also stated that “Juvenile arrest information will be withheld under provisions of the California Welfare and Institutions Code which makes information on juvenile arrests confidential,” again without citing a specific statutory provision.

In addition to the SFPD request, Ms. Lewis has submitted substantially similar requests to other California police departments—including police departments serving Los Angeles, Oakland, and San Diego, among others—which provided the requested address data when fulfilling her request. Other departments are in the midst of fulfilling similar requests for address data.

II. Argument

The SFPD did not fully comply with the CPRA or the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance when it partially denied Ms. Lewis’s request and failed to provide her with arrest data from 2011 to present. The SFPD ignored the plain text of the CPRA, which permits the disclosure of this data, and instead erroneously deemed the bulk of the requested arrest data to be CORI, without citing any statute to support this conclusion. In doing so, the SFPD applied an arbitrary time limitation that any arrest data older than ninety days should be withheld as confidential. But as the Court of Appeal has held in *Fredericks v. Superior Court*, 233 Cal. App. 4th 209 (2015), the CPRA contains no time constraint that would allow the SFPD to limit its release of otherwise disclosable public information in this manner.

a. The Text and Purpose of the CPRA Requires Disclosure of the Requested Arrest Data.

First and foremost, the SFPD’s partial denial of Ms. Lewis’s request was improper because it disregarded both the express requirements of the CPRA and the intent of that law.

As the California Supreme Court has recognized, the CPRA was enacted to promote “[m]aximum disclosure of the conduct of governmental operations was to be promoted by the Act” for the purposes of enabling government accountability. *CBS, Inc. v. Block*, 42 Cal. 3d 646, 651-
In order to verify accountability, individuals must have access to government files. Such access permits checks against the arbitrary exercise of official power.” *Id.* at 651.


The CPRA expressly requires the requested information be made public. It provides that “state and local law enforcement agencies shall make public the following information, except to the extent that disclosure of a particular item of information would endanger the safety of a person involved in an investigation or would endanger the successful completion of the investigation or a related investigation”:

1. The full name and occupation of every individual arrested by the agency, the individual’s physical description including date of birth, color of eyes and hair, sex, height and weight, the time and date of arrest, the time and date of booking, the location of the arrest, the factual circumstances surrounding the arrest, the amount of bail set, the time and manner of release or the location where the individual is currently being held, and all charges the individual is being held upon, including any outstanding warrants from other jurisdictions and parole or probation holds.

2. Subject to the restrictions of Section 841.5 of the Penal Code and this subdivision, the current address of every individual arrested by the agency and the current address of the victim of a crime, if the requester declares under penalty of perjury that the request is made for a scholarly, journalistic, political, or governmental purpose[.]

Cal. Gov’t Code § 6254(f) (footnote added); *see also Austin v. Irwindale Police Dep’t*, 2020 Cal. Super. LEXIS 4217, *12 (“[S]tate and local law enforcement shall disclose the full name and occupation of every person arrested by the agency, the person’s physical description, the time and date of arrest and booking, the location of the arrest, the factual circumstances surrounding the

1 In 2004, Californians voted in favor Proposition 59, which amended the California Constitution and elevated the public’s right of access to a constitutional right. That constitutional provision mandates that access to information sought under the CPRA be “broadly” construed. Cal. Const., art. I § 3(b)(2).

2 Section 841.5 of the California Penal Code places a prohibition on the release of the “address or telephone number of any person who is a victim or witness in the alleged offense,” not the alleged offender.
arrest, the amount of bail, the time and manner of release or the location where the arrestee is being held, and all charges on which he or she is being held.”).³

Nothing in the above provisions imposes a ninety-day limitation on the public’s right to access the enumerated categories of information. Rather, the above provisions use expansive language to describe the information that law enforcement agencies are required to provide the public. See Cal. Gov’t Code § 6254(f)(1) (mandating release of the “full name and occupation of every individual arrested by the agency” (emphasis added); Cal. Gov’t Code § 6254(f)(3) (mandating release of the “current address of every individual arrested by the agency” (emphasis added)). Given this broad language, the requested data should be disclosed.

Additionally, the SFPD’s decision to limit disclosure to arrest data collected in the previous ninety days contravenes the purpose of the CPRA, by undermining the public’s ability to hold government accountable. See Block, 42 Cal. 3d at 651 (“Implicit in the democratic process is the notion that government should be accountable for its actions.”). The request at issue here—which is concerned with the comparative treatment of homeless individuals by the SFPD—is a prime example of that. Indeed, Ms. Lewis emphasized in her request the importance of obtaining long-range arrest data for government accountability by providing examples of news articles demonstrating that “analyses of crime statistics [over time] by housing status are in the public interest.” (App’x at 4.) Her own reporting seeks to identify trends in how the SFPD interacts with San Francisco’s unhoused population, looking at the types of offenses involved and at the rate that homeless individuals are arrested. This reporting will help the public and elected officials alike determine whether specific laws disproportionately affect homeless people and how the number of SFPD enforcement actions against homeless people compares to that against the general population.

In addition, such reporting is manifestly of public interest. See Joy H. Kim, The Case Against Criminalizing Homelessness: Functional Barriers to Shelters and Homeless Individuals’ Lack of Choice, 95 N.Y.U.L. REV. 1150 (arguing that criminalization of homelessness exacerbates

³ Separately, the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance specifically mandates that, unless there is a strong countervailing interest, “[r]ecords pertaining to any investigation, arrest or other law enforcement activity shall be disclosed to the public[.]” S.F. Admin. Code § 67.24(d).

In its treatment of law enforcement records, the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance provides that “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;
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.

Id. None of these conditions apply to Ms. Lewis’s request.
homelessness); Farida Ali, *Limiting the Poor’s Right to Public Space: Criminalizing Homelessness in California*, 21 GEO. J. POVERTY LAW & POL’Y 197, 198 (“The problem of homelessness is particularly acute in California. California has the largest homeless population in the United States, representing almost 21% of the nation’s homeless.”); Maria Foscarinis, *Downward Spiral: Homelessness and Its Criminalization*, 14 YALE L. & POL’Y REV. 1, 2 (1996) (“Increasingly, local governments are using criminal laws to address the presence of homeless people in public places.”). However, this reporting cannot be effective if Ms. Lewis is only able to obtain ninety days’ worth of arrest data, as such a limited data set would make it impossible to analyze long-term trends.

In sum, the CPRA’s text and purpose requires disclosure of the requested data without any time limitation.

b. Controlling Law Has Rejected the Application of Arbitrary Time Limits to Requests Made Pursuant to § 6254(f)(1-3).

Controlling law instructs that the requested records are not time-barred. The logic of *Fredericks v. Superior Court*, 233 Cal. App. 4th 209 (2015), requires disclosure of the long-range records requested here.

*Fredericks* considered whether a § 6254(f) provision was subject to an implicit time limitation, and it is the only case to squarely address this question since the amendment of § 6254(f) in 1995. There the Court found that a time limitation was incorrect. In *Fredericks*, the California Court of Appeal addressed a request for “all ‘complaints and/or requests for assistance’ pertaining to burglary and identity theft for a six-month period, for the entire City of San Diego area that the Department served.” 233 Cal. App. 4th at 219. The San Diego Police Department partially denied the request, taking “the position that since its Calls for Service reports were derived from officer-prepared Incident History Reports that were contemporaneous with the service calls, it was required to supply information only for a 60-day period, and its policy was to characterize any older records as ‘historical’ in nature.” *Id.* The trial court relied on *City of Los Angeles v. Superior Court* (“*Kusar*”) 18 Cal. App. 4th 588, 595 (1993), which “constru[ed] previous versions of § 6254, subd. (f)(1), (2),” and “denied the petition.” *Fredericks*, 233 Cal. App. 4th at 216.

The *Fredericks* Court rejected “the trial court’s narrow construction of the Department’s disclosure duties under the CPRA” as “incorrect both as to the substantive and temporal limits placed upon them.” *Id.* at 218. It held that “Section 6254, subdivision (f)(2) must be read according to its plain terms, and these terms do not include an express time limitation on production of only ‘contemporaneous’ or ‘current’ records.” *Id.* The *Fredericks* Court also made clear that *Kusar* was no longer good law, as the “main terms expressly relied upon by the court in *Kusar* . . . to support its conclusions regarding an imposed time limitation upon disclosure obligations are no longer in the statute.” *Id.* at 232 (further noting that “[i]n 1995, the language of section 6254, subdivision (f)(1) and (2) was amended to remove the terms ‘current address’ for both arrestees and victims”).

4 The *Fredericks* Court also noted that *Kusar* involved an unusual set of facts, where the requester was attempting a “clear ‘end run’ around other discovery procedures conducted in a separate civil action.” *Fredericks*, 233 Cal. App. 4th at 233. In contrast, the requester here is a journalist, who is supported by a news organization that employs her
The reasoning of Fredericks also accords with the California Supreme Court’s treatment of § 6254(f) in Williams v. Superior Court, 5 Cal. 4th 337, 361 (1993). Williams held that courts were to “enforce subdivision (f) according to its terms,” and so refused to read in a time limit into exemptions covering investigatory files. 5 Cal. 4th at 361; see also Fredericks, 233 Cal. App. 4th at 234 (“[T]he conclusion in Williams, that section 6254, subdivision (f) contains no time limit on the exemptions from disclosure allowed for investigatory files, is consistent with a plain reading of the subdivision, to find no ‘contemporaneous’ limitation on disclosures of information from citizen complaints or requests for assistance.”).

Following the precedent of Fredericks and Weaver, it is clear that no arbitrary time limit may be read into § 6254(f)(1) or § 6254(f)(3). As previously explained, neither provision contains any time restriction that would limit release of arrest data to only ninety days from the date of the request. Moreover, the application of Fredericks is especially apposite to § 6254(f)(1), as that provision was amended in the exact same manner as § 6254(f)(2).

As California high courts have rejected efforts to read a time limit into § 6254(f), any effort by the SFPD to impose one here is improper under law.

As Fredericks acknowledged, the language of both § 6254(f)(1) and § 6254(f)(2) was “amended to remove the terms ‘current address’ for both arrestees and victims” subsequent to the disposition of Kusar, rendering null Kusar’s determination that the provisions’ use of the term “current” implied a time limit of some sort on disclosure. Fredericks, 233 Cal. App. 4th at 232.

To be sure, § 6254(f)(3) uses the term “current address” in mandating the disclosure of “the current address of every individual arrested by the agency . . ., if the requester declares under penalty of perjury that the request is made for a scholarly, journalistic, political, or governmental purpose.” However, Fredericks still requires a “plain reading of the subdivision,” 233 Cal. App. 4th at 234, and Kusar’s extrapolation that § 6254(f)’s prior use of the term “current address” imposes an implicit time limit on the disclosure period is still a reaching extrapolation that the statute itself cannot bear.

Moreover, Kusar’s reasoning is now particularly wrongheaded in light of the intervening passage of Proposition 59. That proposition made it a constitutional imperative that “a statute, court rule, or other authority, including those in effect on the effective date of this subdivision, shall be broadly construed if,” like the CPRA, “it furthers the people’s right of access, and narrowly construed if it limits the right of access.” Cal. Const., art. I, § 3(b)(2). Under this directive, § 6254(f)(1) and § 6254(f)(3) should be read in a broader manner than done in Kusar, which itself acknowledged that “it would not be entirely unreasonable to construe the statutory language in the broad general manner proposed by [the plaintiff] in that case. And Kusar—to the extent that it has any vitality subsequent to its abrogation—should itself be applied only narrowly as it qualifies as “other authority” that “limits the right of access.” Cal. Const., art. I, § 3(b)(2). Thus, any reliance on that case by the SFPD is inappropriate.

Other recent cases also support the conclusion that the information categories enumerated in § 6254(f)(1-3) may not be withheld through arbitrary time limitations on the basis that information that was once public may not later be withheld.

In Weaver v. Superior Court, the California Court of Appeal determined that “all charging documents in homicide cases filed . . . between January 1977 and May 1993” could not be withheld as “investigatory files exempt from disclosure under the CPRA” because they had originally been “publicly filed.” 224 Cal. App. 4th 746, 748-49, 751(2014). It follows that because § 6254 requires that “local law enforcement agencies shall make public” identifying
c. The Requested Data May Not Be Withheld as Criminal Offender Record Information.

Contrary to the SFPD’s naked and unsupported assertion, the categories of information enumerated in the subparagraph of § 6254(f) may not be withheld as CORI.

The Penal Code itself broadly defines CORI as “records and data compiled by criminal justice agencies for purposes of identifying criminal offenders and of maintaining as to each such offender a summary of arrests, pretrial proceedings, the nature and disposition of criminal charges, sentencing, incarceration, rehabilitation, and release.” Cal. Penal Code. § 13102. Unlike § 6254(f), this definition does not enumerate specific categories of information such as “full name,” “sex,” and “current address.” Compare Cal. Penal Code. § 13102 to Cal. Gov’t Code § 6254(f).

Although certain records that qualify as CORI—such as rap sheets—may be withheld, the Penal Code is clear that “[n]othing in this chapter” on CORI otherwise “shall be construed to affect the right of access of any person or public agency to individual criminal offender record information such as an arrestee’s “full name,” “sex,” and “current address,” such information cannot later be removed from the public domain.

Indeed, this conclusion accords with Congress v. City of Los Angeles, the Superior Court required the release of non-traffic notices to appear (“NTAs”) because these records essentially comprised “information that must be disclosed under Section 6254(f)(1). 2017 Cal. Super. LEXIS 7784, *7 (Cal. Super. Ct. 2017). Here, Ms. Lewis is not even asking for copies of original records like NTAs which could have colorably been argued to be investigatory records, but rather the specific information mandated to be disclosed under § 6254(f). Legal authorities have routinely recognized that such information must be provided, even if the original records may otherwise be withheld as investigatory records. See 1992 Cal. AG LEXIS 21, *13, 69 Ops. Cal. Atty. Gen. 563, 568 (“Of course, in those cases where the agency refuses to permit public disclosure of its complaint or arrest records, it must make public the information concerning complaints and arrests specified in section 6254(f) by some other reasonable method.”).

In addition to failing to cite any statute to justify its CORI determination, the SFPD’s rationale for withholding appears particularly specious, given that the Penal Code’s chapter on Criminal Offender Record Information contains no provision establishing a ninety-day time restriction on the release of arrest data. The SFPD’s time limitation thus appears to be drawn from thin air, with no statutory basis to support it.

For example, “[l]ocal summary criminal history information,” which is “the master record of information compiled by any local criminal justice agency,” may only be disclosed to certain approved individuals and entities. Cal. Penal Code § 13330; see also Westbrook v. Cty. of L.A., 27 Cal. App. 4th 157, 163 (1994) (allowing withholding of such information where no § 6254(f) claim was raised and where the requester had not “demonstrated any legally acceptable need to know the information, but solely . . . want[ed] to sell the information to others”).

However, even the section governing local summary criminal history information permits that it “is not a violation of this article to include information obtained from a record in . . . any other public record when the inclusion of the information in the public record is authorized by a court, statute, or decisional law,” such as the CPRA. Cal. Penal Code § 13330(i). Indeed, that section even allows that local summary criminal history may be disclosed “if release of the information would enhance public safety, the interest of justice, or the public’s understanding of the justice system and the person making the request declares that the request is made for a scholarly or journalistic purpose.” Cal. Penal Code § 13300(j). Ms. Lewis’s journalistic efforts to conduct an analysis on the arrests of homeless individuals for the nation’s oldest investigative reporting non-profit organization patently fits that description.
information that is authorized by *any other provision of law.*” Cal. Penal Code § 13200 (emphasis added).

Because the Penal Code expressly recognizes that its provisions CORI may not restrict any statutory right of access, § 6254(f) of the CPRA governs this request. Accordingly, the SFPD must provide Ms. Lewis with the entire range of data that she has requested.

d. As to the Data Concerning Juveniles, the Requested Address Data Should Be Disclosed.

The SFPD also broadly cited California Welfare & Institutions Code (“WIC”) as justification for withholding any of the requested information specifically pertaining to juveniles. Although the SFPD failed to cite any statutory provision for this claim, courts have rejected indiscriminate withholding under WIC.

Courts considering the withholding of court and law enforcement records pertaining to juveniles have generally examined the applicability of Welfare & Institutions Code § 827. As written, WIC § 827 is clearly intended to limit the “inspect[ion]” of a juvenile court “case file,” WIC § 827(a)(1), as the law restricts access to “Court personnel,” “district attorney[s]” and “attorneys for the parties, judges, referees, other hearing officers.” WIC § 827(a)(1)(A)-(F).

As a basic matter, WIC § 827 does not apply to the juvenile arrest data at issue here because there is no basis to conclude that the information itemized at § 6254(f) is necessarily encompassed in the term “case file.” But assuming *arguendo* that WIC § 827 does apply to SFPD’s records, it does not serve as a proper basis for the withholding of addresses data because that information is not confidential. Although the police department may “retain the information that it obtains from the youths’ detention” pursuant to WIC § 827, *T.N.G. v. Superior Court*, 4 Cal. 3d 767 (1971), that limitation on disclosure *only applies to clearly confidential information*, see *People v. Superior Court*, No. F058874, 2010 Cal. App. Unpub. LEXIS 3239, at *1 (May 4, 2010) (limiting the redaction of a police report to “the names of . . . three juveniles”). While the name of juvenile (or for example, health data about a juvenile) may be confidential, an address is simply not confidential information. Notably, WIC § 827 also lacks any provision deeming an arrestee’s address as confidential information.

Thus, the Welfare & Institutions Code does not justify withholding of juvenile address data in this instance.

I. Conclusion

In light of the requirements of Government Code § 6254(f) and the impropriety of withholding the relevant information as CORI or as WIC-protected data, CIR respectfully asks the San Francisco Attorney’s Office to determine that the requested data set for the entire time period must be disclosed. Should there be any need of clarification as to any aspect of Ms. Lewis’s request, please direct questions to vbaranetsky@revealnews.org or (510) 982-2890.

---

9 The SFPD does not refer to the Welfare & Institutions Code as justifying withholding of any of the data concerning adults, nor could it.
Sincerely,

D. Victoria Baranetsky  
General Counsel

Alexandra Gutierrez  
First Amendment Fellow
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To whom it may concern:

I am a data reporter for the Center for Investigative Reporting, and I seek information that will allow me to conduct an analysis of the housing status of arrestees.

Pursuant to the California Public Records Act, Gov’t Code § 6250 et seq., and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance, S.F. Admin Code § 67, I write to request data for all arrests made by the San Francisco Police Department from 2011 to the present.

Specifically, I request the following information for each arrest:

- Observation (rows): Arrest charge
- Time frame: 1/1/2011 to date of export
- Fields:
  - Any unique identifier for the arrest event, e.g. incident and/or case number
  - Any field indicating whether the arrest was made in response to a call for service
  - Arrestee:
    - Name
    - Race
    - Ethnicity
    - Gender
    - Date of birth
    - Address recorded at time of arrest
  - Offense and charge description
  - Charge level (misdemeanor/felony class)
  - Date and time of arrest
  - Location of arrest (address and/or geographic coordinates)
  - Police division
  - Police beat

I am requesting these records in a machine-readable format such as a CSV or Excel files, transferred electronically. If this information is stored in a relational database, I request it be provided in its original relational format, not de-normalized. I also request a data dictionary or equivalent documentation for the fields requested.

If it is more expedient in terms of staffing time for you to fulfill this request by providing the entirety of a given table rather than selecting a subset, I would welcome the entirety.
If you deny this request in whole or in part, I request that you respond with the statutory exemption underlying the denial and the reasoning therein. If an asserted exemption applies to only a portion of a record, please delete or redact the portion to which the exemption applies.

However, I expect this request to be fulfilled in its entirety, as the California Public Records Act specifically mandates the disclosure of this information for journalistic purposes:

[S]tate and local law enforcement agencies shall make public the following information, except to the extent that disclosure of a particular item of information would endanger the safety of a person involved in an investigation or would endanger the successful completion of the investigation or a related investigation:

(1) The full name and occupation of every individual arrested by the agency, the individual’s physical description including date of birth, color of eyes and hair, sex, height and weight, the time and date of arrest, the time and date of booking, the location of the arrest, the factual circumstances surrounding the arrest, the amount of bail set, the time and manner of release or the location where the individual is currently being held, and all charges the individual is being held upon, including any outstanding warrants from other jurisdictions and parole or probation holds.

. . .

(3) Subject to the restrictions of Section 841.5 of the Penal Code and this subdivision, the current address of every individual arrested by the agency and the current address of the victim of a crime, if the requester declares under penalty of perjury that the request is made for a scholarly, journalistic, political, or governmental purpose[.]

Gov’t Code § 6254(f).

Moreover, the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance specifically “encourage[s]” law enforcement “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” and specifically mandates that, unless there is a strong countervailing interest, “[r]ecords pertaining to any investigation, arrest or other law enforcement activity shall be disclosed to the public[.]”
I recognize that you may assert the privilege under Section 6254(k) and Evidence Code Section 1040 to omit arrestees' addresses from the records. However, I argue that the necessity for preserving the confidentiality of the information does not outweigh the necessity for disclosure, because housing status will be a key variable in this analysis. I cite the following reporting as evidence that analyses of crime statistics by housing status are in the public interest:

https://www.latimes.com/local/politics/la-me-homeless-arrests-20180204-story.html,
https://crosscut.com/2019/02/seattle-1-5-people-booked-jail-are-homeless,

Additionally, these addresses will never be published, will not be stored online unless password-protected, and will only be accessible to a reporter who analyzes the data.

Additionally, in light of § 6254’s clear mandate that the requested information must be disclosed, such information cannot qualify as protected Criminal Offender Record Information under California Penal Code §§ 11105 or 13300.

If you have any questions, please contact me by whatever means would be most convenient to you.

Additionally, please notify me of costs before taking any billable steps.

Thank you for your assistance,

Melissa Lewis
mlewis@revealnews.org
Dear Melissa Lewis:

Thank you for your interest in public records of the San Francisco Police Department ("SFPD").

The San Francisco Police Department ("SFPD") received your request, dated March 01, 2021 and given the reference number P028478-030121 for tracking purposes.

Record(s) Requested: To whom it may concern: I am a data reporter for the Center for Investigative Reporting, and I seek information that will allow me to conduct an analysis of the housing status of arrestees. Pursuant to the California Public Records Act, Gov’t Code § 6250 et seq., and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance, S.F. Admin Code § 67, I write to request data for all arrests made by the San Francisco Police Department from 2011 to the present. Specifically, I request the following information for each arrest: Observation (rows): Arrest charge - Time frame: 1/1/2011 to date of export - Fields: - Any unique identifier for the arrest event, e.g. incident and/or case number - Any field indicating whether the arrest was made in response to a call for service - Arrestee: - Name - Race - Ethnicity - Gender - Date of birth - Address recorded at time of arrest - Offense and charge description - Charge level (misdemeanor/felony class) - Date and time of arrest - Location of arrest (address and/or geographic coordinates) - Police division - Police beat I am requesting these records in a machine-readable format such as a CSV or Excel files, transferred electronically. If this information is stored in a relational database, I request it be provided in its original relational format, not de-normalized. I also request a data dictionary or equivalent documentation for the fields requested. If it is more expedient in terms of staffing time for you to fulfill this request by providing the entirety of a given table rather than selecting a subset, I would welcome the entirety. If you deny this request in whole or in part, I request that you respond with the statutory exemption underlying the denial and the reasoning therein. If an asserted exemption applies to only a portion of a record, please delete or redact the portion to which the exemption applies. However, I expect this request to be fulfilled in its entirety, as the California Public Records Act specifically mandates the disclosure of this information for journalistic purposes: [S]tate and local law enforcement agencies shall make public the following information, except to the extent that disclosure of a particular item of information would endanger the safety of a person involved in an investigation or would endanger the successful completion of the investigation or a related investigation: (1) The full name and occupation of every individual arrested by the agency, the individual’s physical description including date of birth, color of eyes and hair, sex, height and weight, the time and date of arrest, the time and date of booking, the location of the arrest, the factual circumstances surrounding the arrest, the amount of bail set, the time and manner of release or the location where the individual is currently being held, and all charges the individual is being held upon, including any outstanding warrants from other jurisdictions and parole or probation holds. . . . (3) Subject to the restrictions of Section 841.5 of the Penal Code and this subdivision, the current address of every individual arrested by the agency and the current address of the victim of a crime, if the requester declares under penalty of perjury that the request is made for a scholarly, journalistic, political, or governmental purpose[,] Gov’t Code § 6254(f). Moreover, the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance specifically “encourage[s]” law enforcement “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” and specifically mandates that, unless there is a strong countervailing interest, “[r]ecords pertaining to any investigation, arrest or other law enforcement activity shall be disclosed to the public[,]” I recognize that you may assert the privilege under Section 6254(k) and Evidence Code Section 1040 to omit arrestees' addresses from the records. However, I argue that the necessity for preserving the confidentiality of the information does not outweigh the necessity for disclosure, because housing status will be a key variable in this analysis. I cite the following reporting as evidence that analyses of crime statistics by housing status are in the public interest: https://www.latimes.com/local/politics/la-me-homeless-arrests-20180204-story.html, https://crosscut.com/2019/02/seattle-1-5-people-booked-jail-are-homeless, https://www.oregonlive.com/portland/2018/06/portland_homeless_accounted_fd.html. Additionally, these addresses will never be published, will not be stored online unless password-protected, and will only be accessible to a reporter who analyzes the data. Additionally, in light of § 6254’s clear mandate that the requested information must be disclosed, such information cannot qualify as protected Criminal Offender Record Information under California Penal Code §§ 11105 or 13300. If you have any questions, please contact me by whatever means would be most convenient to you. Additionally, please notify me of costs before taking any billable steps. Thank you for your assistance.
Your request is being forwarded to the appropriate department(s) for processing and you will be notified once the request is complete.

You can monitor request progress at the link below. Thank you for using the San Francisco Public Records Center.

San Francisco Police Department

To monitor the progress or update this request please log into the SFPD Public Records Center.
March 08, 2021

Via email mlewis@revealnews.org

Melissa Lewis
1400 65th Street Suite 200
Emeryville, CA 94608

RE: Public Records Request, dated March 01, 2021, Reference # P028478-030121

Dear Melissa Lewis:

The San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) received your Public Records Act request, dated March 01, 2021.

You requested, "To whom it may concern:

I am a data reporter for the Center for Investigative Reporting, and I seek information that will allow me to conduct an analysis of the housing status of arrestees.

Pursuant to the California Public Records Act, Gov’t Code § 6250 et seq., and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance, S.F. Admin Code § 67, I write to request data for all arrests made by the San Francisco Police Department from 2011 to the present.

Specifically, I request the following information for each arrest:

- Observation (rows): Arrest charge
- Time frame: 1/1/2011 to date of export
- Fields:
  - Any unique identifier for the arrest event, e.g. incident and/or case number
  - Any field indicating whether the arrest was made in response to a call for service
- Arrestee:
  - Name
  - Race
  - Ethnicity
  - Gender
  - Date of birth
  - Address recorded at time of arrest
  - Offense and charge description
  - Charge level (misdemeanor/felony class)
  - Date and time of arrest
  - Location of arrest (address and/or geographic coordinates)
  - Police division
  - Police beat

I am requesting these records in a machine-readable format such as a CSV or Excel files, transferred electronically. If this information is stored in a relational database, I request it be provided in its original relational format, not de-normalized. I also request a data dictionary or equivalent documentation for the fields requested.
If it is more expedient in terms of staffing time for you to fulfill this request by providing the entirety of a given table rather than selecting a subset, I would welcome the entirety.

If you deny this request in whole or in part, I request that you respond with the statutory exemption underlying the denial and the reasoning therein. If an asserted exemption applies to only a portion of a record, please delete or redact the portion to which the exemption applies.

However, I expect this request to be fulfilled in its entirety, as the California Public Records Act specifically mandates the disclosure of this information for journalistic purposes:

[S]tate and local law enforcement agencies shall make public the following information, except to the extent that disclosure of a particular item of information would endanger the safety of a person involved in an investigation or would endanger the successful completion of the investigation or a related investigation:

(1) The full name and occupation of every individual arrested by the agency, the individual’s physical description including date of birth, color of eyes and hair, sex, height and weight, the time and date of arrest, the time and date of booking, the location of the arrest, the factual circumstances surrounding the arrest, the amount of bail set, the time and manner of release or the location where the individual is currently being held, and all charges the individual is being held upon, including any outstanding warrants from other jurisdictions and parole or probation holds.

. . .

(3) Subject to the restrictions of Section 841.5 of the Penal Code and this subdivision, the current address of every individual arrested by the agency and the current address of the victim of a crime, if the requester declares under penalty of perjury that the request is made for a scholarly, journalistic, political, or governmental purpose[.]

Gov’t Code § 6254(f).

Moreover, the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance specifically “encourage[s]” law enforcement “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” and specifically mandates that, unless there is a strong countervailing interest, “[r]ecords pertaining to any investigation, arrest or other law enforcement activity shall be disclosed to the public[.]”

I recognize that you may assert the privilege under Section 6254(k) and Evidence Code Section 1040 to omit arrestees’ addresses from the records. However, I argue that the necessity for preserving the confidentiality of the information does not outweigh the necessity for disclosure, because housing status will be a key variable in this analysis. I cite the following reporting as evidence that analyses of crime statistics by housing status are in the public interest: https://www.latimes.com/local/politics/la-me-homeless-arrests-20180204-story.html, https://crosscut.com/2019/02/seattle-1-5-people-booked-jail-are-homeless, https://www.oregonlive.com/portland/2018/06/portland_homeless_accounted_for.html. Additionally, these addresses will never be published, will not be stored online unless password-protected, and will only be accessible to a reporter who analyzes the data.

Additionally, in light of § 6254’s clear mandate that the requested information must be disclosed, such information cannot qualify as protected Criminal Offender Record Information under California Penal Code §§ 11105 or 13300.

If you have any questions, please contact me by whatever means would be most convenient to you.

Additionally, please notify me of costs before taking any billable steps.

Thank you for your assistance."

On February 25, 2020, the Mayor issued a Proclamation (the “Proclamation”) declaring a local emergency to exist in connection with the imminent spread within the City of a novel (new) coronavirus (“COVID-19”). On March 6, 2020, the Local Health Officer declared a local health emergency under Section 101080 of the California Health and Safety Code, and the Board of Supervisors concurred in that declaration on March 10, 2020. On March 7, 2020, the Department of Human Resources (“DHR”) issued guidance to minimize COVID-19 exposure risk for City employees who provide essential services to the local community, in particular during the current local emergency. On March 23, 2020, the Mayor’s Fifth Supplemental Proclamation stated that “many City employees have been reassigned from their normal work time to work related to the emergency response; City departments have been directed to support telecommuting to the extent possible, and telecommuting employees may not have access to City records; and many City employees are unable to work full-time because they are caring for children and family members at home who have been impacted by the pandemic; these changes to the typical functioning of the City workforce and workplace have burdened the City's ability to respond to requests for public records; temporarily suspending select provisions of the Sunshine Ordinance will allow the City to devote limited staff resources to emergency services and providing services to the public while still providing transparency; the California Public Records Act will continue to apply.”

Significantly, the Mayor suspended “the following provisions of City law governing public records are hereby suspended for pending and future records requests, until the termination of the emergency, unless the Mayor provides notice to the Board of Supervisors that the suspension is no longer necessary and rescinds this Order:

On February 25, 2020, the Mayor issued a Proclamation (the “Proclamation”) declaring a local emergency to exist in connection with the imminent spread within the City of a novel (new) coronavirus (“COVID-19”). On March 6, 2020, the Local Health Officer declared a local health emergency under Section 101080 of the California Health and Safety Code, and the Board of Supervisors concurred in that declaration on March 10, 2020. On March 7, 2020, the Department of Human Resources (“DHR”) issued guidance to minimize COVID-19 exposure risk for City employees who provide essential services to the local community, in particular during the current local emergency. On March 23, 2020, the Mayor’s Fifth Supplemental Proclamation stated that “many City employees have been reassigned from their normal work time to work related to the emergency response; City departments have been directed to support telecommuting to the extent possible, and telecommuting employees may not have access to City records; and many City employees are unable to work full-time because they are caring for children and family members at home who have been impacted by the pandemic; these changes to the typical functioning of the City workforce and workplace have burdened the City's ability to respond to requests for public records; temporarily suspending select provisions of the Sunshine Ordinance will allow the City to devote limited staff resources to emergency services and providing services to the public while still providing transparency; the California Public Records Act will continue to apply.”

Significantly, the Mayor suspended “the following provisions of City law governing public records are hereby suspended for pending and future records requests, until the termination of the emergency, unless the Mayor provides notice to the Board of Supervisors that the suspension is no longer necessary and rescinds this Order:
a. The requirements in Administrative Code Section 67.21(a) and (b) that City agencies comply with requests for inspection or copying of a public record within 10 days following receipt of the request, or provide a written justification for withholding a record within 10 days. The foregoing sentence only addresses those deadlines under the Sunshine Ordinance, and does not affect a City agency’s obligation to provide an initial response to a requester within the timeframes set forth in California Government Code Section 6253(c).

b. The requirement in Administrative Code Section 67.21(c) that City agencies comply with requests for descriptions of records.

c. The requirement in Administrative Code Section 67.24(e)(3) that City agencies prepare and provide documents and information during the course of contract negotiations.

d. The restriction in Administrative Code Sections 67.24(g) and 67.24(i) prohibiting City departments from relying upon Government Code Section 6255 or any similar provision as the basis for withholding any documents or information. This paragraph does not suspend Administrative Code Section 67.24(h) regarding a "deliberative process" exemption.

e. All deadlines in Administrative Code Section 67.21 for the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force or the Supervisor of Records to make determinations, and all deadlines in the Administrative Code or in regulations for parties to submit information to the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force. All such deadlines shall be tolled until 15 days after the termination of this Order.

f. The requirement in Administrative Code Section 67.21(e) that an authorized representative of the custodian of records attend any hearing concerning a records request and explain its decision to withhold the records requested.

The Media Relation Unit has limited resources and with the additional challenges the COVID-19 pandemic has placed on the Commission, we will not be able to respond to your request at this time. Rest assured we take our obligations seriously but hope that you understand that we are limited in our resources and this request is extremely burdensome during this time. We will provide you with an update on March 26, 2021.

Sincerely,

Michael Andraychak
Media Relations
415-837-7395

To monitor the progress or update this request please log into the SFPD Public Records Center.

This is an auto-generated email and has originated from an unmonitored email account. Please DO NOT REPLY.
March 24, 2021

Via email mlewis@revealnews.org

Melissa Lewis
1400 65th Street Suite 200
Emeryville, CA 94608

RE: Public Records Request, dated March 01, 2021, Reference # P028478-030121

Dear Melissa Lewis:

The San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) received your Public Records Act request, dated March 01, 2021, on March 24, 2021.

You requested, *To whom it may concern:*

I am a data reporter for the Center for Investigative Reporting, and I seek information that will allow me to conduct an analysis of the housing status of arrestees.

Pursuant to the California Public Records Act, Gov’t Code § 6250 et seq., and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance, S.F. Admin Code § 67, I write to request data for all arrests made by the San Francisco Police Department from 2011 to the present.

Specifically, I request the following information for each arrest:

- Observation (rows): Arrest charge
- Time frame: 1/1/2011 to date of export
- Fields:
  - Any unique identifier for the arrest event, e.g. incident and/or case number
  - Any field indicating whether the arrest was made in response to a call for service
- Arrestee:
  - Name
  - Race
  - Ethnicity
  - Gender
  - Date of birth
  - Address recorded at time of arrest
- Offense and charge description
- Charge level (misdemeanor/felony class)
- Date and time of arrest
- Location of arrest (address and/or geographic coordinates)
- Police division
- Police beat

I am requesting these records in a machine-readable format such as a CSV or Excel files, transferred electronically. If this information is stored in a relational database, I request it be provided in its original relational format, not de-normalized. I also request a data
dictionary or equivalent documentation for the fields requested.

If it is more expedient in terms of staffing time for you to fulfill this request by providing the entirety of a given table rather than selecting a subset, I would welcome the entirety.

If you deny this request in whole or in part, I request that you respond with the statutory exemption underlying the denial and the reasoning therein. If an asserted exemption applies to only a portion of a record, please delete or redact the portion to which the exemption applies.

However, I expect this request to be fulfilled in its entirety, as the California Public Records Act specifically mandates the disclosure of this information for journalistic purposes:

[State and local law enforcement agencies shall make public the following information, except to the extent that disclosure of a particular item of information would endanger the safety of a person involved in an investigation or would endanger the successful completion of the investigation or a related investigation:

(1) The full name and occupation of every individual arrested by the agency, the individual’s physical description including date of birth, color of eyes and hair, sex, height and weight, the time and date of arrest, the time and date of booking, the location of the arrest, the factual circumstances surrounding the arrest, the amount of bail set, the time and manner of release or the location where the individual is currently being held, and all charges the individual is being held upon, including any outstanding warrants from other jurisdictions and parole or probation holds.

. . .

(3) Subject to the restrictions of Section 841.5 of the Penal Code and this subdivision, the current address of every individual arrested by the agency and the current address of the victim of a crime, if the requester declares under penalty of perjury that the request is made for a scholarly, journalistic, political, or governmental purpose[.]]

Gov’t Code § 6254(f).

Moreover, the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance specifically “encourage[s]” law enforcement “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” and specifically mandates that, unless there is a strong countervailing interest, “[r]ecords pertaining to any investigation, arrest or other law enforcement activity shall be disclosed to the public[.]”

I recognize that you may assert the privilege under Section 6254(k) and Evidence Code Section 1040 to omit arrestees’ addresses from the records. However, I argue that the necessity for preserving the confidentiality of the information does not outweigh the necessity for disclosure, because housing status will be a key variable in this analysis. I cite the following reporting as evidence that analyses of crime statistics by housing status are in the public interest: https://www.latimes.com/local/politics/la-me-homeless-arrests-20180204-story.html, https://crosscut.com/2019/02/seattle-1-5-people-booked-jail-are-homeless, https://www.oregonlive.com/portland/2018/06/portland_homeless_accounted_fo.html. Additionally, these addresses will never be published, will not be stored online unless password-protected, and will only be accessible to a reporter who analyzes the data.

Additionally, in light of § 6254’s clear mandate that the requested information must be disclosed, such information cannot qualify as protected Criminal Offender Record Information under California Penal Code §§ 11105 or 13300.

If you have any questions, please contact me by whatever means would be most convenient to you.

Additionally, please notify me of costs before taking any billable steps.

Thank you for your assistance."

The SFPD anticipates completing this review in the next few weeks.

If you have any questions, please contact me at Personal

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,

Michael Andraychak
Media Relations

To monitor the progress or update this request please log into the SFPD Public Records Center.
Please provide the following clarification:

Regarding arrestee address information, if you declare under penalty of perjury that the request is made for a scholarly, journalistic, political, or governmental purpose then we can provide arrestee address information under Government Code 6254f(3).

Under advice of SF City Attorney, we can only provide arrestee name and identifying information for arrests within 90 days of your request. Arrests prior to 90 days are considered CORI (Criminal Offender Record Information) and that information confidential under law.

Juvenile arrest information will be withheld under provisions of the California Welfare and Institutions Code which makes information on juvenile arrests confidential.

If you wish SFPD to proceed with the request, please provide the requested information by .

You may provide a response to SFPD by any of the following methods:
1. by responding to this email,
2. by logging into the Public Records Center and adding a message to your request,
3. by regular mail to Police Department Headquarters, 1245 3rd Street, San Francisco; or
4. in person at Police Department Headquarters, 1245 3rd Street, San Francisco, Monday through Friday, from 8 A.M. until 5 P.M.

Upon receipt of your clarification, SFPD will further respond to your request as required by law, including providing you with an estimate of costs, if any, associated with producing the requested records.

If you have any questions, please contact me at 415-837-7395.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,

Michael Andraychak
Media Relations

To monitor the progress or update this request please log into the SFPD Public Records Center.

This is an auto-generated email and has originated from an unmonitored email account. Please DO NOT REPLY.
March 26, 2021

Michael Andraychak
Media Relations
San Francisco Police Department

Hello,

Pursuant to California Public Records Act, Government Code 6254(f)(3) I have requested the following as part of Request ID P028478-030121 from the San Francisco Police Department:

Address information recorded for arrestees at the time of their arrest.

I declare under penalty of perjury that I am making the request for a journalistic purpose.

I also declare, under penalty of perjury, that the address information obtained pursuant to the above section shall not be used directly, indirectly, or furnished to another, to sell a product or service to any individual or group of individuals.

Melissa Lewis
Data Reporter
mlewis@revealnews.org
April 20, 2021

Via email mlewis@revealnews.org

Melissa Lewis
1400 65th Street Suite 200
Emeryville, CA 94608

RE: Public Records Request, dated March 01, 2021, Reference # P028478-030121

Dear Melissa Lewis:

The San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) received your Public Records Act request, dated March 01, 2021, on April 20, 2021.

You requested, "To whom it may concern:

I am a data reporter for the Center for Investigative Reporting, and I seek information that will allow me to conduct an analysis of the housing status of arrestees.

Pursuant to the California Public Records Act, Gov't Code § 6250 et seq., and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance, S.F. Admin Code § 67, I write to request data for all arrests made by the San Francisco Police Department from 2011 to the present.

Specifically, I request the following information for each arrest:

- Observation (rows): Arrest charge
- Time frame: 1/1/2011 to date of export
- Fields:
  - Any unique identifier for the arrest event, e.g. incident and/or case number
  - Any field indicating whether the arrest was made in response to a call for service
- Arrestee:
  - Name
  - Race
  - Ethnicity
  - Gender
  - Date of birth
  - Address recorded at time of arrest
  - Offense and charge description
  - Charge level (misdemeanor/felony class)
  - Date and time of arrest
  - Location of arrest (address and/or geographic coordinates)
  - Police division
  - Police beat

I am requesting these records in a machine-readable format such as a CSV or Excel files, transferred electronically. If this information is stored in a relational database, I request it be provided in its original relational format, not de-normalized. I also request a data dictionary or equivalent documentation for the fields requested.

--- Please respond above this line ---
If it is more expedient in terms of staffing time for you to fulfill this request by providing the entirety of a given table rather than selecting a subset, I would welcome the entirety.

If you deny this request in whole or in part, I request that you respond with the statutory exemption underlying the denial and the reasoning therein. If an asserted exemption applies to only a portion of a record, please delete or redact the portion to which the exemption applies.

However, I expect this request to be fulfilled in its entirety, as the California Public Records Act specifically mandates the disclosure of this information for journalistic purposes:

[State and local law enforcement agencies shall make public the following information, except to the extent that disclosure of a particular item of information would endanger the safety of a person involved in an investigation or would endanger the successful completion of the investigation or a related investigation:]

(1) The full name and occupation of every individual arrested by the agency, the individual’s physical description including date of birth, color of eyes and hair, sex, height and weight, the time and date of arrest, the time and date of booking, the location of the arrest, the factual circumstances surrounding the arrest, the amount of bail set, the time and manner of release or the location where the individual is currently being held, and all charges the individual is being held upon, including any outstanding warrants from other jurisdictions and parole or probation holds.

. . .

(3) Subject to the restrictions of Section 841.5 of the Penal Code and this subdivision, the current address of every individual arrested by the agency and the current address of the victim of a crime, if the requester declares under penalty of perjury that the request is made for a scholarly, journalistic, political, or governmental purpose[.]

Gov't Code § 6254(f).

Moreover, the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance specifically "encourage[s]" law enforcement "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" and specifically mandates that, unless there is a strong countervailing interest, "[r]ecords pertaining to any investigation, arrest or other law enforcement activity shall be disclosed to the public[.]

I recognize that you may assert the privilege under Section 6254(k) and Evidence Code Section 1040 to omit arrestees’ addresses from the records. However, I argue that the necessity for preserving the confidentiality of the information does not outweigh the necessity for disclosure, because housing status will be a key variable in this analysis. I cite the following reporting as evidence that analyses of crime statistics by housing status are in the public interest: https://www.latimes.com/local/politics/la-me-homeless-arrests-20180204-story.html, https://crosscut.com/2019/02/seattle-1-5-people-booked-jail-are-homeless, https://www.oregonlive.com/portland/2018/06/portland_homeless_accounted_for.html. Additionally, these addresses will never be published, will not be stored online unless password-protected, and will only be accessible to a reporter who analyzes the data.

Additionally, in light of § 6254’s clear mandate that the requested information must be disclosed, such information cannot qualify as protected Criminal Offender Record Information under California Penal Code §§ 11105 or 13300.

If you have any questions, please contact me by whatever means would be most convenient to you.

Additionally, please notify me of costs before taking any billable steps.

Thank you for your assistance."

Responsive records are available via the San Francisco Public Records Center. Click on the link below to view your request.

Public Records Request - P028478-030121

If you have any questions, please contact Michael Andraychak at 415-837-7395.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,

Sergeant Michael Andraychak
Officer in Charge
Media Relations

To monitor the progress or update this request please log into the SFPD Public Records Center.

This is an auto-generated email and has originated from an unmonitored email account. Please DO NOT REPLY.
Requestor: P028478-030121

Date of Request: March 26, 2021

Request: All Arrest Data from January 1, 2011 until present

Response: The Monthly Arrest and Citation Register (MACR) data for the date range of May 2014 through February 2021 is provided in an Excel spreadsheet.

Arrestee names, dates of birth, and local reference numbers constituting personally identifiable information have been removed. Records involving juveniles have been removed. No additional data fields are available.

MACR: Monthly Arrest and Citation Register (MACR) submitted to CA Department of Justice (DOJ)

The monthly file created on the 12th and sent to DOJ includes the adult bookings entered by the Sheriff’s Department, and the Youth Guidance Center juvenile bookings entered by the San Francisco Police Department ID Bureau. The file is based on Bureau of Criminal Statistics (BCS) codes so if there are multiple BCS codes associated with a single booking there will be multiple records for that booking.

Please note that the file is created using entered date which may cause some records to appear in a future file compared to the arrest date (i.e. a record with an arrest in March but not entered into system until April will not be extracted until May 12th).

Data Source: San Francisco Police Department Monthly Arrest and Citation Register

Date Prepared: April 1, 2021
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constant</th>
<th>Level of Offense</th>
<th>Level of Offense Description</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>BCS Code</th>
<th>BCS Description</th>
<th>Arrest Date</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Race Description</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Sex Description</th>
<th>Printed</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Status Description</th>
<th>Disposition</th>
<th>Disposition Description</th>
<th>NCIC Number</th>
<th>Fill</th>
<th>Record Format Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2-Misdemeanor</td>
<td>500001</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>ASSAULT AND BATTERY (MISDEMEANOR)</td>
<td>4/2/2014</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B-Black</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2-Female</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-Cite</td>
<td>3-Misdemeanor</td>
<td>3801</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2-Misdemeanor</td>
<td>500000</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>OTHER (MISDEMEANOR)</td>
<td>4/2/2014</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W-White</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-Male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-Cite</td>
<td>3-Misdemeanor</td>
<td>3801</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2-Misdemeanor</td>
<td>500002</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>MISC TRAFFIC (OTHER REPORTED OFFENSE)</td>
<td>4/3/2014</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O-Other</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-Male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-Cite</td>
<td>3-Misdemeanor</td>
<td>3801</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2-Misdemeanor</td>
<td>500003</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>VANDALISM (MISDEMEANOR)</td>
<td>4/3/2014</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O-Other</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-Male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-Cite</td>
<td>3-Misdemeanor</td>
<td>3801</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Buta, Odaya (CAT)

From: Buta, Odaya (CAT) on behalf of Supervisor Records (CAT)
Sent: Wednesday, July 14, 2021 5:34 PM
To: [Personal Info.]
Cc: [Personal Info.]
Subject: RE: Public Record Request Determination on Next Request #21-3239 Recreation and Parks Department

Mr. Sullivan,

We understand that on July 13, 2021, the Recreation and Park Department responded to your request. If you believe the department has unlawfully withheld or redacted any record, please let us know and we will look into it. Otherwise, we consider your petition closed. Thank you.

Odaya Buta-Scott
Paralegal
Office of City Attorney Dennis J. Herrera
www.sfcityattorney.org
Find us on: Facebook Twitter Instagram

This message and any attachments are solely for the intended recipient and may include privileged or confidential information. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately, and permanently delete this message and any attachments.

To: Supervisor Records (CAT) <supervisor.records@SFCITYATTY.ORG>
Cc: SOTF, (BOS) <sotf@sfgov.org>; Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Subject: Public Record Request Determination on Next Request #21-3239 Recreation and Parks Department

To the Supervisor of Records:

Recreation and Parks Department and Custodian of Records Tiffany Lin-Wilson (REC) has not responded at all to a public record request # 21-3239, (Attached) as described in San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance (SFSO) Sec 67.21 (b) and has failed to respond under CPRA 6253(c) within 10 days. The public record request was sent and received Monday, June 28, 2021.

I am asking the Supervisor of Records under SFOS Sec 67.21 (d) to determine as soon as possible and within 10 day whether the record requested are public.

Please make the determination in writing. (SFOS Sec 67.21 (d))

Please immediately order the custodian of the public record, Tiffany Lin-Wilson (REC) to comply with my public record request. (SFOS Sec 67.21 (d))

If the custodian refuses or fails to comply with your order within 5 days, please notify the district attorney or the attorney general to take whatever measures she or he deems necessary and appropriate to insure compliance with the provisions of the SF Sunshine Ordinance. (SFOS Sec 67.21 (d))
Thank you for your help in this matter,

Mark Sullivan

SFOS Sec 67.21 (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.
To the Supervisor of Records:

Recreation and Parks Department and Custodian of Records Tiffany Lin-Wilson (REC) has not responded at all to a public record request # 21-3239, (Attached) as described in San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance (SFSO) Sec 67.21 (b) and has failed to respond under CPRA 6253(c) within 10 days. The public record request was sent and received Monday, June 28, 2021.

I am asking the Supervisor of Records under SFOS Sec 67.21 (d) to determine as soon as possible and within 10 day whether the record requested are public.

Please make the determination in writing. (SFOS Sec 67.21 (d))

Please immediately order the custodian of the public record, Tiffany Lin-Wilson (REC) to comply with my public record request. (SFOS Sec 67.21 (d))

If the custodian refuses or fails to comply with your order within 5 days, please notify the district attorney or the attorney general to take whatever measures she or he deems necessary and appropriate to insure compliance with the provisions of the SF Sunshine Ordinance. (SFOS Sec 67.21 (d))

Thank you for your help in this matter,

Mark Sullivan

SFOS Sec 67.21 (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.
Request #21-3239

As of July 2, 2021, 3:42pm
Request Visibility: Unpublished

Details

Public Record Request

Please provide all records (including e-mail, attachments and text messages) between the Recreation and Parks Department employees and San Francisco Park Alliance from Jan 1, 2021 to June 28, 2021 on the subject or pertaining to the Richmond Playground.

Reminder: You need to provide all records in your agency's constructive possession -including your agency's contractors (Community Youth Athletic Center v City of National City) and personal devices (City

Received

June 28, 2021 via web

Departments

Recreation and Parks

Requester

MS

San Francisco, CA

Documents

Public (pending) 1

Requester

(none)
Staff

Point of Contact
Tiffany Lin-Wilson (REC)

Timeline

Department Assignment
Recreation and Parks
June 28, 2021, 1:21pm

Request Opened
Request received via web
June 28, 2021, 1:21pm
August 20, 2021

Sent via email

Morris Green

Re: Petition to Supervisor of Records

Dear Mr. Green:

This letter responds to your petition to the Supervisor of Records sent via email on July 15, 2021, arising from a request for records to the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission ("SFPUC"). You requested the following records from SFPUC:

I would like to make a public records request within the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) for the 5502 Project Manager 1 (PM1) job announcement (PEX-5502-063967) that I applied to in 2015 and the following information pertaining to me and the information that is outlined within the red box as shown in the following attachment. Please see attachment for details of my requests. Please make sure the information or data pertaining to me is provided, the requested information is not redacted or hidden and the meaning of the acronyms are described.

SFPUC produced records responsive to your request. You contend that SFPUC improperly applied redactions to a record bearing Bates numbers CCSF008147 – CCSF008148. SFPUC produced an updated version of this record on August 17, 2021, disclosing additional portions of the document because such portions did not reflect information used in the application process for the position at issue. But SFPUC continued to redact columns J through O. You contend that SFPUC improperly redacted the information in these columns pertaining to you.

Section 6254(g) of the California Government Code provides that “[t]est questions, scoring keys, and other examination data used to administer a licensing examination, examination for employment, or academic examination” is exempt from disclosure in response to a request for public records. The information that SFPUC redacted in columns J through O is data used to administer an examination for employment, and it is therefore exempt from disclosure under Section 6254(g). Additionally, SFPUC is not required to disclose this information under provisions of the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance concerning personnel information, because the information does not fall within any of the categories specified in Section 67.24(c) of the Administrative Code. Thus, we conclude that SFPUC properly redacted the document.
For the reasons stated above, we deny your petition and consider it closed.

Very truly yours,

DENNIS J. HERRERA
City Attorney

Bradley A. Russi
Deputy City Attorney
Mr. Green –

Please see the attached response to your petition. Thank you.

Bradley Russi  
Deputy City Attorney  
Office of City Attorney Dennis Herrera  
City Hall, Room 234  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., San Francisco, CA 94102  
www.sfcityattorney.org

From: Mo Green  
Sent: Tuesday, August 17, 2021 5:51 PM  
To: Ruski Augusto Sa, Mayara <MruskiAugustoSa@sfwater.org>  
Cc: Supervisor Records (CAT) <supervisor.records@SFCITYATTY.ORG>  
Subject: Re: Response to your Supervisor of Records Petition

Dear Ms. Ruski Augusto Sa,

The document you provided is not acceptable and you and SFPUC are deliberately playing games. I am only asking for my data records only and not anyone else's that I stated several times in my requests, but you choose to further redacted my data that I requested with the "null" wording and redacted or black out the following columns (i.e., "Accept1, Reject1, Accept2, Reject2"). You and SFPUC and the rest of the city agencies have NOT DISCLOSED anything which illustrates your evasiveness, avoidance, and lack of cooperation. Since you and SFPUC decide to deliberately withhold information pertaining to my data and public information requests then I will choose to contact the higher authorities regarding your actions. I have been waiting for years for this simple public information requests.

Thanks,  
Mr. Green

On Tuesday, August 17, 2021, 04:36:34 PM PDT, Ruski Augusto Sa, Mayara <mruskiaugustosa@sfwater.org> wrote:

Dear Mr. Green,

We understand that you submitted a petition to the Supervisor of Records concerning the City's redaction of certain information in the records Bates stamped CCSF 008147 and 008148. You originally received those records from the City pursuant to discovery in your civil lawsuit. You have asked SFPUC to produce a less-redacted version of those two records. You wrote to the Supervisor of Records: "My request pertains to the information that I am requesting concerns my records only. I believe the decision to withhold or redact records pertaining to my information that SFPUC already has in its possession is unlawful."
We have reviewed the redactions applied to the document Bates stamped CCSF 008147–CCSF 008150 you attached to your June 15, 2021 public records request (Request No. 21-2743). We are providing a revised version attached to this email disclosing several columns that were previously redacted on page CCSF 008148, including "Ap Expire Date," all columns labeled "Score 1" through "Score 7," "Legal," "Age," and "Disability," because these fields were "null" and, thus were not used during the application process for which you sought records. We have not altered the other redactions on the records marked CCSF 008147 and CCSF 008148 because such information was properly redacted based on the personnel, privacy, and testing exemptions under the Public Records Act that we cited in our June 29, 2021 email to you.

We will provide a separate response to your email dated July 13, 2021.

Thank you,

Mayara Ruski Augusto Sa

SFPUC Public Records Senior Analyst
Buta, Odaya (CAT)

From: Mo Green <Personal Info.>
Sent: Thursday, July 15, 2021 2:21 PM
To: Supervisor Records (CAT)
Subject: Making a Sunshine Appeals. Fw: [External Message Added] City and County of San Francisco public records request #21-2743
Attachments: SFPUC WWE-5502 Project Manager 1 Job Announcement (PEX-5502-063967) and Information.pdf; Request 21-2743 - NextRequest - Modern FOIA & Public Records Request Software.pdf

To Whom It May Concern:

I would like to make a sunshine appeal against the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) for the Public Records Request. Attached is the records I was looking for regarding Public Request no. # 21-2743, dated June 3, 2021.

My request pertains to the information that I am requesting concerns my records only. I believe the decision to withhold or redact records pertaining to my information that SFPUC already has in its possession is unlawful.

Feel free to contact me by email: Personal Info.

M. Green

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Mo Green <Personal Info.>
To: sanfrancisco 21-2743-requester-notes@inbound.nextrequest.com <sanfrancisco 21-2743-requester-notes@inbound.nextrequest.com> Mayara Ruski Augusto Sa <mruskaugustosa@sfwater.org> SOTF (BOS) <sotf@sfgov.org>
Sent: Tuesday, July 13, 2021, 05:38:07 PM PDT
Subject: Re: [External Message Added] City and County of San Francisco public records request #21-2743

To Whom It May Concern Mayara Ruski Augusto Sa Emily Alt and PUC personnel.

1. On page 3 (item b-e), page 4 and 5, I requested copies of less redacted copies of records (Bates stamped CCSF 008147 and CCSF 008148) pertaining to my information only (item No. 24) and no one else. Can you please provide a less redacted version of the records for my data so I don't have to take this request up to management/higher authorities, Sunshine Ordinance Task Force (SOTF) and to the Mayor Office Regarding item nos. 7 on page 9 which is in your possession already (Bates stamped CCSF 008147 and CCSF 008148). The argument pertaining to records being redacted under privacy, personnel and testing exemptions of the Public Records Act is null in void or incorrect because I am only requested information and records pertaining to my data only and no one else (See page 3 (item b)). Besides, based on Order of Determination issued March 4, 2020 by the City County of San Francisco, Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, File No. 19085 and 19084, both the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) and Office of the City Attorney were in violation of Administrative Code Sections 67.21 and 67.25 for failing to respond to requests for documents in a timely and/or complete manner.

2. On page 3 (item d) what does the acronyms stand for under the disposition and status category, particularly "AC", "IN", and others (Bates stamped CCSF 008149) that is located on page 6 of 9 and on page 9 (item 6 and 8 for "what is "PC" stand for under the criteria PC Exp. ").

3. Regarding item no. 5 on page 9 and page 7 (outlined in red) can you please provide me the referenced Hiring Manager Selection Form because apparently I don't have it.

4. Regarding item nos. 1, 2, 3, 6, 7 and 8 on page 9, is already in your possession therefore the City doesn't have to create any new document since PUC administered the interviewed, selected, scored applicants who applied for the WWE-5502 Project Manager 1 position process (PEX-5502-063967).
A message was sent to you regarding record request #21-2743:

Dear Requester,

We write in response to your request no. #21-2743, dated June 3, 2021 ("new request").

Regarding item no. 9 on page 9 of your new request, the SFPUC conducted a diligent search for responsive records and does not currently have any staff employed in the Project Manager 4 job class, nor did it have staff employed under that job class when you submitted your original request in 2019. Therefore, SFPUC has no records responsive to this item of your request.

Regarding item no. 5 on page 9 of your new request seeking the referenced Hiring Manager Selection Form, we note that you made an identical request for this record in item 37 of your request dated October 23, 2019, and the SFPUC produced a copy of this record to you at that time. Please respond to this...
email to clarify whether you would like us to resend you a copy of this record.

Regarding item nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, and 8 on page 9 of your new request, these items sought answers to questions or would otherwise require the SFPUC to create documents that are not currently in its possession. A request that a department create a response to a request for information or answer a series of questions is not a public records request. Neither the Public Records Act nor the Sunshine Ordinance requires the SFPUC to reply to a series of written questions or interrogatories.

The remainder of your new request seeks less redacted copies of records (Bates stamped CCSF 008147 and CCSF 008148) than had been previously produced to you by the City Attorney’s Office in 2019. As explained to you at that time, those records were redacted under the privacy, personnel, and testing exemptions of the Public Records Act. The withholding of age and disability information was based on the California Constitution, Article I, section 1, and California Government Code section 6254, subdivisions (c) and (k). Further, both the California Public Records Act (California Government Code Section 6250) and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance (San Francisco Administrative Code Section 67.1(g)) acknowledge the importance of protecting personal privacy when disclosing records in response to a public records request. Job candidates’ names, personal testing scores and related information were also redacted as confidential personnel records protected by the California Constitutional right of privacy. (See, Cal. Const. Art. I § 1 Hill v. National Collegiate Athletic Assn., (1994) 7 Cal.4th 1, 35 (identifying privacy interest in precluding dissemination of sensitive, confidential information) Teamsters Local 856 v.
Priceless, LLC, (2003) 112 Cal.App.4th 1500, 1512 (public employees have a right to privacy in their personnel files). These provisions guard against disclosure of information that would invade personal privacy. In addition, please note that your requests for removal of redactions of test scores and related information seek information exempt under California Government Code 6254(g), which relates to data used to administer examination for employment.

Finally, please note that the SFPUC is only responding to your records request on its behalf, and not on the behalf of other City departments. Therefore, we recommend that you contact the San Francisco City Attorney’s Office, as we believe it may have records responsive to your request.

We now consider your request closed.

Best Regards,

Emily Alt on behalf of SFPUC Public Records

View Request 21-2743
https://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/requests/21-2743
## 5502 Project Manager 1

One (1) Position, Permanent Exempt, Three-Year Assignment

Recruitment #PEX-5502-063967

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPECIALTY</th>
<th>Wastewater Enterprise, Repair Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEPARTMENT</td>
<td>Public Utilities Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANALYST</td>
<td>Vonn Bair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE OPENED</td>
<td>1/7/2015 08:00:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILING DEADLINE</td>
<td>1/21/2015 5:00:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALARY</td>
<td>$124,696.00 - $124,696.00/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOB TYPE</td>
<td>Permanent Exempt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPLOYMENT TYPE</td>
<td>Full-Time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INTRODUCTION

**Appointment Type, Duration and Location**

Acting pay assignment or temporary exempt appointment. This position is located in San Francisco. Some assignments may require driving and/or weekend work. The duration of the assignment is three (3) years.

**General Description**

Under administrative direction, the 5502 Project Manager plans, organizes, directs and controls all or part of either a highly complex engineering, architectural or information systems project from concept through design and construction to close out of the project contract.

Engineering/Architectural Project Manager positions are responsible for: preparing and monitoring the project budget, including occasionally obtaining funding; overseeing the completion of conceptual design; overseeing planning activities; coordinating work of a multidisciplinary technical staff across organizational boundaries; working extensively with the public, private contractors, special interest groups, governmental funding and regulatory agencies, and City and County departments; coordinating EIR processes and/or obtaining permits; controlling project cost and schedule; reviewing change orders; serving as primary contact for all parties involved in the project; and other duties as required.

**Duties Specific to This Position**

Under general administrative direction of the Treatment Facilities Project Manager IV, this PM I will manage the planning, design and construction of the Treatment Facilities Repair & Replacement (R & R) projects. The combined planning, environmental review, design and construction budget for this project is $22.5 million distributed over the next 3 years and the project description is as follows:

**R & R Projects for Treatment Facilities**
The R & R Program funds the replacement and upgrade of the PUC Wastewater Enterprise’s Treatment Facilities located in the City. Treatment Facilities projects involve the renovation or replacement of process equipment and conveying systems including pumping systems and odor control equipment. These Treatment Plants have mechanical/electrical equipment, piping and other process equipment and generally the plant life of these facilities is 25 years. However, some of the components specially, electrical in a corrosive environment will last only for 10 years. The R&R Program addresses the operation and maintenance problems with these treatment facilities to avoid failures and violations. The scope of these projects will include planning, environmental review, design, and construction of sewer infrastructure projects.

This particular level of project manager is needed to oversee these highly complex and multidimensional projects, secure project funding, prepare project updates, identify staffing in needed areas of expertise, perform scope analysis and determine project alternatives. Furthermore, the PM will review and approve critical path schedules, facility shutdown schedules, and project spending plans. The PM will interact with the Wastewater Enterprise Sewer System Improvement Program (SSIP) Program Management Team, SFPUC Senior Management and Commission, the Board of Supervisors and various city departments as well as other regulatory agencies.

**Minimum Qualifications**

1. Bachelor’s Degree in architecture, engineering or planning plus four years of responsible architectural, engineering or construction management experience, OR
2. A Bachelor’s Degree in another field plus six years of responsible experience in a field directly related to the project, OR
3. Eight years of architectural, engineering, or construction management experience in a field directly related to the project, OR
4. California registration as professional engineer AND
5. Possession of a valid driver’s license.

**Application Procedure**

Submit your application online here by clicking on the “Apply” link at the top of this webpage, or visit http://www.jobaps.com/sf/sup/images/default.asp to see this and other available jobs with the City & County of San Francisco. Please file immediately, as the posting will close on 21 January 2015. If you have questions about the recruitment, please call the analyst at 415/554-1670.

Applicants are advised to keep a copy of their application papers for their own records, as these documents may be requested by hiring departments at a later date. Failure to submit the required documentations will result in disqualification. Applicants will be screened for relevant qualifying experience. Applicants will be screened for relevant qualifying experience. Those applicants most qualified will be offered interviews. Reasonable accommodations under accommodations legislation will be made so that applicants with disabilities may participate in the application and/or selection process. Applicants requesting accommodations should do so by calling (415) 554-1670; TDD (415) 554-1672.

In compliance with the Immigration and Reform Act of 1986, all persons entering City and County employment will be required to prove their identity and authorization to work in the United States.

**Disaster Service Workers**

All City and County of San Francisco employees are designated Disaster Service Workers through state and local law (California Government Code Section 3100-3109). Employment with the City requires the affirmation of a loyalty oath to this effect. Employees are required to complete all Disaster Service Worker-related training as assigned, and to return to work as ordered in the event of an emergency.

MINORITIES, WOMEN AND PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES ARE ENCOURAGED TO APPLY

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

5502-063967WWE/vsb
b. Other discovery documents I have issues with pertain to the Defendant’s SFPUC produced document (CCSF 008147-8148) where the documents were highly redacted including the portion with the Plaintiff’s information (#24) that shouldn’t be redacted.

c. Defendant produced document, CCSF 008153, which Plaintiff requested the location of where’s the Hiring Manager Selection Form that was mentioned below in the document and who was the department head hiring manager that made the final decision to select the candidates to hire for the various Project Manager I positions that Plaintiff applied to.

d. Furthermore, in Plaintiff’s attached email regarding Defendant’s produced documents namely (CCSF 008147 and 008149) under Exhibit what does the acronyms stand for under the disposition and status category, particularly “AC” and others.

e. Defendant produced document, CCSF 008855 on the exact day a few minutes before the Person Most Knowledgeable (PMK) deposition of Ana Valdes had occurred on August 20, 2019. Unfortunately, it left insufficient time for Plaintiff’s counsel to properly prepare and ask appropriate questions related to the produced document (See Plaintiff’s email under Item No. 8 and the rest and Court Dkt No.107 in Exhibit).

Plaintiff attempted to ask these questions later, but Defendant refused to provide.

In summary, the items described in Plaintiff’s Declaration pursuant to Rule 56(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure in requesting for additional time needed to conduct, obtain and review specific discovery that was requested before in order to provide more evidence to the Court showing why Defendant’s Motion for Summary Judgment should not be granted meets the requirements of Rule 56(d). Depending on the response from the Defendant on the specific discovery that Plaintiff is requesting, Plaintiff thinks two (2) weeks or less would be sufficient or whatever the Court deems appropriate in filing the Plaintiff’s Opposition if the Court should grant.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: January 5, 2021

Sign Name: /s/Morris Green Jr.

Print Name: Morris Green Jr.

Pro Se: Plaintiff

PLAINTIFF’S DECLARATION IN SUPPORT FOR EXTENSION IN FILING RESPONSE FOR OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT’S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT TO DISMISS PLAINTIFF’S LAWSUIT CASE NO. C17-00607-TSH
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Interviewed Candidate 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Redacted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>PEX-5502-063967</td>
<td>5502 Project Manager</td>
<td>5502</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>MMQ</td>
<td>AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>PEX-5502-063967</td>
<td>5502 Project Manager</td>
<td>5502</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>MMQ</td>
<td>AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>PEX-5502-063967</td>
<td>5502 Project Manager</td>
<td>5502</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>MMQ</td>
<td>AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>PEX-5502-063967</td>
<td>5502 Project Manager</td>
<td>5502</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>MMQ</td>
<td>AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>PEX-5502-063967</td>
<td>5502 Project Manager</td>
<td>5502</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>MMQ</td>
<td>AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>PEX-5502-063967</td>
<td>5502 Project Manager</td>
<td>5502</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>MMQ</td>
<td>AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>PEX-5502-063967</td>
<td>5502 Project Manager</td>
<td>5502</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>MMQ</td>
<td>AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Selected Candidate 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Redacted</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>PEX-5502-063967</td>
<td>5502 Project Manager</td>
<td>5502</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>MMQ</td>
<td>AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>PEX-5502-063967</td>
<td>5502 Project Manager</td>
<td>5502</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>MMQ</td>
<td>AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Selected Candidate 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Redacted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>PEX-5502-063967</td>
<td>5502 Project Manager</td>
<td>5502</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>MMQ</td>
<td>AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>PEX-5502-063967</td>
<td>5502 Project Manager</td>
<td>5502</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>MMQ</td>
<td>AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Interviewed Candidate 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Redacted</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PEX-5502-063967</td>
<td>5502 Project Manager</td>
<td>5502</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>MMQ</td>
<td>AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>PEX-5502-063967</td>
<td>5502 Project Manager</td>
<td>5502</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>MMQ</td>
<td>AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>PEX-5502-063967</td>
<td>5502 Project Manager</td>
<td>5502</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>MMQ</td>
<td>AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>PEX-5502-063967</td>
<td>5502 Project Manager</td>
<td>5502</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>MMQ</td>
<td>AC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Selected candidate 1 was selected for the 5502 Project Manager I position to help manage the planning, design and construction of the SEP Electrical power improvements.

Selected candidate 1 has 30 years of professional engineering experience in water and wastewater programs. His current experience with SFPUC SEP is of particular value as he is familiar and knowledgeable about the improvements needed at SEP. Prior to joining the SFPUC, Redacted Redacted In addition, his broad knowledge about the complex work processes of municipal government make him a highly desirable candidate for this project.

Selected candidate 1 has a BA in Civil Engineering Redacted a Masters in Management Redacted and a Masters in Sanitary Engineering Redacted

Position 2: PEX-5502-064126 SEP DCS

Selected candidate 2 was selected for the 5502 Project Manager I position for the SEP DCS upgrade projects.

Selected candidate 2 will help manage the SEP DCS upgrades. She has over 6 years experience with project schedule and project control with SFPUC. Over the years, she has build valuable relationships with city as well as outside consultants. Her strong project schedule and project control experience is essential to the PM role.

Selected candidate 2 has a Bachelor of Science in Architectural engineering Redacted Redacted

Position 3: PEX-5502-063967 WW R&R

Selected candidate 3 was selected for the 5502 Project Manager I position for the WW R&R.

Selected candidate 3 has over 10 years engineering experience and has represented Wastewater Enterprise in many projects and special assignments. His experience in wastewater operations with SFPUC will be beneficial for this PM position.

Selected candidate 3 has a Bachelor of Science in Civil Engineering from the San Francisco State University.

CC with Enclosures: Emilio Cruz, Deborah Walters

Enclosures: Interview questions/Score: Summary of Interview Results: Hiring Manager Selection Form: SFPUC Selection Committee Information Form; Job Announcement; Candidate Applications
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Pr's of Experience</th>
<th>Planning/ OBO</th>
<th>PC Exp.</th>
<th>City Experience</th>
<th>Exp Mgr/Sup</th>
<th>Supervision</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Smith</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Doe</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Jones</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 210
Emil,

Please see my comments/questions below in purple and within the original email. Since the City provided the produced CCSF documents I just need some clarification on acronyms and data that wasn’t revealed. This information is simple to obtain from the City and it won’t require much effort on their part, namely:

1. What does Bt stand for in "NonOperBt" and Pos Stat in CCSF8269 document? This means it is funded outside the operating budget. I am assuming Pos Stat in CCSF8269 document stands for Position Status. Is that correct? Also, where is the WWE positions in the department title in this document?

2. Due to us receiving the CCSF 008266/68 document less than an hour before the already scheduled deposition on 8/20/2019, who determined that 43 cutoff point?

3. Are the 3 people who were on the interview panel the same individuals that determined the scoring of the candidates/applicants who applied for the PM position under the various criteria in the CCSF 008266/68 document?

4. Since the City already provided us the CCSF 008266/68 document can the City tell us in the document who were the "Selected Candidate 1, 2 and 3"?

5. Also, can the City provided us the Hiring Manager Selection Form that was mentioned in the CCSF 008153 next to Enclosures?

6. What does MMQ and NQ under Disposition stand for? What does AC and IN under Status category stand for? What document are you referring to? Sorry, I forgot to include the document number. The documents I am referring to are CCSF 001296, 1298, 1300, 1302, 1304, 1306, in particular CCSF001298. The City never provided a legend what each acronym stands for.

7. Lastly, in CCSF 001297, 1299, 1301, 1303, 1305, 1307 documents I would like the City to provide us the data for following categories "Accept1", "Reject1", "Accept2", "Reject2", "Ap Expire Date", and the individual "Score1 to 7" un-redacted?

Note: The City never provided us the data for the following categories "Accept1", "Reject1", "Accept2", "Reject2", "Ap Expire Date" for this portion in CCSF 001297, 1299, 1301, 1303, 1305, 1307 documents. They never provided that portion of the Plaintiff data in those categories as well. They can redact the names, but the data itself is relevant, particularly the Plaintiff portion.

8. In the document CCSF 008266/68 who determined the scoring of the candidates/applicants who applied for the PM position under the various criteria (i.e., Education, Years of Experience, Planning/Environmental, PC Exp., City Experience, Experience in Water/WWE, and Supervision)? How did they determined the score and how to get the maximum score? Who determined that the 43 points is the cutoff point? What is "PC" stand for under the criteria PC Exp.? How is this criteria developed? How is my 10+ years "City Experience" rating of 7 higher than my "Years of Experience" rating of 6 when I had experience outside of the City/SFPUC?

9. In the latest SFPUC Ethnicity Breakdown by Job Class and Race provided by the City, the Project Manager 4 (IV) position is missing (I believe it’s job class 5508). See CCSF 008852 document that list job class 5502 to 5506, but it’s missing job class 5508. I don’t know if other positions are missing as well. Also, CCSF008152 details the interview panel and their job class/position.

Let me know if you want to talk and when.

Thanks,

Mo
Request #21-2743

☑️ CLOSED

As of July 13, 2021, 5:45pm
Request Visibility: Unpublished

Details

I would like to make a public records request within the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) for the 5502 Project Manager 1 (PM1) job announcement (PEX-5502-063967) that I applied to in 2015 and the following information pertaining to me and the information that is outlined within the red box as shown in the following attachment. Please see attachment for details of my requests. Please make sure the information or data pertaining to me is provided, the requested information is not redacted or hidden and the meaning of the acronyms are described. If you have any questions feel free to contact me at this email address.

Thank you,
Morris

---

Received

June 3, 2021 via web

Departments

Public Utilities Commission (PUC)

Requester

Mo

Personal Info.
To Whom It May Concern; Mayara Ruski Augusto Sa; Emily Alt and PUC personnel. 1. On page 3 (item b-e), page 4 and 5, I requested copies of less redacted copies of records (Bates stamped CCSF 008147 and CCSF 008148) pertaining to my information only (item No. 24) and no one else. Can you please provide a less redacted version of the records for my data so I don't have to take this request up to management/higher authorities, Sunshine Ordinance Task Force (SOTF) and to the Mayor Office? Regarding item nos. 7 on page 9 which is in your possession already (Bates stamped CCSF 008147 and CCSF 008148). The argument pertaining to records being redacted under privacy, personnel and testing exemptions of the Public Records Act is null in void or incorrect because I am only requested information and records pertaining to my data only and no one else (See page 3 (item b)). Besides, based on Order of Determination issued March 4, 2020 by the City & County of San Francisco, Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, File No. 19085 and 19084, both the San Francisco Public Utilities
Commission (SFPUC) and Office of the City Attorney were in violation of Administrative Code Sections 67.21 and 67.25 for failing to respond to requests for documents in a timely and/or complete manner. 2. On page 3 (item d) what does the acronyms stand for under the disposition and status category, particularly "AC", "IN", and others (Bates stamped CCSF 008149) that is located on page 6 of 9 and on page 9 (item 6 and 8 for "what is "PC" stand for under the criteria PC Exp.?") 3. Regarding item no. 5 on page 9 and page 7 (outlined in red) can you please provide me the referenced Hiring Manager Selection Form because apparently I don't have it. 4. Regarding item nos. 1, 2, 3, 6, 7 and 8 on page 9, is already in your possession therefore the City doesn't have to create any new document since PUC administered the interviewed, selected, scored applicants who applied for the WWE-5502 Project Manager 1 position process (PEX-5502-063967). Thanks, Mo

July 13, 2021, 5:38pm by the requester via email

External Message

To Whom It May Concern; Mayara Ruski Augusto Sa; Emily Alt and PUC personnel.

1. On page 3 (item b e), page 4 and 5, I requested copies of less redacted copies of records (Bates stamped CCSF 008147 and CCSF 008148) pertaining to my information only (item No. 24) and no one else. Can you please provide a less redacted version of the records for my data so I don't have to take this request up to management/higher authorities, Sunshine Ordinance Task Force (SOTF) and to the Mayor Office? Regarding item nos. 7 on page 9 which is in your possession already (Bates stamped CCSF 008147 and CCSF 008148). The argument pertaining to records being redacted under privacy, personnel and testing exemptions of the Public Records Act is null in void or incorrect because I am only requested information and records pertaining to my data only and no one else (See page 3 (item b)). Besides, based on Order of Determination issued March 4, 2020 by the City & County of San Francisco, Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, File No. 19085 and 19084, both the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) and Office of the City Attorney were in violation of Administrative Code Sections 67.21 and 67.25 for failing to respond to requests for documents in a timely and/or complete manner.
2. On page 3 (item d) what does the acronyms stand for under the disposition and status category, particularly "AC", "IN", and others (Bates stamped CCSF 008149) that is located on page 6 of 9 and on page 9 (item 6 and 8 for "what is "PC" stand for under the criteria PC Exp.?").

3. Regarding item no. 5 on page 9 and page 7 (outlined in red) can you please provide me the referenced Hiring Manager Selection Form because apparently I don't have it.

4. Regarding item nos. 1, 2, 3, 6, 7 and 8 on page 9, is already in your possession therefore the City doesn't have to create any new document since PUC administered the interviewed, selected, scored applicants who applied for the WWE 5502 Project Manager 1 position process (PEX 5502 063967).

Thanks,
Mo
July 13, 2021, 5:28pm by the requester

---

External Message

To Whom It May Concern; Mayara Ruski Augusto Sa; Emily Alt and PUC personnel.

1. On page 3 (item b e), page 4 and 5, I requested copies of less redacted copies of records (Bates stamped CCSF 008147 and CCSF 008148) pertaining to my information only (item No. 24) and no one else. Can you please provide a less redacted version of the records for my data so I don't have to take this request up to management/higher authorities, Sunshine Ordinance Task Force (SOTF) and to the Mayor Office? Regarding item nos. 7 on page 9 which is in your possession already (Bates stamped CCSF 008147 and CCSF 008148). The argument pertaining to records being redacted under privacy, personnel and testing exemptions of the Public Records Act is null in void or incorrect because I am only requested information and records pertaining to my data only and no one else (See page 3 (item b)). Besides, based on Order of Determination issued March 4, 2020 by the City & County of San Francisco, Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, File No. 19085 and 19084, both the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) and Office of the City Attorney were in violation of Administrative Code Sections 67.21 and 67.25 for failing to respond to requests for documents in a timely and/or complete manner.
2. On page 3 (item d) what does the acronyms stand for under the disposition and status category, particularly "AC", "IN", and others (Bates stamped CCSF 008149) that is located on page 6 of 9 and on page 9 (item 6 and 8 for "what is "PC" stand for under the criteria PC Exp.?"").

3. Regarding item no. 5 on page 9 and page 7 (outlined in red) can you please provide me the referenced Hiring Manager Selection Form because apparently I don't have it.

4. Regarding item nos. 1, 2, 3, 6, 7 and 8 on page 9, is already in your possession therefore the City doesn't have to create any new document since PUC administered the interviewed, selected, scored applicants who applied for the WWE 5502 Project Manager 1 position process (PEX 5502 063967).

Thanks,
Mo

July 13, 2021, 5:28pm by the requester

---

**Request Closed**

*June 29, 2021, 5:54am*

---

**External Message**

Requester + Staff

Dear Requester,

We write in response to your request no. # 21 2743, dated June 3, 2021 ("new request").

Regarding item no. 9 on page 9 of your new request, the SFPUC conducted a diligent search for responsive records and does not currently have any staff employed in the Project Manager 4 job class, nor did it have staff employed under that job class when you submitted your original request in 2019. Therefore, SFPUC has no records responsive to this item of your request.

Regarding item no. 5 on page 9 of your new request seeking the referenced Hiring Manager Selection Form, we note that you made an identical request for this record in item 37 of your request dated October 23, 2019, and the SFPUC produced a copy of this record to you at that time. Please respond to this email to clarify whether you would like us to resend you a copy of this record.
Regarding item nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, and 8 on page 9 of your new request, these items sought answers to questions or would otherwise require the SFPUC to create documents that are not currently in its possession. A request that a department create a response to a request for information or answer a series of questions is not a public records request. Neither the Public Records Act nor the Sunshine Ordinance requires the SFPUC to reply to a series of written questions or interrogatories.

The remainder of your new request seeks less redacted copies of records (Bates stamped CCSF 008147 and CCSF 008148) than had been previously produced to you by the City Attorney's Office in 2019. As explained to you at that time, those records were redacted under the privacy, personnel, and testing exemptions of the Public Records Act. The withholding of age and disability information was based on the California Constitution, Article I, section 1, and California Government Code section 6254, subdivisions (c) and (k). Further, both the California Public Records Act (California Government Code Section 6250) and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance (San Francisco Administrative Code Section 67.1(g)) acknowledge the importance of protecting personal privacy when disclosing records in response to a public records request. Job candidates' names, personal testing scores and related information were also redacted as confidential personnel records protected by the California Constitutional right of privacy. (See, Cal. Const. Art. I § 1; Hill v. National Collegiate Athletic Assn., (1994) 7 Cal.4th 1, 35 (identifying privacy interest in precluding dissemination of sensitive, confidential information); Teamsters Local 856 v. Priceless, LLC, (2003) 112 Cal.App.4th 1500, 1512 (public employees have a right to privacy in their personnel files).) These provisions guard against disclosure of information that would invade personal privacy. In addition, please note that your requests for removal of redactions of test scores and related information seek information exempt under California Government Code 6254(g), which relates to data used to administer examination for employment.

Finally, please note that the SFPUC is only responding to your records request on its behalf, and not on the behalf of other City departments. Therefore, we recommend that you contact the San Francisco City Attorney's Office, as we believe it may have records responsive to your request.

We now consider your request closed.

Best Regards,
Emily Alt on behalf of SFPUC Public Records
Due Date Changed
06/28/2021 (was 06/14/2021). Additional time needed to search for records

June 14, 2021, 7:20am

External Message
Dear Requester,

We are conducting a diligent search for records, and we have determined that we have records responsive to your request. Please note that the SFPUC reserves the right to invoke one or more exemptions to the disclosure of records, as applicable.

Finally, the SFPUC estimates that it will be able to provide a full response to your request on or before June 28, 2021.

Best regards,
SFPUC Public Records

June 14, 2021, 7:20am by Mayara Ruski Augusto Sa (Staff)

External Message
Dear Requester,

Thank you for your public records request. Due to the COVID 19 pandemic, the Mayor has issued supplementary orders suspending select provisions of the Sunshine Ordinance which will affect how soon you may receive responsive documents. This memo provides details.

We have forwarded your request to the appropriate staff and will provide an update including a potential timeline within 10 days of your request.

Best Regards,
SFPUC Public Records

June 3, 2021, 4:08pm by Mayara Ruski Augusto Sa (Staff)

Department Assignment
Public Utilities Commission (PUC)
June 3, 2021, 3:02pm

Request Opened
Request received via web

June 3, 2021, 3:02pm

Public
Thank you Mr. Russi. I just received the requested data this evening...nearly two months after my initial request. It just seemed like RPD was intentionally stalling throughout this whole process, and they only finally responded after I bombarded everyone I could think of with complaints.

Sincerely,
Michael Cawthon

On Aug 16, 2021, at 7:36 PM, Supervisor Records (CAT) <supervisor.records@sfcityatty.org> wrote:

Mr. Cawthon –

Where a department has not responded to a request, we work with them to try and get the requester the documents that they are seeking, as has happened here. I am happy to check with Rec Park again on the status of their response if you wish. Thanks.

Bradley Russi
Deputy City Attorney
Office of City Attorney Dennis Herrera
City Hall, Room 234
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., San Francisco, CA 94102
www.sfcityattorney.org

Mr. Russo,

Thank you for your reply.

I finally received a phone call from a Recreation & Parks employee yesterday evening. We discussed my requests, and he pledged to provide materials to me, including an update by the end of this week. I am more hopeful that I will be able to obtain responsive documents soon, although the process will have taken nearly two months from my initial requests (and requiring numerous followup attempts).

I do have a question regarding your reply. It appears from your explanation that a city department could simply ignore a public request or perpetually delay the provision of records by claiming to be
‘searching’ for documents. If a city department never responds to a request or never actually provides any records, are you stating that the Supervisor of Records would have no jurisdiction over those situations? That would appear to be a significant loophole, which would enable city departments to ignore public requests and avoid the intervention of the City Attorney.

Please let me know if my understanding is accurate.

Thank you,
Michael Cawthon

On Aug 10, 2021, at 7:09 PM, Supervisor Records (CAT) <supervisor.records@sfcityatty.org> wrote:

Mr. Cawthon –

Under the Sunshine Ordinance (Section 67.21(d) of the Administrative Code), the Supervisor of Records is responsible for determining whether a City department has withheld a record, or any part of a record, without a lawful basis for doing so – for determining “whether the record requested, or any part of the record requested, is public.” The Supervisor of Records does not have jurisdiction to consider whether a department has timely complied with a request or properly invoked an extension. We understand that the Recreation and Park Department is in the process of searching for records responsive to your request. If the department withholds or redacts records when they produce records responsive to your request and you believe that they have acted unlawfully in doing so, please let us know and we will look into the issue. Nonetheless, we will check in with the Recreation and Park Department again on the status of their response. Thank you.

Bradley Russi
Deputy City Attorney
Office of City Attorney Dennis Herrera
City Hall, Room 234
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., San Francisco, CA 94102
www.sfcityattorney.org

From: Michael Cawthon <Personal Info.>
Sent: Tuesday, August 10, 2021 10:29 AM
To: Supervisor Records (CAT) <supervisor.records@SFCITYATTY.ORG>
Subject: Re: Sunshine Appeal

Supervisor of Records,

I request an update regarding my petition, which I submitted two weeks ago. Rec & Park has still not responded to any of my public records requests, the first of which was
submitted 46 days ago. Please provide me with an update, so I know that my complaint is still being investigated.

Sincerely,
Michael Cawthon

On Aug 3, 2021, at 9:31 AM, Michael Cawthon wrote:

Supervisor of Records,

If possible, I would appreciate an update regarding the status of my petition. I have submitted a total of three records requests to the Recreation & Parks Department, the first two of which were initiated more than one month ago. I am positive that RPD has at least some of the requested information readily available, but they have failed to provide anything. I have also received very little communications from RPD to date, despite my repeated followup attempts. Last week, an RPD secretary finally responded and notified me that she had reminded RPD staff again for responsive documents. However, I still have no indications if or when I will ever obtain the requested information. RPD appears to be intentionally delaying or withholding public records without any justification.

I am not an attorney, so I would also appreciate an explanation of the relevant laws and regulations applicable to my requests. I understand that certain requirements of the Sunshine Ordinance have been temporarily suspended due to the pandemic emergency. Given the current situation, how is RPD required to respond to my requests, if at all? If they fail to respond or provide any responsive documents, are there any consequences or do I have any recourse? It would be extraordinarily disingenuous for RPD to hide behind the emergency proclamations as an excuse to avoid their responsibilities. As I mentioned, I am absolutely positive they have at least some of the information readily available and could have easily provided it to me several weeks ago. In the meantime, they have responded to several other public records requests that were initiated after my submissions. They appear to be picking and choosing which requests they will honor, which is antithetical to the principles of government transparency and the Sunshine Ordinance. If the requirements of the Sunshine Ordinance cannot be enforced, is the RPD subject to the California Public Records Act? If so, what are these requirements and how can they be enforced?
Please let me know if there is anything I can do or if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Michael Cawthon

On Jul 30, 2021, at 7:02 AM, Michael Cawthon <Personal Info.> wrote:

Ms. Buta-Scott,

Thank you for your response. Please let me know if there are any updates regarding my requests, or if you need any additional information or documentation from me. There has still been no further communication from RPD regarding my requests, two of which were submitted more than one month ago.

Sincerely,

Michael Cawthon

On Jul 27, 2021, at 11:21 AM, Supervisor Records (CAT) <supervisor.records@sfcityatty.org> wrote:

Mr. Cawthon –

I write to acknowledge receipt of your petition. We will look into the issues raised in your petition and get back to you. Thank you.
This message and any attachments are solely for the intended recipient and may include privileged or confidential information. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately, and permanently delete this message and any attachments.

From: Michael Cawthon
Sent: Monday, July 26, 2021 5:29 PM
To: Supervisor Records (CAT)
Subject: Sunshine Appeal

Supervisor of Records,

I have made three separate public records requests of the Recreation & Parks Department (RPD), using the City’s online request system NextRequest. Snapshots of these three requests are included below. These requests were submitted by me on 6/25/2021, 6/29/2021, and 7/15/2021. I have received absolutely no information or documentation in response to any of these requests. Other than automated acknowledgments, I have also received virtually no communications from RPD, despite my repeated attempts to contact staff. RPD did send a message to me related to the 6/29 request (it is included in the snapshot below). Sixteen days after I submitted this request, RPD apologized for the delay and stated it was working on gathering documents. That was eleven days ago. There have been no communications at all regarding the other two requests (including the initial request submitted one month ago) and
there have been no further information or updates from RPD since 7/15. I have absolutely no indication from RPD that they are working on any of these requests, whether they will or won’t provide the requested records, or any estimated timeframes for potential resolution.

I submitted a complaint to the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force (SOTF) on 7/19. On 7/20, the SOTF sent an email to RPD asking them to provide me with assistance. There has been no response from RPD. I acknowledge that the request submitted on 6/29 may take some time and effort by RPD to gather documents. However, this does not excuse the ongoing and extended lack of communication from RPD. Further, the other two requests (submitted on 6/25 and 7/15) simply ask for data that should be readily accessible by RPD. Summaries of the information requested has been included by RPD in recent public documents and has also been discussed verbally by RPD staff in public meetings. I am requested detailed supporting information to validate these public claims made by RPD. I know that RPD has made at least one factually incorrect statement, and I believe they are also providing intentionally misleading information to the public and elected City officials. It is my understanding that the Sunshine Ordinance exists exactly for that purpose – to promote transparency and enable citizens to hold government employees accountable for their actions and statements.

Please let me know if you have any questions or need any additional information from me. You may contact me via email or phone at 415-831-2969.

Thank you,
Michael Cawthon

> 
<image002.png>
Buta, Odaya (CAT)

From: Michael Cawthon <Personal Info.>
Sent: Monday, July 26, 2021 5:29 PM
To: Supervisor Records (CAT)
Subject: Sunshine Appeal

Supervisor of Records,

I have made three separate public records requests of the Recreation & Parks Department (RPD), using the City’s online request system NextRequest. Snapshots of these three requests are included below. These requests were submitted by me on 6/25/2021, 6/29/2021, and 7/15/2021. I have received absolutely no information or documentation in response to any of these requests. Other than automated acknowledgments, I have also received virtually no communications from RPD, despite my repeated attempts to contact staff. RPD did send a message to me related to the 6/29 request (it is included in the snapshot below). Sixteen days after I submitted this request, RPD apologized for the delay and stated it was working on gathering documents. That was eleven days ago. There have been no communications at all regarding the other two requests (including the initial request submitted one month ago) and there have been no further information or updates from RPD since 7/15. I have absolutely no indication from RPD that they are working on any of these requests, whether they will or won’t provide the requested records, or any estimated timeframes for potential resolution.

I submitted a complaint to the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force (SOTF) on 7/19. On 7/20, the SOTF sent an email to RPD asking them to provide me with assistance. There has been no response from RPD. I acknowledge that the request submitted on 6/29 may take some time and effort by RPD to gather documents. However, this does not excuse the ongoing and extended lack of communication from RPD. Further, the other two requests (submitted on 6/25 and 7/15) simply ask for data that should be readily accessible by RPD. Summaries of the information requested has been included by RPD in recent public documents and has also been discussed verbally by RPD staff in public meetings. I am requested detailed supporting information to validate these public claims made by RPD. I know that RPD has made at least one factually incorrect statement, and I believe they are also providing intentionally misleading information to the public and elected City officials. It is my understanding that the Sunshine Ordinance exists exactly for that purpose – to promote transparency and enable citizens to hold government employees accountable for their actions and statements.

Please let me know if you have any questions or need any additional information from me. You may contact me via email or phone at Personal Info.

Thank you,
Michael Cawthon

>
To Whom It May Concern:

Please provide copies of or access to materials related to the development and construction of the existing multi-use path on the Upper Great Highway (specifically: the two-mile path from Lincoln Way to Sloat Boulevard, which is situated on the border between the Upper Great Highway and the Lower Great Highway).

The materials should identify when the path and related improvements were constructed, the projected and actual development and the projected and actual visitor use of the path. To the extent possible, projected and actual visitor use should show the mode of transportation (e.g. pedestrian or bicycle) for daily, weekly, and monthly time periods.

Received: June 29, 2021 via web

Departments: Recreation and Parks

Requester: Michael Cawthon

Documents:

- Public (pending): (none)
- Requester: (none)

Staff:

Point of Contact: Tiffany Lin-Wilson (REC)
Request #21-3207

To Whom It May Concern:

During the June 10, 2021 joint meeting of the Recreation and Park Commission and the SFMTA Board, the supporting documents stated that the Great Highway was the second most visited open space in the city after Golden Gate Park. Please provide the detailed supporting data for this statement. In particular, please provide details regarding the total number of visitors to Golden Gate Park, the Great Highway, and the remaining top ten open spaces in the city (ranked by use). Please specify what days of the week and which hours of the day are covered by this data and analysis. Please clearly explain any data limitations, and indicate whether any open spaces with data were excluded from this analysis.

In addition, please provide detailed Great Highway usage data for the months of April and May 2021 (and June 2021 when available). For Great Highway data, please indicate the type of recreational use (e.g., pedestrian or bicycle) and please differentiate between weekday and weekend use. Please clarify whether Great Highway usage data includes or excludes users of the bike path.

Please contact me with any questions regarding these requests.

Thank you

Received: June 25, 2021 via web

Departments: Recreation and Parks

Requester: Michael Cawthon

Documents: (none)

Staff: Tiffany Lin-Wilson (REC)
Immediate Information Request

This is a formal request for public information related to the closure of the Great Highway to traffic. This request is being made in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act (47 C.F.R., Section 0.461), the California Public Records Act, Government Code Section 6250, and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance, San Francisco Administrative Code Section 67.1.

Please provide detailed daily recreational usage data for the Great Highway (between Lincoln Way and Sloat Avenue) covering the period from October 2020 through June 2021. Please clearly identify the number of recreational users each day during this period. Please also clarify whether such data includes or excludes recreational users of the multi-use path adjacent to the Great Highway. Please clearly explain any data limitations. Please provide the requested information in any readily accessible format, preferably an electronic spreadsheet. I am willing to pay any reasonable costs for the collection and reproduction of this information, not to exceed $200.

Please respond to this request immediately. I submitted a different request for similar information on June 25, 2021 (#21-3640) and have not received any responses for 20 days despite two followup messages to the department. I will continue to request this information until it is provided or a satisfactory explanation is provided regarding why it cannot be provided to me. If I do not receive a prompt response, I will explore any available options to escalate this matter.

Please contact me with any questions regarding this request.

Received: July 15, 2021 via web

Departments: Recreation and Parks

Requester: Michael Cawthon

Documents

Public (pending): 0 (none)
Requester: 0 (none)

Staff

Point of Contact: Tiffany Lin-Wilson (REC)
Sent via email (nuala@sfpublicpress.org)

Nuala Bishari
Reporter
San Francisco Public Press

Re: Petition to Supervisor of Records

Dear Ms. Bishari:

This letter responds to your petition to the Supervisor of Records sent via email on August 10, 2021, arising from a request for records to the San Francisco Department of Public Health (SFDPH) on July 27, 2021, with follow up requests several times in August 2021, requesting the number of positive COVID-19 cases that have come from people residing in Moscone South and Next Door Shelter in the past three months, broken down by week.

On September 16, 2021, SFDPH responded to your request informing you that SFDPH could not provide the responsive data because the data contains personally identifiable information associated with shelter residents’ medical records.

We have determined that the requested information was appropriately withheld pursuant to subsections (c) and (k) of Section 6254 of the California Government Code. Subsection (c) provides that “Personnel, medical, or similar files, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy” are exempt from disclosure in response to a request for public records. Subsection (k) provides that “Records, the disclosure of which is exempted or prohibited pursuant to federal or state law” are exempt from disclosure in response to a request for public records. Both California and federal law classify an individual’s address as protected health information because an address has the potential to reveal a person’s identity. See Cal. Civil Code § 56.05(j); 45 C.F.R. § 164.514(b).

Because we conclude that SFDPH properly withheld the requested information, we deny your petition and consider it closed.

Very truly yours,

DENNIS J. HERRERA
City Attorney

Lisa M. Powell
Deputy City Attorney
Dear Petitioner,

Attached please find our response to your petition below. Thank you.

Odaya Buta-Scott
Paralegal
Office of City Attorney Dennis J. Herrera
odaya.buta@sfcityatty.org
www.sfcityattorney.org
Find us on: Facebook Twitter Instagram

This message and any attachments are solely for the intended recipient and may include privileged or confidential information.
If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately, and permanently delete this message and any attachments.

To Whom it May Concern,

On July 27, 2021 I sent a straightforward email request for information to the Department of Public Health, requesting "the number of positive COVID-19 cases that have come from people residing in MSC South and Next Door Shelter in the past three months, broken down by week."

I never received an answer to this request. I followed up on Aug. 4, Aug. 6, and Aug. 9.

In an Aug. 9 email from Noel Sanchez at the Department of Public Health, he wrote "depending on how many cases per week there have been (like 1 or 2 or a low number), there’s potential to identify someone; hence we won’t be able to share the data."

I was also told in July 28 and Aug. 9 phone calls with Sanchez that fulfilling such a request would violate HIPAA, despite the fact that I have requested no identifiable information.

I believe the decision to withhold these records is unlawful. In the past, the Department of Public Health and the city of San Francisco has publicized data on COVID-19 outbreaks in congregate shelters, such as the instance in April 2020 when 92 people tested positive. In that case, a press release was sent to media and posted online. The number of positive cases in congregate shelters is vital public health information that should be available to residents of San Francisco.
I've attached screenshots of my correspondence with DPH for your consideration.

Thank you,
Nuala

--

Nuala Bishari
Reporter
San Francisco Public Press
To Whom it May Concern,

On July 27, 2021 I sent a straightforward email request for information to the Department of Public Health, requesting "the number of positive COVID-19 cases that have come from people residing in MSC South and Next Door Shelter in the past three months, broken down by week."

I never received an answer to this request. I followed up on Aug. 4, Aug. 6, and Aug. 9.

In an Aug. 9 email from Noel Sanchez at the Department of Public Health, he wrote "depending on how many cases per week there have been (like 1 or 2 or a low number), there's potential to identify someone; hence we won't be able to share the data."

I was also told in July 28 and Aug. 9 phone calls with Sanchez that fulfilling such a request would violate HIPAA, despite the fact that I have requested no identifiable information.

I believe the decision to withhold these records is unlawful. In the past, the Department of Public Health and the city of San Francisco has publicized data on COVID-19 outbreaks in congregate shelters, such as the instance in April 2020 when 92 people tested positive. In that case, a press release was sent to media and posted online. The number of positive cases in congregate shelters is vital public health information that should be available to residents of San Francisco.

I’ve attached screenshots of my correspondence with DPH for your consideration.

Thank you,
Nuala

--

Nuala Bishari
Reporter
San Francisco Public Press

22nd Annual SOR Report
APPENDIX - Page 762
vaccination rates among homeless people

Nuala Bishari <nuala@sfpublicpress.org>
to dph.press

Hello,

I'm working on a story about the city's homeless shelters expanding capacity, and am curious if DPH has information on the following:

- the number of homeless people who have been vaccinated (approximate is fine)
- the number of positive COVID-19 cases that have come from people residing in MSC South and Next Door Shelter in the past three months, broken down by week

My deadline is end of day Wednesday.

Thank you!
Nuala

--
Nuala Bishari
Reporter
San Francisco Public Press

Personal
Info
I'm following up on a request for data on the number of positive COVID-19 cases that have come from people residing in MSC South and Next Door Shelter in the past three months, broken down by week.

I was told over the phone that this information was not available due to HIPAA. However, this request does not violate HIPAA in any way, as I'm simply looking for numbers of positive cases, not any identifying information or protected health information. Historically this information has been made available; in April of last year, Mayor London Breed herself confirmed an outbreak of COVID-19 cases at MSC South to the media.

Please let me know when this request will be fulfilled.

Thank you,

Nuala
Hello!

Just following up on this. My deadline is Monday morning.

Thank you,
Nuala

***
Mon, Aug 9, 2:24 PM (19 hours ago)

Nuala,

Thank you for taking my call today. As we discussed, depending on how many cases per week there have been (like 1 or 2 or a low number), there's potential to identify someone; hence we won't be able to share the data.

If you were to report on the cluster of cases at these two sites over some time frame (e.g. June through August), we could look into this but due to the current Delta surge, our data team is stretched very thin. If we are able to share and validate data, we might be looking at later this week, Friday, based on current projects that are deemed urgent, or next week.

Let us know if that works with your publication plans.

Best,

Department of Public Health
City and County of San Francisco

Twitter: @SF_DPH
Facebook: @sf/publichealth
Hello! Can you let me know if this request will be fulfilled today? It's now been 13 days since I originally asked for data on COVID-19 cases at Next Door and MSC South.
August 12, 2022

Sent via email (arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com)

Re: Petition to Supervisor of Records

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter responds to your petition to the Supervisor of Records dated August 27, 2021, concerning a request to the City Attorney’s Office for communications with Recology and others regarding settlement of a lawsuit. You contend the City Attorney’s Office unlawfully withheld records.

We find that the City Attorney’s Office properly withheld records reflecting confidential settlement communications, and/or records that were acquired in confidence, and there was an ongoing need for non-disclosure that outweighed any interest in disclosure. See Gov’t Code §§ 6254(k), 6255; Evid. Code § 1040.

Very truly yours,

DAVID CHIU
City Attorney

Bradley A. Russi
Deputy City Attorney
To Whom It May Concern:

Please see the attached response to your petition.

Bradley Russi  
Deputy City Attorney  
Office of City Attorney David Chiu  
City Hall, Room 234  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
www.sfcityattorney.org

Herrera: Preserve all of the responsive records pending all appeals. In 40 days an ethics complaint will be filed.

Supervisor of Records: Determine in writing that these records or any part thereof are public and order them disclosed, SFAC 67.21(d).

SOTF:

File a new complaint: Anonymous v Dennis Herrera and the Office of the City Attorney (this is SEPARATE from the complaint from earlier today)

Herrera has refused in entirety to disclose any of his communications with adversary Recology and its affiliates.

Violations: CPRA Gov Code 6253(c) failure to provide determination within 10 days, SFAC 67.21 incomplete response, 67.26 non-minimal withholding, 67.27 unjustified withholdings

First, communications sent by the City to Recology cannot be acquired in confidence by the City, and Evidence Code 1040 cannot apply by its own terms.

Second, there is no evidence that the communications sent by Recology to the City were in fact acquired in confidence by the City. Recology is not a whistleblower or similar - it is the party that wronged City ratepayers and Herrera is apparently helping cover up their wrongdoing.
Third, even if the above two points could be proven false by Herrera, he must also prove the public interest balancing test: but the public interest in disclosure of this information is obvious: one to see if ratepayers' interests were actually protected well by their elected City attorney to the fullest and best extent possible, two to publicly understand the full extent of any potential corruption involved, and three to determine whether Herrera opted for a settlement for his own benefit or the City's benefit. There is no need for any confidentiality in this information at all. The balancing test, even if it applies, thus falls in favor of disclosure.

As always, Herrera overplays his hand with exemptions.

Regards,

Anonymous
Twitter @journo_anon

IMPORTANT:
1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.
2. If you are NOT a public official: This communication is confidential and may contain unpublished information or confidential source information, protected by the California Shield Law, Evidence Code sec. 1070. I am a member of the electronic media and regularly publish information about the conduct of public officials.
3. I am not a lawyer. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.
4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sent with ProtonMail Secure Email.

-------- Original Message --------
On Friday, August 27th, 2021 at 3:22 PM, CityAttorney (CAT) <cityattorney@sfcityatty.org> wrote:

Dear Anonymous,

You have requested “[a]ll communications between [this] office and Recology, Sunset Scavanger [sic], Golden Gate, its and their affiliates, and its and their attorneys in the settlement and lawsuit discussed here: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Y1KE3ypMEzo by [City Attorney] Herrera.” We respectfully to decline to produce these records, as they are confidential settlement communications between the parties, and/or were acquired in confidence, and there is an ongoing need for nondisclosure that strongly outweighs any interest in disclosure. Accordingly, we are withholding the records from disclosure under California Evidence Code Section 1040, and California Government Code Sections 6254(k) and 6255.

Please send replies to cityattorney@sfcityatty.org

Best,
Immediate disclosure request for all communications between your office and Recology, Sunset Scavanger, Golden Gate, its and their affiliates, and its and their attorneys in the settlement and lawsuit discussed here: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Y1KE3ypMEzo today by Herrera. Provide all emails as exact PDF copies with attachments, To/From/Cc/Bcc, images, formatting, using PDFMaker.

**NOTE:** 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. I am not an attorney. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous
Herrera: Preserve all of the responsive records pending all appeals. In 40 days an ethics complaint will be filed.

Supervisor of Records: Determine in writing that these records or any part thereof are public and order them disclosed, SFAC 67.21(d).

SOTF:

File a new complaint: Anonymous v Dennis Herrera and the Office of the City Attorney (this is SEPARATE from the complaint from earlier today)

Herrera has refused in entirety to disclose any of his communications with adversary Recology and its affiliates.

Violations: CPRA Gov Code 6253(c) failure to provide determination within 10 days, SFAC 67.21 incomplete response, 67.26 non-minimal withholding, 67.27 unjustified withholdings

First, communications sent by the City to Recology cannot be acquired in confidence by the City, and Evidence Code 1040 cannot apply by its own terms.

Second, there is no evidence that the communications sent by Recology to the City were in fact acquired in confidence by the City. Recology is not a whistleblower or similar - it is the party that wronged City ratepayers and Herrera is apparently helping cover up their wrongdoing.

Third, even if the above two points could be proven false by Herrera, he must also prove the public interest balancing test: but the public interest in disclosure of this information is obvious: one to see if ratepayers' interests were actually protected well by their elected City attorney to the fullest and best extent possible, two to publicly understand the full extent of any potential corruption involved, and three to determine whether Herrera opted for a settlement for his own benefit or the City's benefit. There is no need for any confidentiality in this information at all. The balancing test, even if it applies, thus falls in favor of disclosure.

As always, Herrera overplays his hand with exemptions.

Regards,

Anonymous
Twitter @jorno_anon

IMPORTANT:
1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.

2. If you are NOT a public official: This communication is confidential and may contain unpublished information or confidential source information, protected by the California Shield Law, Evidence Code sec. 1070. I am a member of the electronic media and regularly publish information about the conduct of public officials.

3. I am not a lawyer. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.

4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sent with ProtonMail Secure Email.

------ Original Message ------
On Friday, August 27th, 2021 at 3:22 PM, CityAttorney (CAT) <cityattorney@SFCITYATTY.ORG> wrote:

Dear Anonymous,

You have requested “[a]ll communications between [this] office and Recology, Sunset Scavanger [sic], Golden Gate, its and their affiliates, and its and their attorneys in the settlement and lawsuit discussed here: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Y1KE3ypMEzo by [City Attorney] Herrera.” We respectfully to decline to produce these records, as they are confidential settlement communications between the parties, and/or were acquired in confidence, and there is an ongoing need for nondisclosure that strongly outweighs any interest in disclosure. Accordingly, we are withholding the records from disclosure under California Evidence Code Section 1040, and California Government Code Sections 6254(k) and 6255.

Please send replies to cityattorney@sfcityatty.org

Best,

Elizabeth A. Coolbrith
Paralegal
Office of City Attorney Dennis Herrera

(415) 554-4685 Direct

www.sfcityattorney.org
Immediate disclosure request for All communications between your office and Recology, Sunset Scavanger, Golden Gate, its and their affiliates, and its and their attorneys in the settlement and lawsuit discussed here: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Y1KE3ypMEzo today by Herrera. Provide all emails as exact PDF copies with attachments, To/From/Cc/Bcc, images, formatting, using PDFMaker.

NOTE: 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. I am not an attorney. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous
Sent via email

Darren Kelly

Re: Petition to Supervisor of Records

Dear Mr. Kelly:

This letter responds to your petition to the Supervisor of Records sent via email on September 30, 2021, arising from a request for records to the San Francisco Fire Department ("Department"). You requested the “[v]erified Complaint filed by Chief of Department Jeanine Nicholson with the San Francisco Fire Commission on January 9, 2020.” The Department withheld the record under Section 6254(c) of the Government Code. We conclude that the Department properly withheld the record at issue.

Section A8.343 of the San Francisco Charter provides that where the Chief of the Fire Department believes that a uniformed member of the Department has committed misconduct warranting a suspension exceeding 10 days, the Chief must file a verified complaint with the Fire Commission. The member is entitled to a trial before the Commission, and the Commission will then render a decision on the complaint. The Fire Commission may meet in closed session to consider the discipline or dismissal of a member of the department under Section 54957(b) of the Government Code and Section 67.10(b) of the Administrative Code.

Under Government Code Section 6254(c), “[p]ersonnel, medical, or similar files, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy” are exempt from disclosure. Similarly, Article I, Section 1, of the California Constitution provides a right to privacy, and Section 6254(k) of the Government Code exempts from disclosure records that are protected by other provisions of state law including Article I, Section 1 of the Constitution.

The verified complaint you requested is a personnel record, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy of the City employee to which it pertains, and the Department properly withheld it under Government Code Sections 6254(c) and (k). You contend that the complaint should be disclosed, because the Fire Commission considered it at a public meeting, but the Fire Commission conducted its review and decision on the complaint in closed session as permitted under the provisions of state and local law referenced above, and the Fire Commission did not discuss the substance of the complaint nor disclose the identity of the member in open session.
For the reasons stated above, we deny your petition and consider it closed.

Very truly yours,

DENNIS J. HERRERA
City Attorney

[Signature]

Bradley A. Russi
Deputy City Attorney
Buta, Odaya (CAT)

From: Russi, Brad (CAT) on behalf of Supervisor Records (CAT)
Sent: Tuesday, November 2, 2021 3:46 PM
To: 'Darren Kelly'
Cc: Buta, Odaya (CAT)
Subject: RE: Sunshine Appeal
Attachments: Ltr. to D. Kelly 11.2.2021.pdf

Mr. Kelly -

Please see the attached response to your petition. Thank you.

Bradley Russi
Deputy City Attorney
Office of City Attorney David Chiu
City Hall, Room 234
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., San Francisco, CA 94102
www.sfcityattorney.org

From: Russi, Brad (CAT) On Behalf Of Supervisor Records (CAT)
Sent: Thursday, September 30, 2021 6:19 PM
To: 'Darren Kelly' <Personal Info.>
Cc: Buta, Odaya (CAT) <Odaya.Buta@sfcityatty.org>
Subject: RE: Sunshine Appeal

Dear Darren Kelly –

I write to acknowledge receipt of your petition. We will look into the issues you have raised and get back to you. Thank you.

Bradley Russi
Deputy City Attorney
Office of City Attorney Dennis Herrera
City Hall, Room 234
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., San Francisco, CA 94102
www.sfcityattorney.org

From: Darren Kelly <Personal Info.>
Sent: Thursday, September 30, 2021 9:21 AM
To: Supervisor Records (CAT) <supervisor.records@SFCITYATTY.ORG>
Subject: Sunshine Appeal

City Attorney

Please find attached my correspondence with the San Francisco Fire Department, dated March 9, 2021, regarding my public records request of March 9, 2021. My request for a verified complaint document was denied pursuant to
California Government Code Section 6254(c) which prohibits public agencies from such production of “Personnel, medical, or similar files, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.”

This refusal is not complaint with Section 6254(c) inasmuch as the document requested was not an internal personnel, medical or similar file maintained by the San Francisco Fire Department or the City of San Francisco but rather, as a verified complaint, is a sworn statement that originated outside of city government and not subject to Section 6254(c). The subject document, sent to the San Francisco Fire Commission on January 9, 2020, by the Chief of Department and referenced during open session of the commission, was omitted from the meeting minutes published by the San Francisco Fire Commission on March 3, 2020, also attached.

Further, the subject verified complaint document was presented by a public officer (SFFD Chief of Department) during a public meeting (San Francisco Fire Commission) to other public officers (San Francisco Fire Commissioners) for discussion of yet another public officer (SFFD “member”). As such, the subject document is appropriate for disclosure upon request and absolutely necessary for public transparency as outlined in San Francisco Municipal Ordinance Section 67.1, specifically paragraph (g), which states that “…when a person or entity is before a policy body or passive meeting body, that person, and the public, has the right to an open and public process.”

I look forward to hearing from your office.

Thank you,

Darren M. Kelly, Architect
City Attorney

Please find attached my correspondence with the San Francisco Fire Department, dated March 9, 2021, regarding my public records request of March 9, 2021. My request for a verified complaint document was denied pursuant to California Government Code Section 6254(c) which prohibits public agencies from such production of “Personnel, medical, or similar files, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.”

This refusal is not complaint with Section 6254(c) inasmuch as the document requested was not an internal personnel, medical or similar file maintained by the San Francisco Fire Department or the City of San Francisco but rather, as a verified complaint, is a sworn statement that originated outside of city government and not subject to Section 6254(c). The subject document, sent to the San Francisco Fire Commission on January 9, 2020, by the Chief of Department and referenced during open session of the commission, was omitted from the meeting minutes published by the San Francisco Fire Commission on March 3, 2020, also attached.

Further, the subject verified complaint document was presented by a public officer (SFFD Chief of Department) during a public meeting (San Francisco Fire Commission) to other public officers (San Francisco Fire Commissioners) for discussion of yet another public officer (SFFD “member”). As such, the subject document is appropriate for disclosure upon request and absolutely necessary for public transparency as outlined in San Francisco Municipal Ordinance Section 67.1, specifically paragraph (g), which states that “…when a person or entity is before a policy body or passive meeting body, that person, and the public, has the right to an open and public process.”

I look forward to hearing from your office.

Thank you,

Darren M. Kelly, Architect
March 19, 2021

VIA EMAIL

PUBLIC RECORDS REQUEST RESPONSE

This email is in response to the Public Records Request email dated March 9, 2021. The Department is invoking Mayor Breed’s Proclamation dated March 13, 2020 suspending various sections of the Sunshine Ordinance, including Sections 67.25(a), 67.25(b), 67.21(b), and 67.24(g) and (i) of the Administrative Code for the duration of the local emergency.

In your email you requested the following information:

“1. SFFD Work History for Daniel A. Gracia for the date range February 1, 2020 to February 14, 2020.
   2. SFFD Employment verification for Daniel A. Gracia for the date range October 1, 2018 to February 14, 2020.
   3. Verified Complaint filed by Chief of Department Jeanine Nicholson with the San Francisco Fire Commission on January 9, 2020.”

On March 17, 2021, the Department requested clarification for the items below:

2. SFFD Employment verification for Daniel A. Gracia for the date range October 1, 2018 to February 14, 2020.
3. Verified Complaint filed by Chief of Department Jeanine Nicholson with the San Francisco Fire Commission on January 9, 2020

In your March 18, 2021 email response, you clarified your request items as follows:

“The employment verification documentation in my request Item No.2 can simply be a Work History for Daniel A. Gracia for the date range September 1, 2018 to November 30, 2018.

The term "Verified Complaint" in my request Item No. 3 is referenced in the minutes of an SF Fire Commission Special Hearing on March 27, 2020, which I’ve attached to this email. Specifically, Agenda Item 2, “Case 2020-01: Hearing and deliberations on Verified Complaint filed with the Commission by Chief of Department” references a Verified Complaint the Chief of Department filed with the Commission on January 9, 2020. I’m not interested in records of the
deliberations themselves, which I understand were in a closed session and are therefore unavailable, just the Verified Complaint document itself.”

Based on your clarification for Item No. 2, the Department is providing you with responsive, non-exempt records/information to the item below:

“The employment verification documentation in my request Item No.2 can simply be a Work History for Daniel A. Gracia for the date range September 1, 2018 to November 30, 2018.

With regard to Item No. 3, under Government Code section 6254 (c), which states in part that Departments must not disclose “personnel, medical, or similar files, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy, the Department is prohibited from providing this information. The verified complaint is protected based on the privacy rights of the member who is the subject of the complaint.

Kind Regards,

Public Records Office
San Francisco Fire Department
President Covington called the hearing to order at 9:31.

Item No.

1. ROLL CALL

- President: Francée Covington
- Vice President: Katherine Feinstein
- Commissioner: Stephen A. Nakajo
- Commissioner: Ken Cleaveland
- Commissioner: Tony Rodriguez

Also Present:
- Brad Russi, Deputy City Attorney, Government Team – Counsel to the Commission
- Maureen Conefrey, Commission Secretary
- Jeanine Nicholson, Chief of Department
- Lisa Berkowitz, Deputy City Attorney, Counsel to the Department
- Joel Abelson, Counsel to Member
- Dawn Sandner, Court Reporter

2. CASE NO. 2020-01: HEARING AND DELIBERATIONS ON VERIFIED COMPLAINT FILED WITH THE COMMISSION BY CHIEF OF DEPARTMENT [Discussion and possible action]

On January 9, 2020, Chief of Department Jeanine Nicholson filed a Verified Complaint with the Commission recommending termination for the following violations:

- Section 3921 – Inattention to Duty
- Section 3922 – Inaptitude for duty/Incompetence.

This case may be heard in Closed Session pursuant to Government Code Section 54957(b) and San Francisco Administrative Code Section 67.10(b).

A. Public Comment on Special Meeting Agenda Item; Possible Closed Session

Members of the public may comment on all matters pertaining to Agenda Item 2 and whether to consider the matter in closed session. [Government Code §54954.3(a), Administrative Code §67.15(b)]

There was no public comment.

B. Votes on Closed Session

1. Whether to hold the hearing on the verified complaint in closed session [Action]
Vice President Feinstein Moved to hold the hearing in closed session. Commissioner Cleaveland Seconded. The motion was unanimous.

2. Whether to conduct deliberations in closed session [Action]

Commissioner Nakajo Moved to conduct deliberations in closed session. Commissioner Rodriguez Seconded. The motion was unanimous.

Resumed in closed session at 9:35 a.m.

Lunch taken from 12:54 – 1:45 p.m.

Resumed in closed session at 1:50

C. Hearing and Deliberations

1. Hearing on verified complaint (in open or closed session, per the Commission’s vote)

2. Deliberations and possible action on charges (in open or closed session, per the Commission’s vote) [Discussion and Possible Action]

D. If Closed Session is held, reconvene in Open Session


The matter was not concluded, and Commission Secretary will poll the parties and scheduled a date to complete the hearing.

2. Vote to elect whether to disclose any or all discussions held in Closed Session, as specified in San Francisco Administrative Code Section 67.12(a). [Action Item]

Commissioner Rodriguez Moved to not disclose. Vice President Feinstein Seconded. The motion was unanimous.

2. ADJOURNMENT

Vice President Moved to adjourn. President Covington Seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.
Sent via email (independentm68@gmail.com)

February 17, 2022

Independentm68@gmail.com

Re: Petition to Supervisor of Records

To whom it may concern:

This letter responds to your petition to the Supervisor of Records sent via email on November 22, 2021, arising from your February 18, 2020 Immediate Disclosure Request to San Francisco Public Works (“PW”), seeking: “WeChat, text, or any other kind of chat (things like Whatsapp…) messages with Mohammed Nuru, Nick Bovis, Linda Crayton, Zhang Li, or Walter Wong including a complete personal account search of all employees, commissioners, and officials.”

On March 13, 2020, PW notified you that it had completed its search for responsive records, had released records responsive to your request, and explained the bases for redactions and for any records withheld. On November 22, 2021, you submitted a petition to the Supervisor of Records, seeking a determination that certain items are public records that PW must disclose. The 16 items you listed, along with our determination, are set forth below.

   
   Under the Sunshine Ordinance (Administrative Code Sec. 67.21(d)), the Supervisor of Records has authority to determine whether a City department has withheld a record, or any part of a record, without a lawful basis for doing so – for determining “whether the record requested, or any part of the record requested, is public.” Public Works has not redacted information from this record, and there is therefore no issue for the Supervisor of Records to address.

2. https://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/documents/4002651 - the rest of the first text message
   
   Public Works confirmed the screenshots in the text message string were previously released. Specifically, the photo at the bottom of the document was released as “Screenshot_20200221-173917_Messages.jpg,” available at https://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/documents/4002652.
   Public Works confirmed that it is not withholding these items, because the records do not
   include the embedded contact files.

   pages 2, 17, 18, 21, 22, 25.
   Public Works confirmed that it only has the screenshots produced; it does not possess the
   items embedded in the screenshots and is not withholding any records.

5. https://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/documents/4688332 - the message associated with
   this apparent attachment.
   Public Works indicated that the message was released as “Chris Buck texts with
   Mohammed 1830 Alemany inquiry.jpg.”
   This record is available at: https://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/documents/4688327.

   Public Works confirmed that the text was provided as a static screenshot. It does not
   possess the video embedded in the document and is not withholding any records.

7. https://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/documents/4682368 - the various attachments to
   these emails; also the identity of the persons being emailed, even if the addresses are
   redacted.
   Public Works confirmed that it does not possess the attachments.
   The email addresses were redacted on the basis of privacy because they are personal
   email addresses. We find that Public Works properly applied the redactions under Government
   Code Section 6254(e) and (k), and Article I, Section 1 of the California Constitution. The
   redacted email address in the “To” line indicates that it belongs to Larry Stringer.

8. https://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/documents/4682365 - the various attachments to
   this email; also the identity of the persons being emailed, even if the addresses are redacted.
   Public Works confirmed that it does not possess the attachments and is not withholding
   any records.
   The email addresses were redacted on the basis of privacy because they are personal
   email addresses. We find that Public Works properly applied the redactions under Government
   Code Section 6254(e) and (k), and Article I, Section 1 of the California Constitution. The
   redacted email address in the “To” line indicates that it belongs to Larry Stringer.

   Public Works confirmed that it does not possess the attachments embedded in the
document and is not withholding any records.

10. https://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/documents/4382790 - the identity of this person
texting Mohammed about 555 Fulton.

   Under the Sunshine Ordinance (Administrative Code Sec. 67.21(d)), the Supervisor of
Records has authority to determine whether a City department has withheld a record, or any part
of a record, without a lawful basis for doing so – for determining “whether the record requested,
or any part of the record requested, is public.” Public Works has not redacted information from
this record, and there is therefore no issue for the Supervisor of Records to address.

identity of the participants.

   Public Works confirmed that it does not possess the embedded video and is not
withholding any records.

   Additionally, under the Sunshine Ordinance (Administrative Code Sec. 67.21(d)), the
Supervisor of Records has authority to determine whether a City department has withheld a
record, or any part of a record, without a lawful basis for doing so – for determining “whether the
record requested, or any part of the record requested, is public.” Public Works has not redacted
information from this record, and there is therefore no issue for the Supervisor of Records to
address.

12. https://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/documents/4682115 - the original record of these
texts. it's impossible to tell who is saying what when records are mangled like this.

   Public Works confirmed that it does not possess the texts in their original format.

texting Nuru about sweeping homeless people

   The personal contact information that was redacted based on privacy grounds does not
indicate the identity of the individual. We find that Public Works properly applied the redaction
under Government Code Section 6254(c) and (k), and Article I, Section 1 of the California
Constitution.

whatever is going on here.

   Public Works confirmed that it does not possess the attachments embedded in the
screenshots and is not withholding any records.
15. https://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/documents/4165203 – all of Nuru’s messages on the left hand side which are blacked out for some reason.

   Public Works confirmed that it will fix this issue and upload a corrected version.


   Public Works confirmed that it does not possess the embedded text message and is not withholding any records.

As detailed above, the Public Works has confirmed that it has produced all responsive records in its possession. Further, the Public Works is not obligated to respond to questions about the content of a record, including answering questions about the identity of an individual involved in a communication. For these reasons, we deny your Petition and consider it closed.

Very truly yours,

DAVID CHIU
City Attorney

Zachary Poriana
Deputy City Attorney
Hi Odaya – Here’s a response to an SOR petition for the log and the report. Thanks.

**Bradley Russi**  
**Deputy City Attorney**  
**Office of City Attorney David Chiu**  
(415) 554-4645 Direct  
City Hall, Room 234  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., San Francisco, CA 94102  
www.sfcityattorney.org

Attorney-Client Communication - Do Not Disclose  
Confidential Attorney Work Product - Do Not Disclose

This email may contain privileged or confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient, please reply to this email to inform me of your receipt and then destroy all copies.

---

From: Porianda, Zachary (CAT)  
Sent: Tuesday, February 22, 2022 12:22 PM  
To: Russi, Brad (CAT) <Brad.Russi@sfcityatty.org>  
Subject: FW: Supervisor of Records letter re request #20-830

Zach

Zachary Porianda (he/him/his)  
Deputy City Attorney  
Office of City Attorney David Chiu  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Suite 234  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
phone: (415) 554-4665  
www.sfcityattorney.org

The information in this email is confidential and may be protected by the attorney/client privilege and/or the attorney work product doctrine. If you are not the intended recipient of this email or received this email inadvertently, please notify the sender and delete it.

---

From: Lopez, Reyna (CAT)  
Sent: Friday, February 18, 2022 10:53 AM  
To: Porianda, Zachary (CAT) <Zachary.Porianda@sfcityatty.org>  
Subject: FW: Supervisor of Records letter re request #20-830
Here you go.

Reyna Lopez, Legal Secretary
Office of City Attorney David Chiu
(415) 554-4630 Direct
Email: reyna.lopez@sfcityatty.org
www.sfcityattorney.org
Find us on: Facebook Twitter Instagram

From: Lopez, Reyna (CAT)
Sent: Friday, February 18, 2022 7:59 AM
To: independentm68@gmail.com
Subject: Supervisor of Records letter re request #20-830

Attached please find a response to your petition to the Supervisor of Records.

Reyna Lopez, Legal Secretary
Office of City Attorney David Chiu
(415) 554-4630 Direct
Email: reyna.lopez@sfcityatty.org
www.sfcityattorney.org
Find us on: Facebook Twitter Instagram
Hi supervisor of records,

Please provide me a written determination that records below that Public Works has failed to provide are public and order them to disclose the records.

1. https://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/documents/4382821 - the identity of the person sending this message
2. https://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/documents/4002651 - the rest of the first text message
3. https://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/documents/4002698 - the three attached items
5. https://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/documents/4688332 - the message associated with this apparent attachment
6. https://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/documents/4382808 - the video in this one
7. https://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/documents/4682368 - the various attachments to these emails; also the
identity of the persons being emailed, even if the addresses are redacted

8. https://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/documents/4682365 - the various attachments to this email; also the identity of the persons being emailed, even if the addresses are redacted


10. https://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/documents/4382790 - the identity of this person texting Mohammed about 555 Fulton


12. https://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/documents/4682115 - the original record of these texts. it's impossible to tell who is saying what when records are mangled like this.


14. https://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/documents/4002783 - the attachments of whatever is going on here...

15. https://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/documents/4165203 - all of Nuru's messages on the left hand side which are blacked out for some reason

16. https://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/documents/4002816 - the rest of the last text on the first page
Hi there
Record request #20-830 has been closed and published. The closure reason supplied was:

We have conducted a diligent search for records responsive to your request. We have located responsive records and have released them to you.

If you have trouble accessing the files, we can burn the responsive records onto a CD at a rate of 1 per CD or load the responsive records onto a flash drive at a rate of 4 per flash drive. Fees for duplication are subject to change and postage is an additional cost.

If hard copies are needed, we can provide hard copies of any 8.5x11 documents that are made available to you at a cost of 10 cents per copy, as allowed by the San Francisco Administrative Code § 67.28(c). This section states "a fee not to exceed 10 cents per page may be charged." Postage is an additional cost.

Please note that the Public Records Act requires an agency to make available to any person a copy of an "identifiable record or records" in its possession, unless the record is specifically
exempt from disclosure. (Please see California Government Code § 6253(b).) The City's obligation under the Sunshine Ordinance, like the Public Records Act, is to produce public records in its custody. (See San Francisco Administration Code § 67.20(b).) There is no requirement that a department or officer construct a document to meet the specifications of the request.

Please note that it is not necessary to create a NextRequest account to view responsive records. Once they have been released, a link, valid for 30 days, will be provided to view the records. Additionally, unless privacy concerns prevent it, Public Works makes all records requests visible to the public. You may search for requests at https://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/.

Due to privacy concerns, personal information, such as personal phone numbers, cell numbers and email addresses, has been redacted from the documents that we are making available to you. We redacted this personal information pursuant to Section 6254(c) and Section 6254(k) of the California Public Records Act and Article 1, Section 1 of the California Constitution.

We have withheld records responsive to your request [and/or redacted parts of the records provided in response to your request] that constitute private personnel records of a City employee. Cal. Govt. Code Secs. 6254(c), 6254(k) California Constitution, Art. I, Sec. 1.

Regards,

David A. Steinberg
Custodian of Records
San Francisco Public Works
View Request 20-830

http://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/requests/20-830

Questions about your request? Reply to this email or sign in to contact staff at City and County of San Francisco.

Technical support: See our help page.
Nick thanks for the message return call Ron

12/2/19, 8:18 AM
Nick I have gotten commitments from Webcor, Clark, and Pankow for Lefty Odoul’s Foundation. Please confirm receipt.
Thanks
Ron

Jes W. Pedersen
Bret Firebaugh
Marivic Chennault
Thx Nick!

I call Jes and bret and left them messages

Great thx!

12/4/19, 12:25 PM
Marivic’s phone # is she just tried calling you

12/9/19, 8:18 AM
I talked to Vicki, she will check with Christopher on receipt of information. Did you mail or email the form?

12/9/19, 2:47 PM
Heard from Vicki sounds like you and Christopher connected today. Hope you were able to close the loop on information. I will be seeing Pankow later today

12/10/19, 8:10 AM
Nick, I pinged Vicki she has not received the form so stuck until it’s returned

I never received one here’s my email nick@leftysf.com

Thank you
They sent it please confirm receipt

Yes

I filled it out and send it back to him

It was a six page form that was mainly for vendors so I filled out the best I could for a nonprofit donation

Thx

Process in progress when approved it will be overnighted to your foundation address

Nick let me know if you received anything. Any updates?

Not yet I will check mail today

Ok should be overnight service

Ok

I believe you will receive tomorrow

Ok

Receive anything?

Not yet

Sorry, I can't talk right now.

No problem I was just letting you know I haven't seen anything come by yet I'm gonna leave here in an hour or so
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Page (# of occurrences)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>Due to privacy concerns, personal information, such as personal phone numbers, cell numbers and email addresses, has been redacted from the documents that we are making available to you. We redacted this personal information pursuant to Section 6254(c) and Section 6254(k) of the California Public Records Act and Article 1, Section 1 of the California Constitution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fwd: Invoices for Garbage Cans
1 message

Nuru Family Privacy
To: Privacy
Mon, Dec 19, 2016 at 5:08 PM
can you look into these for w. thanks

---Original Message---
From: Walter Wong <jaidin@pacbell.net>
To: Mohammed Nuru Family Privacy
Sent: Mon, Dec 19, 2016 3:09 pm
Subject: Invoices for Garbage Cans

Mohammed,

Attached are the three outstanding invoices for the garbage cans installed. Two of them have been past due for more than 60 days. Please kindly let us know when payment can be expected.

Thanks,

Walter
# Redaction Log

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Page (# of occurrences)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
<td>Due to privacy concerns, personal information, such as personal phone numbers, cell numbers and email addresses, has been redacted from the documents that we are making available to you. We redacted this personal information pursuant to Section 6254(c) and Section 6254(k) of the California Public Records Act and Article 1, Section 1 of the California Constitution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fwd: Invoices

1 message

Fri, Aug 25, 2017 at 8:39 AM

Nuru Family: Privacy

To: Privacy

not sure we need gold plated labels anymore. expense

-----Original Message-----
From: Jaidin Consulting <consult@jaidin.net>
To: Mohammed Nuru personal: Privacy
Sent: Tue, Aug 22, 2017 11:33 am
Subject: Fwd: Invoices

can you help is over 30 days
---Original Message---
From: Jaidin Consulting <consult@jaidin.net>
To: Mohammed Nuru personal
Sent: Fri, Jun 16, 2017 8:53 am
Subject: 3rd Replacement can location List
Fwd: Oakdale Fence Photos & CAD
1 message

Fri, Feb 1, 2019 at 8:36 AM

-----Original Message-----
From: Jaidin Consulting <consult@jaidin.net>
To: Mohammed Nuru personal
Sent: Thu, Jan 31, 2019 10:13 pm
Subject: Fwd: Oakdale Fence Photos & CAD

Ps ck

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: Washington Wong <washington@jaidin.net>
Date: Thu, Jan 31, 2019, 21:25
Subject: Oakdale Fence Photos & CAD
To: Walter Wong <consult@jaidin.net>
Larry,

Attached is the invoice for the UN Plaza Fence that we sent to DPW Accounting Dept. on 4/8/2019. We also attached the invoice for the 70 trash cans sent on 3/28/19. When we check on the SF Supplier Portal, we found these 2 invoices still have not yet posted to the system. Please kindly help us to check the payment status and let us know if any questions.

Thanks, we appreciate your hep!

Walter Wong
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Page (# of occurrences)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
<td>Due to privacy concerns, personal information, such as personal phone numbers, cell numbers and email addresses, has been redacted from the documents that we are making available to you. We redacted this personal information pursuant to Section 6254(c) and Section 6254(k) of the California Public Records Act and Article 1, Section 1 of the California Constitution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fyi- Shaw pipeline left this mess on teresita today

The inspector will check things out and get them to clean up

Thank you
Please look into 1550 visitation, something about BSM permit and Tree

Ok. Let me check with BUF

Thanks 🙏
The owner of 1550 Visitacion called BUF and they are working out the tree planting requirements. Based on the frontage they need to plant 4 trees.
Please look into this for me.....Hey Mo, we are trying to get your folks at dpw desk on 5th floor at dbi to sign permit and walk down to ppc. Permit number is 2018-0423-7121 and address is 342 29Th ave in sf. Was supposed to be complete yesterday and we have been yesterday and today and they tell us to now come back tomorrow. If there is anyway to get sign off and have it down to ppc, that would be great. Thank you!

Our staff at DBI is walking the permit to ppc now.

Thank you 🙏
Thu, Jun 20, 7:41 PM

Mohammed

Getting calls of excessive noise

What’s the location?

Found the address we will send someone out

600 block Post Street and Shannon

Thu, Jun 20, 10:31 PM

Any updates on situation?

Need to shit crew working. Still

Thu, Jun 20, 10:31 PM

Any updates on situation? Need to shit crew working. Still noisy

Fri, Jun 21, 8:18 AM

Mo. I didn't get your text and call until this morning. Circling with the team to resolve the issue. We are pulling the night noise permit.

Tue, Jul 16, 7:48 PM

Please look into the status of this permit for me....1206 15th Ave Permit #17IE-0666 Plan checker name is Theo Devine.....tomorrow is good. Thanks🙏

Will do

Thanks
Thanks

Wed, Jul 24, 1:08 PM

We are ready to issue the robot permits. Do you have any concerns?

Yes, please make sure that Norman Yee's office is okay with it. Jeremy can help communicate.

Will do

Thu, Jul 25, 9:08 PM

Bernie, Patrick from Folsom says the trailers are still on 10th. He's blowing up Mayor's office. You're going to get them moved, right?

Wed, Aug 21, 12:09 PM

Photo of a road with a pothole.
I sent this to Mike and haven't herd back from him. Please look into this and let me know what happening here.....FYI: Good morning, last night my sister passed through this hole. I went this morning and it is near 916 Natoma. Someone did this and has not filled it in nor put anything so the cars don't sink in. Someone had this.
I sent this to Mike and haven’t herd back from him. Please look into this and let me know what happing here.....FYI: Good morning, last night my sister passed through this hole. I went this morning and it is near 916 Natoma. Someone did this and has not filled it in nor put anything so the cars don’t sink in. Someone had this alley blocked the other day to do this. Thank you.

Will do

Thanks 🙏
The work was done by Phoenix Electric under permit 19e-00070 for 961 Natoma. We talked to the foreman and final paving restoration is scheduled for Friday. We will have the contractor to the ramping.

Thank you.

Good morning, hope you are doing well. Can you assist me by getting someone to fix this steel plate? It is very loose and you hear the noise everytime a car, bus and heavy trucks hit it when they pass by. Thank you 🙏

Exhibit: Image of a street with various vehicles and a pedestrian.
Do you have a location?

11th and kisling around Don Ramon Restaurant

We will send an inspector

Thanks 🙏

Mon, Sep 16, 11:00 AM

PUC Water Dept. has been notified of loose/noisy manhole.

Thank you
Please call me when you have a chance. Thanks

Revived this text this morning from the supervisor...Hi Catherine

This is Anna Zankel, co-owner with my husband Ken of The Grove Restaurants all in SF. This is regarding The Grove - Fillmore. I have left Ken off of this email as he is at a Family event on the East coast and do not want to ruin it with this notification. This afternoon Friday Sept 20th our General Manager at The Grove - Fillmore received a 72 hour notice from DPW giving us a notice of correction and 72 hours to comply. If this sounds like déjà vu it is. We had our Architects, Macy Architecture, go back and forth last year with DPW and your
If this sounds like déjà vu it is. We had our Architects, Macy Architecture, go back and forth last year with DPW and your office was also involved. We are reviewing our records to see where it was left as is Macy Architecture too. I have attached the notice for your review.

The Grove - Fillmore has been in existence since 2002 providing jobs, being a stellar neighbor and an integral part of Fillmore Street and the community at large.

I can’t tell you how disappointing this city has become to small business especially restaurants, and notices like this makes us wonder why we even continue. We employ over 200 people with jobs in this city, provide health care benefits and additional employee benefits.
especially restaurants, and notices like this makes us wonder why we even continue. We employ over 200 people with jobs in this city, provide health care benefits and additional employee benefits above and beyond to be an employer of choice not because we have to but because we believe it is the right thing to do. With rising costs and notices like this that discourage business instead of partnering with business, we have to question whether we want to continue. We have no outside investors or venture capital. Ken and I personally support numerous charities and non profits in this city and live downtown which has become increasingly challenging. This year we are celebrating our 20th Anniversary of The Grove established in 1999.
established in 1999.

I have to let you know if our tables and chairs permit is revoked our numbers to keep this restaurant open will not be tenable. This city needs to change or institutions such as ourselves will disappear.

We would appreciate a call with you on Monday to review the situation and also have you advocate for an extension until a mutually acceptable resolution can be reached.

Thank you and please feel free to call me on my cell listed below.

Sincerely,

Anna

I am very concerned that if this type of threat for extra tables
I am very concerned that if this type of threat for extra tables continues small business will turn against our dept.
Good morning Mohammed. Gwendolyn Wright here. I've been up since 2am from jackhammering and metal clanging, etc. Why does the city of San Francisco continue to disrespectful and disregard our community?

Please look into this

Will do
4:22

Mohammed

Will do

Tue, Oct 22, 10:43 PM

Is this on your radar?

It is now. Do you know the cross street

Looks like Hahn. Need to verify
Looks like Hahn. Need to verify

We will check who built the ramp and can’t spell or look up at the street sign

Okay, thanks 🙏

Wed, Oct 23, 9:52 AM

Sannydale was installed by PG &E in 2012 at Sunnydale and Sawyer. We are having them correct the spelling as part of the legacy curb ramp program.

Okay, can you connect with Dijada, she going out to fix

Sure

Tue, Nov 5, 12:57 PM
Mohammed: this is Jay Wallace (Darius' partner) needing some help for our TZK Broadway hotel and theater project on Port property ASAP.

Javier Rivera has the final piece.
Mohammed: this is Jay Wallace (Darius' partner) needing some help for our TZK Broadway hotel and theater project on Port property ASAP.

Javier Rivera has the final piece of mapping for the Street Vacation Ordinance on his desk today (DPW Work Order) and we really need for him to get that to the Port TODAY.

We know he's super busy and that he's transitioning too but this is really important that we move this out of your department/his desk and over to the Port TODAY so they can get the Street Vacation Ordinance and the Lease onto the Board of Supes’ calendar.

Really appreciate your help and Javier’s efforts to get this done
Mohammed

Really appreciate your help and Javier’s efforts to get this done and over to the Port today. Thanks, Jay

He is on it. There is some minor map updates needed from the developer and legislation update from City Attorney. He will try and get it out today.

Fri, Nov 8, 2:43 PM

FYI. TZK Broadway hotel is in your queue for approval. That is the last step before turning it over to the Port to send to the BOS.

Fri, Nov 8, 3:51 PM

All signed

Thanks we will get it out to the Port.
Thanks we will get it out to the Port.

Today

Sat, Dec 14, 1:38 PM

Judson True

Ernie Banks

Privacy

Wed, Dec 18, 1:26 PM

256 Casitas never called in for final inspection. The concrete contractor Eric Jones, On The Level Concrete, said he forgot to call. We will schedule final inspection with him for tomorrow or Friday when he’s available.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Page (# of occurrences)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>24 (1) 25 (1)</td>
<td>Due to privacy concerns, personal information, such as personal phone numbers, cell numbers and email addresses, has been redacted from the documents that we are making available to you. We redacted this personal information pursuant to Section 6254(c) and Section 6254(k) of the California Public Records Act and Article 1, Section 1 of the California Constitution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please respond to Yvonnes email from Tuesday about the 5260. She can't send out a new offer until she gets that. Thanks and happy halloween!!

Okay, got to look for it.

Thanks so much!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Page (# of occurrences)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Redaction Log
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Page (# of occurrences)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>Due to privacy concerns, personal information, such as personal phone numbers, cell numbers and email addresses, has been redacted from the documents that we are making available to you. We redacted this personal information pursuant to Section 6254(c) and Section 6254(k) of the California Public Records Act and Article 1, Section 1 of the California Constitution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Monday, January 20, 2020

At 17:07, I received a call from Reza indicating that our geotechnical consultant, AGS, recommended closure of south bound Great Highway at Sloat due to ongoing erosion of the beach.

At 17:47, I arrived at the site and found the shoulder of the Great Highway starting to become undermined at the loc

MMS
18:05
View all
A few corrections for 555 Fulton, which we are going over with them now at the counter. Once they update, Jessica can give them partial TCO.

Thu, Aug 15, 2:53 PM

Just a heads up that MTA has Emerging Technology/Mobility Legislation, supported by Andres and the Mayor, which may be in conflict with President Yee’s ET legislation and intended to be introduced the same day. Andres is calling a meeting with PW, MTA and City Administrators folks to discuss.

Fri, Aug 16, 9:05 AM

Wanted to let you know I’m meeting with Andres and folks re: ET in 30 minutes to discuss dueling legislation.
this rolling out. Thanks

Hey Mohammed, I’d be happy to catch up. Does today work for you? If not let me know when does. Suzanne looped me.

Let me see what Myisha can find.

Wed, Nov 13, 8:44 AM

Morning, can you call me when you have a chance. Thanks

Fri, Nov 22, 6:31 PM

I just saw your missed call - and wanted to be responsive but I couldn’t answer the phone

Okay, no worries. Call me when you have a chance.

Thu, Dec 19, 11:56 AM

Headed to the signing for OET today folks
What time will you be at the venue?

Fri, Dec 20, 2:56 PM

Be there in 5

The lady says we need mats or a tarp for the prep tables 😞

Yes

She also says we need an emergency exit sign. Any chance you have one? I don’t.

Fri, Dec 20, 5:06 PM

Do you have any utensil holders?

Any solution for garbage cans?

Sat, Dec 21, 8:17 AM

Found my wallet. Thank you for everything last night. You were incredible

I knew you would

Good news

Everything went so well
I can get the lights and my coat Monday morning at 9:30. Is that good with you?

Yes

Anytime Monday

Sat, Dec 21, 12:11 PM

Okay thank you

Thank you again for storing the lights for me

No pu

Problem

Sun, Dec 22, 6:29 PM

Can I call you in the morning I talked to Mohammed he needs me to make an invoice or they can cut me a check tomorrow I'm a little tight to pay all the people Any help would be greatly appreciated thank you nick

Yes you can! I will be on my way to the restaurant tomorrow at around 9:30/10. Feel free to call me before then or if you're going to be there we can talk in person. Either way I'm here to help you out
I did not hear anything back yet I was wondering do you think I should just call Mohammed

Just got word that the check won’t be ready until Jan 3 :/

Should I ask Mohammed if he can get it to me sooner

You can try but the check signed from the parks alliance is out of town til Jan 2

Mon, Jan 6, 8:39 AM

Hi Nick. Hope you’re doing well. Did you receive the check from the Parks Alliance? Do you need me to contact them?

Yes I got the check from the park department but I did not get one from Webcor yet they told me that they mail would mail it Friday but that was two weeks ago

I’m glad you got the check from Parks. Webcor just sent us an email saying they will overnight the check to your Jefferson address. You should receive it tomorrow

Ok thanks
Thanks
I'll be down there before 930 give you a call before that thank you

Okay sounds good. Talk to you tomorrow morning and see you soon after

Mon, Dec 23, 9:30 AM

Be there in 10

Mon, Dec 23, 1:28 PM

I did not hear anything back yet I was wondering do you think I should just call Mohammed

Just got word that the check won't be ready until Jan 3 :/

Should I ask Mohammed if he can get it to me sooner

You can try but the check signed from the parks alliance is out of town til Jan 2

Mon, Jan 6, 8:39 AM

Hi Nick. Hope you’re doing well. Did you receive the check from the Parks Alliance? Do you need me to contact them?
Ms. Heath –

I understand that the Department of Public Health has now responded to your request and produced the responsive records in its possession. Unless we hear otherwise from you, we will consider this petition closed. Thank you.

**Bradley Russi**  
Deputy City Attorney  
Office of City Attorney David Chiu  
City Hall, Room 234  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., San Francisco, CA 94102  
[www.sfcityattorney.org](http://www.sfcityattorney.org)

Ms. Heath – I write to acknowledge receipt of your petition. We will look into the matter and follow up if we have questions. Thank you.

**Bradley Russi**  
Deputy City Attorney  
Office of City Attorney David Chiu  
City Hall, Room 234  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., San Francisco, CA 94102  
[www.sfcityattorney.org](http://www.sfcityattorney.org)

I am writing to ask the City Attorney to help us obtain time-sensitive records. DPH has not complied with our request.

We filed an Immediate Disclosure Request on 10/25/21 for all emails and attachments for Amy Brownell at DPH related to 300 DeHaro and have received no records or explanation.

14 day extensions were invoked on 10/27/21 and again on 11/9/21. The second extension expired on 11/23/21.
There has been no response and no communication since 11/9/21. Below is my correspondence with the Custodian of Records.

Thanks for your help with this. I look forward to your reply.

Regards,
Alison Heath

To: Custodian of Records

Date: 10/25/21

Name of Requester: Alison Heath, Potrero Boosters Neighborhood Association
Email: [Personal Info.]

FOR IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE

Subject or Item Requested:

300 De Haro – all emails and email attachments dated 8/1/19 to 10/25/21
Amy Brownell

External Message
Requester  Staff
I am still waiting for a response.
December 2, 2021, 1:20pm by the requester

External Message
Requester  Staff
This was an immediate disclosure request dated 10/25/21. Two 14 day extensions have now expired and I have not received documents. Please advise.
November 28, 2021, 12:44pm by the requester

Due Date Changed  Public
11/09/2021 (was 11/04/2021). We are invoking an extension of up to 14 days until Nov 9 because of the need to search for, collect, and appropriately examine a voluminous amount of separate and distinct records that are demanded in a single request. We will endeavor to complete our response before that date.
October 27, 2021, 3:51pm

Due Date Changed  Public
11/23/2021 (was 11/09/2021). We are invoking an extension of up to 14 days until November 23 because of the need to search for, collect, and appropriately examine a voluminous amount of separate and distinct records that are demanded in a single request. We will endeavor to complete our response before that date.
November 9, 2021, 4:53pm

External Message
Requester  Staff
Hi Sam, I see you are the contact for records requests. As this was an immediate disclosure request and 24 hours have passed, I'm checking current status. Thanks for your help.

October 27, 2021, 11:25am by the requester

Department Assignment
Public
Public Health: Hazardous Materials / USTs / Maher Ordinance
October 25, 2021, 12:17pm

Request Opened
Public
Request received via web
October 25, 2021, 12:17pm

Alison Heath
alisonheath.com
I am writing to ask the City Attorney to help us obtain time-sensitive records. DPH has not complied with our request.

We filed an Immediate Disclosure Request on 10/25/21 for all emails and attachments for Amy Brownell at DPH related to 300 DeHaro and have received no records or explanation.

14 day extensions were invoked on 10/27/21 and again on 11/9/21. The second extension expired on 11/23/21.

There has been no response and no communication since 11/9/21. Below is my correspondence with the Custodian of Records.

Thanks for your help with this. I look forward to your reply.

Regards,
Alison Heath

To: Custodian of Records

Date: 10/25/21

Name of Requester: Alison Heath, Potrero Boosters Neighborhood Association
Email: [Personal Info.]

FOR IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE

Subject or Item Requested:

300 De Haro – all emails and email attachments dated 8/1/19 to 10/25/21
Amy Brownell

External Message Requester Staff
I am still waiting for a response.
December 2, 2021, 1:20pm by the requester

External Message Requester Staff
This was an immediate disclosure request dated 10/25/21. Two 14 day extensions have now expired and I have not received documents. Please advise.
Due Date Changed  Public
11/09/2021 (was 11/04/2021). We are invoking an extension of up to 14 days until Nov 9 because of
the need to search for, collect, and appropriately examine a voluminous amount of separate and
distinct records that are demanded in a single request. We will endeavor to complete our response
before that date.
October 27, 2021, 3:51pm

Due Date Changed  Public
11/23/2021 (was 11/09/2021). We are invoking an extension of up to 14 days until November 23
because of the need to search for, collect, and appropriately examine a voluminous amount of
separate and distinct records that are demanded in a single request. We will endeavor to complete
our response before that date.
November 9, 2021, 4:53pm

External Message Requester  Staff
Hi Sam, I see you are the contact for records requests. As this was an immediate disclosure request and 24 hours
have passed, I'm checking current status. Thanks for your help.
October 27, 2021, 11:25am by the requester

Department Assignment  Public
Public Health: Hazardous Materials / USTs / Maher Ordinance
October 25, 2021, 12:17pm

Request Opened  Public
Request received via web
October 25, 2021, 12:17pm

Alison Heath
alisonheath.com
I understand that Public Works has now produced a document in response to your request. I further understand that Public Works has no further responsive documents. Accordingly, because the department has not withheld any records based on an exemption in the Public Records Act, there is nothing for the Supervisor of Records to consider and we consider your petition closed. Thank you.

Bradley Russi  
Deputy City Attorney  
Office of City Attorney David Chiu  
City Hall, Room 234  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., San Francisco, CA 94102  
www.sfcityattorney.org

Hi Bradley,

Could you please advise on the progress?

Best,
Yuli

On Mon, Feb 7, 2022 at 7:56 PM Supervisor Records (CAT) <supervisor.records@sfcityatty.org> wrote:

Yuli —

I apologize for the delay. We have been working with Public Works to determine if there are documents that are not exempt from disclosure. I hope to have more information for you this week. Thank you for your patience.

Bradley Russi  
Deputy City Attorney  
Office of City Attorney David Chiu
Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to respectfully make a sunshine appeal regarding the attached Public Record Request #21-6702.

The city department to which I made your request: Public Works
The record or records I requested: Two records were requested for Sunset and Parkside Sewer and Pavement Renovation Project: a) Approval document by the Engineer and b) Submitted calculation package that determines and supports the choice of hammering parameters and hammering operation plan including precautionary measures.
The date of my request: December 3.

The justification of my request was based on a) San Francisco Standard Specifications of Public Works, Part 7 - Excavation and Backfill, requires the use of vibratory hammers to be approved by the Engineer (Engineer(s) of Record listed in the attachment), and b) the fact that the Sunset and Parkside Sewer and Pavement Renovation Project has been using hammering for sheet-pile installation during construction.

The request was closed on December 9 with a comment that Public Works has "finished conducting a diligent search and found no documents responsive to your request."

I am not sure if I understand the implication underlying the observation that an approval document required by San Francisco Standard Specifications of Public Works is not identifiable and associated with a no-document response after a diligent search. As such, I would like to bring my appeal to your attention.

I appreciate your help and look forward to hearing from you.

Best,
Yuli
San Francisco Standard Specifications of Public Works, Part 7 - Excavation and Backfill, require the use of vibratory hammers to be approved by the Engineer.

I am writing to request the following documents for the Sunset and Parkside Sewer and Pavement Renovation Project, which apparently used hammers for sheet-pile during construction.

1. Approval document by the Engineer.
2. Submitted calculation package that determines and supports the choice of hammering parameters and hammering operation plan including precautionary measures.

---

**Request Closed**

We have finished conducting a diligent search and found no documents responsive to your request.

The Public Records Act requires an agency to make available to any person a copy of an “identifiable record or records” in its possession, unless the record is specifically exempt from disclosure. (See California Government Code § 6253(b).) The City’s obligation under the Sunshine Ordinance, like the Public Records Act, is to produce public records in its custody. (See San Francisco Administration Code § 67.20(b)) There is no requirement that a department or officer construct a document to meet the specifications of the request.

We now consider your request closed.

Regards,

David A. Steinberg
Custodian of Records
San Francisco Public Works
December 9, 2021, 10:42am

---

**External Message**

We received your public records request, dated Dec. 3. You have requested the following records:

RE: Sunset and Parkside Sewer and Pavement Renovation Project, which apparently used hammers for sheet-pile during construction.

1. Approval document by the Engineer.
2. Submitted calculation package that determines and supports the choice of hammering parameters and hammering operation plan including precautionary measures.

Our department will identify and compile the requested information. The Sunshine Ordinance requires departments to respond as soon as possible or within 10 calendar days from receipt of any records requests. Therefore, we will contact you as soon as the responsive documents are ready for you to view and will do so on or before Dec. 13, as permitted by San Francisco Administrative Code § 67.21(b) and California Government Code § 6253(c).

It is not necessary to create a NexRequest account to view responsive records. Once they have been released, a link, valid for 30 days, will be provided to view the records. Additionally, unless privacy concerns prevent it, Public Works makes all records requests visible to the public. You may search for requests at [https://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/](https://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/).

December 3, 2021, 10:18am by David A. Steinberg, Custodian of Records (Staff)

---

**Department Assignment**

Public Works
December 3, 2021, 9:57am

---

**Request Opened**

Request received via web
December 3, 2021, 9:57am
SECTION 00 01 07

SEALS PAGE

The various portions of the specifications and other contract documents for project "SUNSET AND PARKSIDE STREETS PAVEMENT RENOVATION AND SEWER REPLACEMENT," San Francisco Public Works Contract No. 0000002288, have been prepared under the direction of the following design professionals, licensed in the State of California.

CIVIL ENGINEER
Deanna M. Calleros, P.E.
San Francisco Public Works
Bureau of Engineering
Streets & Highways Section

CIVIL ENGINEER
John J. Helmuth, P.E.
San Francisco Public Works
Bureau of Engineering
Hydraulic Engineering Section

CIVIL ENGINEER
Richard Chiricop, P.E.
San Francisco Public Works
Bureau of Engineering
Streets & Highways Section
TRAFFIC ENGINEER
Daniel Padilla, P.E.
Municipal Transportation Agency
Sustainable Streets Division
Transportation Engineering Section

END OF SECTION
OUTSTANDING PETITIONS
submitted by the Anonymous petitioner
March 10, 2021

Sent via email (arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com)

Re: Further Invocation of the Rule of Reason

To Whom It May Concern:

We write concerning your petitions to the Supervisor of Records. You have filed approximately 135 petitions with the Supervisor of Records since May 2019. In the past three months alone you have filed 64 petitions. This is an unprecedented quantity of petitions from any single person and far outpaces the number of petitions we typically receive from all sources combined on an annual basis. Indeed, in the ten-year period between October 2008 and December 2018, we received a total of 161 petitions for an average of 16 petitions per year. At your current rate of submission, you will have submitted more petitions in two years than we received from all sources over a ten-year period.

The burden you have placed on this office is unreasonable, and undermines the City Attorney’s ability to devote time and resources to its other duties under the Charter, Municipal Codes, and State law. Responding to each petition typically involves communications with departments, review of records and redactions, and legal analysis, and it requires attorneys in our office to defer their other obligations providing advice and representation to City departments. While approximately 70 of your petitions are resolved, there are still many outstanding. Addressing your outstanding petitions in a timely manner will be so burdensome and time consuming that it will unreasonably impinge on our other duties.

On September 16, 2019, we wrote to you to invoke the rule of reason due to the complexity and volume of your petitions, and we informed you our goal was to address your petitions within 30 days. In light of your excessive submission of petitions over the past year and a half and the burden it has imposed, we now further specify how we will handle your petitions going forward. We have already responded to 25 of your petitions since January 1, and we plan to review and respond to six more of your petitions this year. Beginning in 2022, we will respond to six of your petitions per calendar year, which will allow our office capacity to dedicate time to petitions submitted by other petitioners while also carrying out our many other duties for the people of the City and County of San Francisco. You may provide us a list identifying your preferred prioritization of outstanding petitions. If you prefer to withdraw any of your petitions, please let us know that as well. Thank you.

Very truly yours,

DENNIS J. HERRERA
City Attorney

Bradley A. Russi
Deputy City Attorney
Buta, Odaya (CAT)

From: 84184-60623262@requests.muckrock.com on behalf of ‘84184-60623262@requests.muckrock.com’
<84184-60623262@requests.muckrock.com>

Sent: Tuesday, August 25, 2020 8:39 PM

To: Supervisor Records (CAT)

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Calendars and Emails - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF FAMSF)

Fine Arts Museums Of San Francisco
PRA Office
de Young Museum
50 Hagiwara Tea Garden Drive
San Francisco, CA 94118

August 25, 2020

This is a follow up to a previous request:

Supervisor of Records,

Thank you for your reply. Under SFAC 67.21(d), please determine that some or all of the following records or parts thereof are public, and order FAMSF to disclose them.

Issues (by Exhibit letter, with links at the bottom):
1. Row B-1: please order the "Email 1 - fully withheld" disclosed with minimal redaction.
2. Page A-1 through A-4, and A-6: These documents were sent by FAMSF to someone outside of City employment. It is not a draft - it is in fact the email that was sent. Please order everything except personal non-City phone numbers, email addresses, or physical addresses on these pages disclosed.
3. Attachments on pages A-2 and A-4: These are also not drafts, and were sent to someone outside of the City. Please order them disclosed (along with their names).
4. Pg C-13 - This meeting is on City property, and thus the topic and attendees must be recorded. If they are recorded on the redacted line, they must be disclosed (SFAC 67.29-5).
5. Pg C-25, 29 - If the first redaction is the physical location of the meeting (as opposed to a virtual conference pin code etc.), it must be disclosed (SFAC 67.29-5, and SOTF 19108 Anonymous v City Attorney).
6. Pg C-49, 53, 61, 77, 83 - If this meeting is on City property or with one of the specified persons listed in SFAC 67.29-5 or in their home or business, the details must be disclosed.
7. Pg C-63 - Unredact the issue discussed if it is in the title (SFAC 67.29-5).
8. Pg D-1 - Unredact the second redaction about what they discussed.
9. Each email listed as fully withheld in Exhibit E "Set 1" and "Set 2" should instead by minimally redacted.

The issues above are in reference to:
Exhibit C: https://cdn.muckrock.com/foia_files/2020/08/14/003_-_R_-_12.7.19_-_Nov_10_-_17_Calendar.pdf
Exhibit D: https://cdn.muckrock.com/foia_files/2020/08/14/001_-_R_-_12.7.19_-_5 RECEIVED Emails.pdf
Exhibit E: https://cdn.muckrock.com/foia_files/2020/08/14/12.7.19_-_Public_Records_Request_-_Redaction_Log.xlsx

22nd Annual SOR Report
APPENDIX - Page 856
Thanks,
Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 84184-60623262@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:
%3Fn%3Dsupervisor%2520records%2Fsfcityatty.org%3Femail%3Dsupervisor%2520records%2Fsfcityatty.org
Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 84184
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.

---

On Aug. 25, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Calendars and Emails – Immediate Disclosure Request (SF FAMSF)
To Whom It May Concern -

We understand that FAMSF has produced records responsive to this request. If you have complaints about their response that are within Supervisor of Records jurisdiction, please let us know. Thank you.

Bradley Russi
Deputy City Attorney
Office of City Attorney Dennis Herrera
City Hall, Room 234
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., San Francisco, CA 94102
www.sfcityattorney.org

---

On Aug. 14, 2020:
Subject: Re: California Public Records Act Request - December 7, 2019
To Whom it May Concern:

Thank you for contacting the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco. This email is in response to your public records request submitted on Saturday, December 7, 2019, for:

*1. the specific calendar required to be kept by SF Admin Code 67.29-5 (aka “Prop G calendar”) for your Department Head (whether an employee or elected
official, defined pursuant to SF Charter 2A.30 para 1), with each and every meeting/item for Nov 10 - Nov 17, 2019 (inclusive). Since these dates are more than 3 business days prior to this request, you must immediately provide them. You may use any format to provide this calendar as long as it provides at least the location, exact start and end times, general description of topics, and (as required by 67.29-5) identity of meeting participants for every meeting. If all 67.29-5 information is not visible in a summary view, you must print out the individual meeting entries*.

Attached you will find the responsive records pertaining to your request.

*2. every meeting/entry on every calendar for your Department Head for Nov 10-17, 2019 (inclusive). This specifically includes both the SFAC 67.29-5/Prop G calendar, and all other calendar records (aka "non-Prop G" calendars) prepared, owned, retained, or used by your Department Head or agency staff (see SOTF Order 19047). Calendars and meeting entries are requested in their original electronic format or in .ICS format, with all non-exempt headers and metadata, and you must preserve all attachments, exhibits, formatting, hyperlinks, images, colors, email addresses, invitees and their attendance status, recurrences, exact start/end times, locations, titles, and descriptions. Daily, weekly, or monthly summary views are non-responsive - each individual meeting entry is requested.*

There are no additional responsive records for this request. All records have been provided in our response to Item 1.

*3. every meeting/entry on every calendar for your Department Head for future dates Dec 16-23 (inclusive). This specifically includes both the SFAC 67.29-5/Prop G calendar, and all other calendar records (aka "non-Prop G" calendars) prepared, owned, retained, or used by your Department Head or agency staff (see SOTF Order 19047). Calendars and meeting entries are requested in their original electronic format or in .ICS format, with all non-exempt headers and metadata, and you must preserve all attachments, exhibits, formatting, hyperlinks, images, colors, email addresses, invitees and their attendance status, recurrences, exact start/end times, locations, titles, and descriptions. Daily, weekly, or monthly summary views are non-responsive - each individual meeting entry is requested.*

Attached you will find the responsive records pertaining to your request.

*4. the most recent 5 emails sent by your Department Head via their government email account. Emails are requested in their original electronic format, or in .EML or .MSG format, with all non-exempt headers and metadata, and you must preserve all attachments, exhibits, formatting, hyperlinks, images, colors, and From/To/Cc/Bcc email addresses.*

Attached you will find the responsive records pertaining to your request.

*5. the most recent 5 emails received by your Department Head via their government email account. Emails are requested in their original electronic format, or in .EML or .MSG format, with all non-exempt headers and
metadata, and you must preserve all attachments, exhibits, formatting, hyperlinks, images, colors, and From/To/Cc/Bcc email addresses.*

Attached you will find the responsive records pertaining to your request.

*6. the most recent 5 emails relating to the conduct of public business, subject to City of San Jose v Superior Court (Smith, 2017), sent by your Department Head via their personal email account. Emails are requested in their original electronic format, or in .EML or .MSG format, with all non-exempt headers and metadata, and you must preserve all attachments, exhibits, formatting, hyperlinks, images, colors, and From/To/Cc/Bcc email addresses.*

There are no responsive records for this request.

*7. the most recent 5 emails relating to the conduct of public business, subject to City of San Jose v Superior Court (Smith, 2017), received by your Department Head via their personal email account. Emails are requested in their original electronic format, or in .EML or .MSG format, with all non-exempt headers and metadata, and you must preserve all attachments, exhibits, formatting, hyperlinks, images, colors, and From/To/Cc/Bcc email addresses.*

There are no responsive records for this request.

Additionally, you will find the redaction log for this request, per Admin. Code § 67.26 and Admin. Code § 67.27. At this time, FAMSF has provided all its responsive documents for this request.

Thank you,

Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco

---

On Feb. 11, 2020:
Subject: RE: BCC Emails - Immediate Disclosure Request
To Whom it May Concern,

Thank you for contacting the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco. This email is in response to your public records request submitted on Saturday, February 8, 2020, for:

*"An exact copy with all email headers (incl. but not limited to the BCC identities), attachments, color, formatting, hyperlinks, images, and all other parts of the record of the most recent 5 emails which have any BCC recipients which were sent by your Dept Head on any government account."*

Attached you will find the responsive documents for your request. Additionally, you will find the redaction log for this request, per Admin. Code § 67.26 and Admin. Code § 67.27.
Thank you,

Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco

---

On Feb. 8, 2020:

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Calendars and Emails - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF FAMSF)
RE: BCC Emails - Immediate Disclosure Request

Department Head:

Below are new Immediate Disclosure Requests (SF Admin Code 67.25(a)) directed to your agency and the department head. Your response is required by Feb 11, 2020. Rolling records responses are requested (SFAC 67.25(d)) if you are unable to immediately produce records. Exact copies of every responsive record are requested (Gov Code 6253(b)) - do not: provide mere URLs, print and scan electronic records, convert native files to PDFs, or provide black and white versions of any color record. Provide only copies of records not requiring fees and in-person inspection of all other records (GC 6253). Emails are requested in the easily-generated EML or MSG formats (SFAC 67.21(l)).

I am now auditing how the City appears to unlawfully withhold the BCC recipients of emails when they print out emails in certain formats. The identity of BCC recipients is not exempt. BCC is not an information security record that reveals vulnerabilities or increases chance of an attack. The BCC names was typed in by a human being and are not metadata. You must provide BCC just like you provide To or CC recipients. There is no legal authority to keep secret the identities of persons communicating with government officials, unless they are specifically confidential informants and such. If you withhold the BCC names, I will file complaints, separate and apart from email metadata complaints (which I have now already won, see ruling in SOTF 19044).

Your non-exhaustive obligations: All withholding of any information must be justified in writing (SFAC 67.27). All withholdings by masking or deletion (aka redactions) must be keyed by footnote or other clear reference to the specific justification for that redaction, and only the minimal exempt portion of any record may be withheld (SFAC 67.26). You must respond to emailed requests (SFAC 67.21(b)). You must notify us of whether or not responsive records exist and/or were withheld for each below request (Gov Code 6253(c), 6255(b)). You must state the name and title of each person responsible for withholding any information (Gov Code 6253(d)). Do not impose any end-user restrictions upon me (Santa Clara Co. vs Superior Ct, 170 Cal.App 4th 1301); so if you use a third-party website to publish records, please make them completely public without any login or sign-in.

Your agency must do all of the above things in your response, and you cannot wait until we file complaints.

****** We have no duty to, and we will not again, remind the City of its obligations. Instead, we will file complaints for every Sunshine Ordinance or CPRA violation. We will continue to file complaints until the City's procedures are modified to fully comply with the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA, without caveat or exception. ******

1. An exact copy with all email headers (incl. but not limited to the BCC identities), attachments, color, formatting, hyperlinks, images, and all other parts of the record of the most recent 5 emails which have any BCC recipients which were sent by your Dept Head on any government account. Note that you will have to search directly from the person's computer or account in their Sent folder specifically (In many email systems, no other method will allow you to see the BCC recipients). In modern Outlook systems, the search query is as follows: (bcc:*)

Do not destroy or discard any responsive records - we will appeal all withholdings or Sunshine violations.

NOTE: Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. The email address sending this request is a publicly-viewable mailbox. All of your responses (including all
responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

---

On Jan. 13, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Calendars and Emails - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF FAMSF)
To Whom It May Concern:

We write to provide an update on the status of our consideration of your petitions. You have submitted twenty-six separate petitions to the Supervisor of Records and numerous other follow up communications concerning prior petitions. We have already responded to eighteen of your petitions.

Due to the volume of petitions and the complexity of the issues raised, we are continuing to invoke the rule of reason and will respond to your petitions within a reasonable time period with the goal of addressing each petition within 30 days of submission. We understand you disagree with this basis. As we recently explained in response to one of your complaints with the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, we strive to respond to petitions within the 10-day period specified in Section 67.21(d), but we don't view it as an absolute deadline. Particularly here, where you have submitted numerous petitions over a short time period, responding within 10 days is not feasible because doing so would unreasonably impinge on our ability to perform our other responsibilities. Thank you.

Bradley Russi
Deputy City Attorney
Office of City Attorney Dennis Herrera
City Hall, Room 234
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., San Francisco, CA 94102
www.sfcityattorney.org

---

On Dec. 7, 2019:
Subject: California Public Records Act Request: Calendars and Emails - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF FAMSF)
To the Department Head (Director Thomas P. Campbell),

Attached is an Immediate Disclosure Request (SF Admin Code 67.25(a)).
Your response is required by Dec. 10, 2019. Rolling records responses are requested (67.25(d)).

NOTE: Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. The email address sending this request is a publicly-viewable mailbox. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an
indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 84184-60623262@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:
3Fnext%3D%252Faccounts%252Fagency_login%252Ffine-arts-museums-of-san-francisco-18604%252Fcalendars-and-
emails-immediate-disclosure-request-sf-famsf-
84184%252F%253Demail%253Dsupervisor.records%252540sfcityatty.org&url_auth_token=AA BjfIlSW_fpJr3i9m3gl-
ek3s%3A1kAmGu%3AVfEdPuYCYpXY88m0Zr26ShiHGj0
Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 84184
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.
From: 82814-07144940@requests.muckrock.com
Sent: Tuesday, September 15, 2020 4:38 PM
To: Supervisor Records (CAT)
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request #20-881

September 15, 2020

This is a follow up to request number 20-881:

Supervisor of Records,

This is a 67.21(d) petition against Sean Elsbernd and the Office of the Mayor regarding the following records production:

We are challenging specifically those redactions which fall under this justification from Hank Heckel: "Further, information relating to negotiations concerning labor issues and hotel procurement has been redacted because it constitutes bargaining information, the disclosure of which would place the city at a competitive disadvantage, and because the balance of the public interest disfavors production regarding such sensitive contracting and procurement information. See SF Admin Code 67.23(a)(2), (e); Cal. Gov. Code 6254(a); 6255(a)." Note that Heckel believes which redactions fall under this category are self-evident, so while I cannot be certain which ones fall under that justification, perhaps you can be.

Please determine one or more parts of records currently withheld are public and order Sean Elsbernd and Office of Mayor to disclose those parts.

Sincerely,
--Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 82814-07144940@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:

Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 82814
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.
On Sept. 15, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request #20-881
Please clearly identify all 67.23(a)(2) (e), 6254(a), 6255(a) redactions in https://cdn.muckrock.com/foia_files/2020/09/15/March__-__April_SE_Calendars_Redacted.pdf - we are challenging them all.

Furthermore this is an immediate disclosure request for (please indicate "no records" if that is the case)
a) all Outlook meeting invites or calendar entries currently in the Trash, Deleted Items, or similar feature (whether in a server or local deleted area) for Sean Elsbernd, London Breed, Andrea Bruss.

Remember you have to preserve any documents that exist as of the time I make a request. You cannot destroy requested records that run out of a retention time period during the pendency of my request or any appeals thereof.

This is also a regular records request for:
b) the full 2020 calendar, (future and past): specifically, each calendar item individually printed from Outlook *not the timeline view you just gave*, for Sean Elsbernd, London Breed, and Andrea Bruss (including ALL calendars, Prop G or non Prop G, personal or . Your output should look like: https://cdn.muckrock.com/foia_files/2020/01/31/Memo_Style_45.pdf
c) all entries in (a) but in ICS format per SFAC 67.21(l). To be clear, even if you refuse to provide these ICS records, intentionally violating SOTF's order 19047, you must still preserve the original Outlook calendar entries because I will appeal.

---

On Sept. 15, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request #20-881
Anonymous,

Please see the attached calendars of Sean Elsbernd responsive to your request below.

Please note that personal contact information, dial-in numbers, conference call pass codes, web and video conference links and access codes and the like have been redacted pursuant to the official information privilege. Cal. Evid. Code Sec. 1040(b)(2). Attorney/Client privileged information has been redacted as indicated in the document. See Gov Code §§ 6254(k), 6276.04; Admin Code 67.23(k); Cal. Evid. Code § 950 et seq. Further, information relating to negotiations concerning labor issues and hotel procurement has been redacted because it constitutes bargaining information, the disclosure of which would place the city at a competitive disadvantage, and because the balance of the public interest disfavors production regarding such sensitive contracting and procurement information. See SF Admin Code 67.23(a)(2), (e); Cal. Gov. Code 6254(a); 6255(a). Those redactions are clearly indicated by the topic headings of certain entries.

Moreover, where entire entries have been redacted this is because the entries relate to personal and other non-city business related matters, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy. Gov Code § 6254(c), California Constitution, Art. I, Sec. 1.

As you can see, such calendar information is currently retained for at least 37 days, which is our current practice. If you have any questions, please let us know.

Regards,

Hank Heckel
Compliance Officer
Office of the Mayor
Hi there

Record request #20-881 has been closed and published. The closure reason supplied was:

We have finished conducting a diligent search and identified documents responsive to your request.

As we wrote to you previously, due to Sandra Zuniga’s suspension, we do not have access to her personal calendar. Further,

As we previously noted, Public Works staff devoted a significant amount of time trying to determine how to release records in the format you have requested. Our IT team said they are unaware of a way to edit an .ics file or convert an .ics file to a format that can be edited. These documents require extensive review for redaction of personal information and potential security issues, requiring additional staff time. We worked with you to determine if there was a format that would allow us to redact information and followed your instructions on some test files. You told us, however, that those documents did not contain the information you requested. For that reason, we have withheld records responsive to your request on the basis that the information contained may reveal vulnerabilities to, or otherwise increase the potential for an attack on, an information technology system of a public agency. (Cal. Govt. Code 6254.19). In addition, we have withheld records on the basis of personal privacy (Cal. Govt. Code Secs. 6254(c), 6254(k); California Constitution, Art. I, Sec. I).

Please note that pdf versions of these files have been produced in response to your request #20-880.

We now consider your request closed.

Regards,

David A. Steinberg
Custodian of Records
San Francisco Public Works

Questions about your request? Reply to this email or sign in to contact staff at City and County of San Francisco. Technical support: See our help page

---

On July 23, 2020:
Subject: Your City and County of San Francisco public records request #20-880 has been closed.
City and County of San Francisco

------------------------------
Hi there

Record request #20-880 has been closed and published. The closure reason supplied was:

As we wrote to you on Feb. 28 and March 9, we have been unable to search for additional potentially responsive documents because we were unable to access Sandra Zuniga or her personal device(s).

Because the department still does not have access to Ms. Zuniga's devices at this time, we now consider your request closed. If, however, the department comes into possession of the device(s) and has the ability to extract the information, we will reopen your request.

Regards,

David A. Steinberg
Custodian of Records
San Francisco Public Works

Questions about your request? Reply to this email or sign in to contact staff at City and County of San Francisco. Technical support: See our help page

---

On June 5, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request #20-881
Anonymous,

We have received your recent correspondence noting that you were lifting your voluntary waiver of certain request deadlines during the pandemic response. Note that we are continuing to process your pending requests. We will begin providing responsive records on a rolling basis, beginning tomorrow.

Regarding this specific request, please note that it is neither simple nor routine nor readily answerable and requires consultation with other departments. Accordingly, we will respond within the full 10 day period for a regular request, barring the need for a further extension. See Cal. Gov. Code 6253 and Admin. Code 67.25(b).

Hank Heckel
Compliance Officer
Office of the Mayor
City and County of San Francisco

---

On Nov. 2, 2019:
Subject: California Public Records Act Request: Permanent Calendar Archive - Immediate Disclosure Request
Mayor Breed, Andrea Bruss, Sean Elsbernd, and the Office of the Mayor,

** NOTE: Redact your records correctly. This is a public mailbox, and all of your responses (including disclosed records) may be automatically and instantly available to the general public on the MuckRock.com service used to issue this request (though I am not a MuckRock representative). **

This is a new immediate disclosure request under the Sunshine Ordinance and under the CPRA for:
1) IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE: an electronic copy of all of London Breed's, Andrea Bruss's and Sean Elsbernd's ("Named Custodians") government calendars (all of them, Prop G and non-Prop G, including but not limited to 'PropG, Mayor (MYR)', 'Calendar, Mayor (MYR)', 'Breed, London (MYR)', 'Elsbernd, Sean (MYR)', 'Bruss, Andrea (MYR)' and all successors to or renames of these accounts), scheduling entries, appointments, and meeting invitations from the Requested Dates: October 27, 2019 to November 9, 2019 (inclusive). For calendars, you may provide this by directly exporting to PDF any Outlook view that shows for each and every event at least Subject, Location, Start, End, Recurrence, Meeting Status, Organizer, Show Time As, Required/Optional Attendees, Categories, Importance, Description/Body/Message, and preserving full color, formatting and text-searching. For meeting invitations, you should convert the invitations directly and individually to PDF. This includes declined or not-yet-accepted invitations, and those both sent and received for events on those days. Printing and scanning will be appealed. Use of PDF images as opposed to selectable text will be appealed. For examples of proper production, see DPW's PDF provision here: https://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/requests/19-4150 - they provide PDFs of each item, and a screenshot of all of the attendee status. I am explicitly asking for those same parts of these records. All Attachments should also be provided and in their original electronic format.

2) IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE: Furthermore, I request that a City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017) search be performed of each Named Custodian to provide: calendar items, scheduling entries, and meeting invitations for the Requested Dates that are present on their personal calendars/email or on personal accounts/devices/property (solely to the extent the record or portion thereof relates to the public's business). Any electronic format easily generated by the Named Custodian is acceptable here. Notwithstanding Gov Code 6253.3(b)(1), you may redact the Named Custodian's personal email addresses "used by the employee to conduct public business, or necessary to identify a person in an otherwise disclosable communication."

3a) regular disclosure: Furthermore, I request .ICS copies of each record identified in #1.

3b) regular disclosure: Finally, the following information, regardless of format, for each record identified in #1:
   i) creation timestamp,
   ii) modification timestamp,
   iii) creator identity,
   iv) timezone,
   v) name, email address, and acceptance status of each attendee
   vi) categories
   vii) importance
   viii) organizer name and email address
   ix) subject
   x) location
   xi) description/body

   If you provide all of (i)-(xi) in 3a, you may disregard this 3b. For 3b you may use whichever format you wish as long as this public information, which is not an information security record, is not withheld.

   It is likely that you will refuse some portion, and I will appeal all withholdings, exemptions, delays, and refusals. Preserve originals of all records during my appeals.

   All records must be provided in rolling fashion. Every withholding (including redactions) must be justified with clear reference to a statute or case law.

   Provide only those records without fees.

   My purpose is to maintain a permanent record of the Mayor's business, including through her top surrogates, regardless of how you wish to destroy records internally. Such requests will be made continually and periodically to retain this permanent record, both forward- and backward-looking. If you would like to suggest a change in the form of future
periodic requests that would provide *all* of the same information I've requested, with less work, I may consider such suggestions - however that will not affect this request.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 82814-07144940@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:
%3Fnext%3D%2Faccounts%2Fagency_login%2Foffice-of-the-mayor-3891%2Fpermanent-calendar-archive-
immediate-disclosure-request-
82814%2Fpermanent-calendar-archive-request-82814%2Femail%253Dsupervisor.records%2540sfcityatty.org&url_auth_token=AAAxJOK2OUULoYu4xv2F8W
XKz5U%3A1kKWZ%3A2iNFq-xCLJNPrB9jxkyv vbC3pDU
Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 82814
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.
Buta, Odaya (CAT)

From: 88551-86881685@requests.muckrock.com
Sent: Friday, October 2, 2020 9:47 PM
To: Supervisor Records (CAT)
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Police Misconduct Records (SB 1421 / Becerra v Superior Court) - Immediate Disclosure Request - SF Sheriff

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

October 3, 2020

This is a follow up to a previous request:

Supervisor of Records Dennis Herrera,

This is a new 67.21(d) petition against SFSD. SFSD in response to a records request for certain SB 1421/Becerra v Superior Court records made on Feb 22, 2020 from this email address produced, among other records, the following 41 page document on July 20, 2020:

They stated:
"1. A2012-0073
- Deputy E. Gonzales #1103: currently employed with SFSO
- Incident occurred on 9/10/2012 in Oakland, CA
- Officer involved shooting (off-duty)"

As SFSD refuses to comply with SFAC 67.27 and has not justified their withholding of information in writing and refuses to comply with SFAC 67.26 and has not provided footnotes or other clear references to justifications for their redactions, we challenge all of the redactions and also all documents withheld in entirety in case A2012-0073. Please determine in writing that one or more parts of these records are public, and order them disclosed.

Presumably, as an attorney who is also sworn to uphold the law, you will comply with your duty under the Sunshine Ordinance to independently review all 41 pages of documents and pass judgment on each of withheld part to identify if *any part* of the record is public.

If you choose to shirk your full obligations, here are some examples (not exhaustive) of unlawful redactions:
- Page 2, Location of incident - GC 6254(f)(2)(A)
- Page 2, Officer in Charge
- Page 3, first sentence, location
- Page 4 and throughout - name of suspect. Because the suspect was arrested, their name is public. GC 6254(f)(1)
- Page 7, 0800 hrs - unclear what was redacted
- Page 8 - all redactions in final table column
- Page 16 - location of incident publicly disclosed by Oakland PD PIO
- Page 18 - full para redacted
- Page 25 - location
- Page 26, all locations, firearm serial #
- Page 31 - location of incident report 6254(f)(2)(A)
- Page 31-39 - incident report: unredact all except private info of persons, under 6254(f)(2)(A). Note that the deputy's
girlfriend, who is alleged as a victim, is not private, unless it qualifies as follows: "The name of a victim of any crime defined by Section 220, 261, 261.5, 262, 264, 264.1, 265, 266, 266a, 266b, 266c, 266e, 266f, 266j, 267, 269, 273a, 273d, 273.5, 285, 286, 288, 288a, 288.2, 288.3, 288.4, 288.5, 288.7, 289, 422.6, 422.7, 422.75, 646.9, or 647.6 of the Penal Code may be withheld at the victim's request, or at the request of the victim's parent or guardian if the victim is a minor."

Remember however that we are challenging *all* redactions in the linked document.

Sincerely,
Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 88551-86881685@requests.muckrock.com
Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 88551
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.

---

On July 20, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Police Misconduct Records (SB 1421 / Becerra v Superior Court) - Immediate Disclosure Request - SF Sheriff
The Sheriff's office is providing you with the following responsive record. Multiple emails are being sent to you due to the size limitations of attachments.
1. A2012-0073
   - Deputy E. Gonzales #1103: currently employed with SFSO
   - Incident occurred on 9/10/2012 in Oakland, CA
   - Officer involved shooting (off-duty)

Alison Lambert, Legal Assistant
Central Records and Warrants Unit
Office of the Sheriff
City and County of San Francisco
850 Bryant Street RM 460
415-553-1780
Alison.Lambert@sfgov.org<mailto:Alison.Lambert@sfgov.org>

---
On July 20, 2020:

Subject:
The Sheriff’s office is providing you with the following responsive records:

1. A2012-0073
   - Deputy E. Gonzales #1103: currently employed with SFSO
   - Incident occurred on 9/10/2012 in Oakland, CA
   - Officer involved shooting (off-duty)

2. A2015-0064
   - Deputy F. Lu #2113: currently employed with SFSO
   - Incident occurred on 10/23/2015 at County Jail #1
   - Use of force
   - Injury is fractured arm
   - Medical records have been excluded from disclosure pursuant to Penal Code section 832.7(b)(5)(C).
   - This case does have audio and video evidence. Due to the lack of resources, the Sheriff’s office has not been able to execute the redaction process of audio/video materials.

3. A2017-0011
   - Deputy J. Barnes #1723, Deputy S. Castillo #1785 and Deputy M. Hodgers #2200: all are currently employed with SFSO
   - Incident occurred on 12/16/2016 at County Jail #1
   - Use of force
   - Injury is fractured arm
   - Medical records have been excluded from disclosure pursuant to Penal Code section 832.7(b)(5)(C).
   - This case does have audio evidence. Due to the lack of resources, the Sheriff's office has not been able to execute the redaction process of audio/video materials.

4. A2018-027
   - Senior Deputy K. Lewis #1187: currently employed with SFSO
   - Incident occurred on 3/21/2018 at San Francisco General Hospital
   - Use of force
   - Injury is fractured arm

5. A2012-0012
   - Deputy Doug Jones #1696: no longer employed with SFSO
   - Incidents occurred from January 1, 2012 through February 4, 2012 and in March 2012
   - Sustained on allegations of sexual assault and untruthfulness
   - Complainants and witnesses have been redacted pursuant to Penal Code 832.7(b)(5)(B).
   - This case does have audio evidence. Due to the lack of resources, the Sheriff’s office has not been able to execute the redaction process of audio materials.

6. A04092
   - Deputy Rafael Cabrera #1218: currently employed with SFSO
   - Incident occurred on 6/23/2004 in San Francisco
   - Officer involved shooting
   - Medical records have been excluded from disclosure pursuant to Penal Code 832.7(b)(5)(C).
   - Complainants and witnesses have been redacted pursuant to Penal Code 832.7(b)(5)(B).
   - This case does have audio evidence. Due to the lack of resources, the Sheriff’s office has not been able to execute the redaction process of audio materials.

7. A06082
   - Deputy Scott Neu #1823: no longer employed with SFSO
   - Incident occurred on 5/26/2006 at County Jail #1 (6th floor facility at the Hall of Justice)
- Use of force
- Injury is a fractured rib
- Complainants and witnesses have been redacted pursuant to Penal Code section 832.7(b)(5)(B)
- Medical records have been excluded from disclosure pursuant to Penal Code section 832.7(b)(5)(C).
- This case does have audio evidence. Due to the lack of resources, the Sheriff’s office has not been able to execute the redaction process of audio materials.

8. A09098
- Lt. John Casey #339: no longer employed with SFSO
- Senior Deputy Matthew Wong #1360: currently employed by SFSO
- Sgt. Kevin Macksoon #1698: currently employed by SFSO
- Deputy Melvin Song #1269: no longer employed with SFSO
- Deputy Tonyette Smith Al-Ghani #1576: currently employed by SFSO
- Deputy Edward Gutierrez #1928: currently employed by SFSO
- Deputy Juan Guitron #1894: currently employed by SFSO
- Deputy Daniel White #2115: no longer employed with SFSO
- Deputy Kenneth Lomba #2074: currently employed by SFSO
- Incident occurred on 9/7/2009 at County Jail #3 (6th floor facility at the Hall of Justice)
- Use of force: resulting in death
- Floor plans of the facility have been excluded from disclosure due to safety and security
- Complainants and witnesses have been redacted pursuant to Penal Code section 832.7(b)(5)(B)
- Photographs have been excluded from disclosure pursuant to Penal Code section 832.7(b)(5)(C).
- Medical records have been excluded from disclosure pursuant to Penal Code section 832.7(b)(5)(C).
- This case does have audio evidence. Due to the lack of resources, the Sheriff’s office has not been able to execute the redaction process of audio materials.

9. A10071
- Deputy Samuel Lou #1812: currently employed by SFSO
- Incidents occurred on April 6, 2010, May 7, 2010 and July 7, 2010
- Sustained on allegation of untruthfulness
- Records have been excluded from disclosure pursuant to Penal Code section 851.8.

---

On July 17, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Police Misconduct Records (SB 1421 / Becerra v Superior Court) - Immediate Disclosure Request - SF Sheriff
You have cited no legal justification for your desire to restrict who can access these public records - neither a statute nor a court case. What "security reasons" would stop anyone in the public from lawfully accessing and viewing copies of these records? Is it not the case that every single person has an equal right to access these SB 1421-disclosable public records?

You cannot in fact impose any end-user conditions on access to these public records - Santa Clara Co. vs Superior Ct, 170 Cal.App 4th 1301.

If you refuse to provide a completely open, public link to the records, imposing no end-user conditions, by CoB Monday, we will file further complaints. You may want to consult your peers in SFPD, Police Commission, etc. and ask why they have not tried to restrict access to their SB 1421 records.

NOTE: THE EMAIL ADDRESS SENDING THIS REQUEST IS A PUBLICLY-VIEWABLE MAILBOX. Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative
On July 17, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Police Misconduct Records (SB 1421 / Becerra v Superior Court) - Immediate Disclosure Request - SF Sheriff
Dear Anonymous:
Thank you for your patience with this matter. In response to your email dated July 10, 2020, for security reasons, the Sheriff’s office unable to provide you with “a completely open/public share link.”

In order to provide the documents to you that were previously shared with you with our OneDrive link on March 9, 2020, the Sheriff’s office is willing to mail a flash drive to you via the United States Postal Service. However, the Sheriff’s office requires that any flash drive that will be mailed to you be password protected in the event that the flash drive becomes lost in the mail. The Sheriff’s office will then email the password to the flash drive to you in a separate email if you choose this option.

Please respond to this letter to let the Sheriff’s office know if you would like a password protected flash drive mailed to you care of MuckRock News, or to an address of your designation.

If you have any other requests, please contact us at sfso.foia@sfgov.org. We again thank you for your continued courtesy and cooperation with this matter.

Alison Lambert, Legal Assistant
Central Records and Warrants Unit
Office of the Sheriff
City and County of San Francisco
850 Bryant Street RM 460
415-553-1780
Alison.Lambert@sfgov.org<mailto:Alison.Lambert@sfgov.org>

---

On July 10, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Police Misconduct Records (SB 1421 / Becerra v Superior Court) - Immediate Disclosure Request - SF Sheriff
When you provide the files PLEASE use a fully public link where I don't have to sign-in.
I am not required to sign-in or agree to any end-user agreement to get any records (Santa Clara Co. vs Superior Ct, 170 Cal.App 4th 1301).

NOTE: THE EMAIL ADDRESS SENDING THIS REQUEST IS A PUBLICLY-VIEWABLE MAILBOX. Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable
for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

---

On Feb. 22, 2020:
Subject: California Public Records Act Request: Police Misconduct Records (SB 1421 / Becerra v Superior Court) - Immediate Disclosure Request - SF Sheriff
Sheriff's Department:

NOTE: THE EMAIL ADDRESS SENDING THIS REQUEST IS A PUBLICLY-VIEWABLE MAILBOX. Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Below are new Immediate Disclosure Requests (SF Admin Code 67.25(a)) directed to your agency.
Your initial response is required by Feb 25, 2020. Rolling records responses are requested (SFAC 67.25(d)) if you are unable to immediately produce records.
Exact copies of every responsive record are requested (Gov Code 6253(b)) - do not: provide mere URLs, print and scan electronic records, convert native files to PDFs, or provide black and white versions of any color record. Provide only copies of records not requiring fees and in-person inspection of all other records (GC 6253).

Your non-exhaustive obligations:
- All withholding of any information must be justified in writing by specific statutory authority (SFAC 67.27).
- All withholdings by masking or deletion (aka redactions) must be keyed by footnote or other clear reference to the specific justification for that redaction, and only the minimal exempt portion of any record may be withheld (SFAC 67.26).
- You must respond to emailed requests (SFAC 67.21(b)).
- You must notify us of whether or not responsive records exist and/or were withheld for each below request (Gov Code 6253(c), 6255(b)).
- You must state the name and title of each person responsible for withholding any information (Gov Code 6253(d)).
- Do not impose any end-user restrictions upon me (Santa Clara Co. vs Superior Ct, 170 Cal.App 4th 1301); so if you use a third-party website to publish records, please make them completely public without any login or sign-in or Terms of Service.

Your agency must do all of the above things in your response, and you cannot wait until we file complaints.

****** We have no duty to, and we will not again, remind the City of its obligations. Instead, we will file complaints for every Sunshine Ordinance or CPRA violation. We will continue to file complaints until the City’s procedures are modified to fully comply with the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA, without caveat or exception. ******

In simple terms, I want all SB 1421 records you have retained, and I want a quantity/existence/form statement, even if you believe their contents are exempt. Just like the AG in Becerra v Superior Court, if you retained any SB 1421 records you must release your own copies, regardless of what any other agency does. Here's the full request:

1. Pursuant to Becerra v Superior Court (First Amendment Coalition, 2020), provide all records (where "record(s)" is defined specifically by Penal Code 832.7(b)(2), and REGARDLESS of whether they are prepared by or for your agency or
its employees) of all incidents involving the discharge of a firearm at a person by a peace officer or custodial officer; all incidents in which the use of force by a peace officer or custodial officer against a person resulted in death, or in great bodily injury; all records relating to an incident in which a sustained finding was made by any law enforcement agency or oversight agency that a peace officer or custodial officer engaged in sexual assault involving a member of the public; all records relating to an incident in which a sustained finding was made by any law enforcement agency or oversight agency of dishonesty by a peace officer or custodial officer directly related to the reporting, investigation, or prosecution of a crime, or directly relating to the reporting of, or investigation of misconduct by, another peace officer or custodial officer, including, but not limited to, any sustained finding of perjury, false statements, filing false reports, destruction, falsifying, or concealing of evidence. Note: The potential exception that the State AG may have under Gov Code 6255 / public-interest balancing test, which the Court of Appeal found may apply if Becerra had asked for it, DOES NOT APPLY TO YOUR OFFICE, pursuant to SFAC 67.24(g and i).

2. Please also provide an SFAC 67.21(c) written statement of the existence or quantity of these records in #1 (even if you believe their contents to be exempt) within 7 days (no extensions)

Do not destroy or discard any responsive records - we will appeal all withholdings or Sunshine violations.

FYI - If you haven't read Becerra v Superior Court, the Court of Appeals held: "We conclude, as a matter of statutory interpretation, that section 832.7 generally requires disclosure of all responsive records in the possession of the Department, regardless whether the records pertain to officers employed by the Department or by another public agency and regardless whether the Department or another public agency created the records. Although we also determine, as a matter of statutory interpretation, that the so-called “catchall exemption” of the CPRA, codified at Government Code section 6255, may apply to records that are subject to disclosure under section 832.7, our independent review leads us to conclude the Department did not adequately demonstrate that the public interest served by nondisclosure of the records at issue clearly outweighs the public interest in their disclosure."

However, no San Francisco agency or official can use the catchall exemption/6255 due to SF Admin Code 67.24(g and i).

Thank you for your anticipated cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,
Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 88551-86881685@requests.muckrock.com
Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 88551
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the
requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.
Buta, Odaya (CAT)

From: 76435-93915115@requests.muckrock.com
Sent: Sunday, October 11, 2020 10:20 PM
To: Supervisor Records (CAT)
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request #P008260-071519

San Francisco Police Department
PRA Office
1245 3rd Street
SF, CA 94158

October 12, 2020

This is a follow up to request number P008260-071519:

Supervisor of Records Dennis Herrera,

Attached is a new 67.21(d) petition against SFPD.

Sincerely,
Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 76435-93915115@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:
3Fnext%3D252Faccounts%252Fagency_login%252Fsan-francisco-police-department-367%252FeMail-and-electronic-communications-audit-sfpd
76435%252Fs1245%252F252Faccounts%252Fsfcityatty.org&url_auth_token=AAAIho6-kUH0n
qo3T6PAL_wX5Q%3A1kRqFt%3Afph0kgKn3kGbl16bAESI0XZ3DvLU
Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 76435
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.

---
On Oct. 12, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request #P008260-071519
Re: P008260-071519

Please also provide, as an immediate disclosure request, a copy of the communications you sent to these persons asking them to perform a corrected City of San Jose search and all of their replies.

--Anonymous
---

On Oct. 8, 2020:
Subject: P008260-071519
Greetings:

The following members replied that they have no responsive documents from personal phone devices (SMS, etc.) or personal email or messenger accounts.
Chief of Police
Chief of Staff
Asst. Chief Operations
DC Operations
DC Airport
DC Special Ops
DC Investigations
Commander GG
Cdr. Metro
Cdr. Risk Management
Cdr. MTA
Cdr. Investigations
Cdr. Air
Dir. Strategic Planning/PSPP
Dir Crime Strategies
Dir. Forensics
Dir Pub Policy - left department
Dir. Communications - left department
Dir. IT - left department

DC Admin - (Yee) provided responsive documents that he sent from his personal email to his SFgov email. I am working on those now.
Commander Admin - (O'Sullivan) provided responsive documents that he sent from his personal email to his SFgov email. I am working on those now.

Michael Andraychak #457

Sergeant of Police

Public Information Officer

Officer in Charge - Media Relations Unit

San Francisco Police Department
On Oct. 2, 2020:
Subject: SOTF - Sunshine Ordinance Task Force 10/07/20 Meeting - Agenda and Packet Online

Good Afternoon:

The agenda and packet for the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force 10/07/20 - 4:00 p.m. meeting is online at the following link:

https://sfgov.org/sunshine/sites/default/files/sotf_100720_agenda.pdf

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

Cheryl Leger

Assistant Clerk, Board of Supervisors

Cheryl.Leger@sfgov.org

Tel: 415-554-7724

Fax: 415-554-5163

www.sfbos.org

<http://www.sfbos.org/index.aspx?page=104> Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.


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
On Oct. 2, 2020:
Subject: SOTF - Sunshine Ordinance Task Force 10/07/20 Meeting - Agenda and Packet Online

Good Afternoon:

The agenda and packet for the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force 10/07/20 - 4:00 p.m. meeting is online at the following link:

https://sfgov.org/sunshine/sites/default/files/sotf_100720_agenda.pdf

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

Cheryl Leger
Assistant Clerk, Board of Supervisors

Cheryl.Leger@sfgov.org
Tel: 415-554-7724
Fax: 415-554-5163
www.sfbos.org

<http://www.sfbos.org/index.aspx?page=104> Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.


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.

On Sept. 25, 2020:
Subject: SOTF - Notice of Appearance, October 7 2020 - Sunshine Ordinance Task Force; 4:00 PM; remote meeting

Good Morning:
You are receiving this notice because you are named as a Complainant or Respondent in one of the following complaints scheduled before the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force to: 1) hear the merits of the complaint; 2) issue a determination; and/or 3) consider referrals from a Task Force Committee.

Date: October 7, 2020

Location: Remote meeting

Time: 4:00 p.m.

Complainants: Your attendance is required for this meeting/hearing.

Respondents/Departments: Pursuant to Section 67.21 (e) of the Ordinance, the custodian of records or a representative of your department, who can speak to the matter, is required at the meeting/hearing.

Complaints:

File No. 19080: Complaint filed by Paul A. Vander Waerdt against the Dept. of Homelessness and Supportive Housing for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Section 67.25, for failing to respond to an Immediate Disclosure Request in a timely manner.

File No. 19109: Complaint filed by Stephen Malloy against Dept. of Public Health for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.24, 67.25, 67.26 and 67.27 by failing to respond to a public records request in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19112: Complaint filed by Anonymous against Chief William Scott and Lt. R. Andrew Cox and the Police Department for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.25, 67.26, 67.27, by failing to respond to an Immediate Disclosure Request in a timely and/or complete manner, failing to respond to a public records request in a timely and/or complete manner; failing to justify withholding of records and failing to maintain a Proposition G calendar.

File No. 19098: Complaint filed by Anonymous against Police Department for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.21, 67.26 and 67.27, by failing to respond to a public records request in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19145: Complaint filed by Chris Kohrs against the Police Commission for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.5 and 67.21, by failing to respond to a public records request in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19140: Complaint filed by Stephen Malloy against the Department of Human Resources 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.

Documentation (evidence supporting/disputing complaint)

For a document to be considered, it must be received at least five (5) working days before the hearing (see attached Public Complaint Procedure).

For inclusion in the agenda packet, supplemental/supporting documents must be received by 5:00 pm, September 30, 2020.

Cheryl Leger
Assistant Clerk, Board of Supervisors

Tel: 415-554-7724


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.

---

On July 2, 2019:
Subject: California Public Records Act Request: Email and Electronic Communications Audit (SFPD)
RE: Email and Electronic Communications Audit

To Whom It May Concern:

** NOTE: this is a public mailbox, and all of your responses (including disclosed records) may be automatically and instantly available to the general public on the MuckRock.com service used to issue this request (though I am not a MuckRock representative). **

We request under the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance (Ordinance) and the California Public Records Act (CPRA) the following items from the SFPD.

Similar requests were recently made of the Board of Supervisors, Clerk, and Mayor's Office. If a person has multiple email addresses (including but not limited to email aliases), 10 emails from each are requested. For example the Mayor may have a public-facing email alias and also an email address she uses to do business internally- 10 from each are requested. Please do not include spam or product advertisement emails.

We remind you of your obligations to provide electronic records in the original format you hold them in. Therefore, e-mails exported in the .eml or .msg format with all non-exempt headers, metadata, attachments, etc. are best. However, if you choose to convert emails, for example, to PDF or printed format, to easily redact them, you must ensure that you have preserved the full content of the original email record (as specified in request "A"), which contains many detailed headers beyond the generally used From/To/Subject/Sent/etc. For the chat apps, a screenshot or print-out is acceptable.

If you use PDF, use properly redacted searchable or text pdfs. Please don't use image PDFs to make it harder to analyze the records.

If you provide PDFs instead of original email files, only give a few of the headers or lacking attachments/images, and/or improperly withhold public records that exist on private accounts/devices you may be in violation of SF Admin Code and/or CPRA, and we may challenge your decision at the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, Supervisor of Records,
judicially, and/or via any other remedies available to us. I currently have pending petitions to the Task Force and Supervisor of Records to correct prior disclosure failures of electronic information from various SF agencies.

You must justify all withholding.

Provide records in a rolling fashion. Do not wait for all records to be available.

Please provide only those copies of records available without any fees. If you determine certain records would require fees, please instead provide the required free notice of which of those records are available and non-exempt for inspection in-person if we so choose. Please use email to respond.

I look forward to your prompt disclosure.

PART 1 - Email

A. an electronic copy, in the original electronic format, with all headers, metadata, timestamps, attachments, appendices, exhibits, and inline images, except those explicitly exempted by the Ordinance, of the most recent 10 emails RECEIVED BY EACH OFFICIAL government email account of
1. Chief of Police
2. Asst. Chief/Chief of Staff
3. Asst. Chief/Operations
4. Deputy Chief/Administration
5. Executive Director/Strategic Management
6. Deputy Chief/Field Operations
7. Deputy Chief/Investigations
8. Deputy Chief/Special Operations
9. Deputy Chief/Airport
10. every Commander
11. every Civilian Director

B. an electronic copy, in the original electronic format, with all headers, metadata, timestamps, attachments, appendices, exhibits, and inline images, except those explicitly exempted by the Ordinance, of the most recent 10 emails SENT FROM EACH OFFICIAL government email account of
1. Chief of Police
2. Asst. Chief/Chief of Staff
3. Asst. Chief/Operations
4. Deputy Chief/Administration
5. Executive Director/Strategic Management
6. Deputy Chief/Field Operations
7. Deputy Chief/Investigations
8. Deputy Chief/Special Operations
9. Deputy Chief/Airport
10. every Commander
11. every Civilian Director

C. an electronic copy, in the original electronic format, with all headers, metadata, timestamps, attachments, appendices, exhibits, and inline images, except those explicitly exempted by the Ordinance, of the most recent 10 emails IN THE DRAFT or OUTBOX folder of EACH OFFICIAL government email account of the following. Please remember the special Sunshine exceptions to CPRA draft withholding under SF Admin Code 67.24(a).
1. Chief of Police
2. Asst. Chief/Chief of Staff
3. Asst. Chief/Operations
4. Deputy Chief/Administration
5. Executive Director/Strategic Management
6. Deputy Chief/Field Operations
7. Deputy Chief/Investigations
8. Deputy Chief/Special Operations
9. Deputy Chief/Airport
10. every Commander
11. every Civilian Director

D. an electronic copy, in the original electronic format, with all headers, metadata, timestamps, attachments, appendices, exhibits, and inline images, except those explicitly exempted by the Ordinance, of the most recent 10 emails regarding the public's business (specifically those disclosable under relevant statute and case law, including but not limited to City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017)) SENT FROM EACH PERSONAL email account(s) of the following officials, TO/CC/BCC any sfgov.org email address. If NO such emails exist for each entry, remember you must state under Govt Code 6253(c) that there are no responsive records.
1. Chief of Police
2. Asst. Chief/Chief of Staff
3. Asst. Chief/Operations
4. Deputy Chief/Administration
5. Executive Director/Strategic Management
6. Deputy Chief/Field Operations
7. Deputy Chief/Investigations
8. Deputy Chief/Special Operations
9. Deputy Chief/Airport
10. every Commander
11. every Civilian Director

E. an electronic copy, in the original electronic format, with all headers, metadata, timestamps, attachments, appendices, exhibits, and inline images, except those explicitly exempted by the Ordinance, of the most recent 10 emails regarding the public's business (specifically those disclosable under relevant statute and case law, including but not limited to City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017)) RECEIVED BY EACH PERSONAL email account(s) of the following officials, FROM any sfgov.org email address. If NO such emails exist for each entry, remember you must state under Govt Code 6253(c) that there are no responsive records.
1. Chief of Police
2. Asst. Chief/Chief of Staff
3. Asst. Chief/Operations
4. Deputy Chief/Administration
5. Executive Director/Strategic Management
6. Deputy Chief/Field Operations
7. Deputy Chief/Investigations
8. Deputy Chief/Special Operations
9. Deputy Chief/Airport
10. every Commander
11. every Civilian Director

PART 2 - Chat/Messaging

As used below "Conversations" include but are not limited to any metadata records showing that a conversation had taken place but is now deleted (due to expiration for example). Various types of apps are mentioned below.
A. an electronic copy, in the original electronic format, with all headers, metadata, timestamps, attachments, appendices, exhibits, and inline images, except those explicitly exempted by the Ordinance, of the most recent 10 conversations (whether individual or group chats) of all OFFICIAL government account(s) of the following person in [Facebook Messenger ]:
1. Chief of Police
2. Asst. Chief/Chief of Staff
3. Asst. Chief/Operations
4. Deputy Chief/Administration
5. Executive Director/Strategic Management
6. Deputy Chief/Field Operations
7. Deputy Chief/Investigations
8. Deputy Chief/Special Operations
9. Deputy Chief/Airport
10. every Commander
11. every Civilian Director

B. an electronic copy, in the original electronic format, with all headers, metadata, timestamps, attachments, appendices, exhibits, and inline images, except those explicitly exempted by the Ordinance, of the most recent 10 conversations (whether individual or group chats) of all OFFICIAL government account(s) of the following person in [Telegram ]:
1. Chief of Police
2. Asst. Chief/Chief of Staff
3. Asst. Chief/Operations
4. Deputy Chief/Administration
5. Executive Director/Strategic Management
6. Deputy Chief/Field Operations
7. Deputy Chief/Investigations
8. Deputy Chief/Special Operations
9. Deputy Chief/Airport
10. every Commander
11. every Civilian Director

C. an electronic copy, in the original electronic format, with all headers, metadata, timestamps, attachments, appendices, exhibits, and inline images, except those explicitly exempted by the Ordinance, of the most recent 10 conversations (whether individual or group chats) of all OFFICIAL government account(s) of the following person in [Slack ]:
1. Chief of Police
2. Asst. Chief/Chief of Staff
3. Asst. Chief/Operations
4. Deputy Chief/Administration
5. Executive Director/Strategic Management
6. Deputy Chief/Field Operations
7. Deputy Chief/Investigations
8. Deputy Chief/Special Operations
9. Deputy Chief/Airport
10. every Commander
11. every Civilian Director

D. an electronic copy, in the original electronic format, with all headers, metadata, timestamps, attachments, appendices, exhibits, and inline images, except those explicitly exempted by the Ordinance, of the most recent 10 conversations (whether individual or group chats) of all OFFICIAL government account(s) of the following person in [Google Hangouts ]:
1. Chief of Police  
2. Asst. Chief/Chief of Staff  
3. Asst. Chief/Operations  
4. Deputy Chief/Administration  
5. Executive Director/Strategic Management  
6. Deputy Chief/Field Operations  
7. Deputy Chief/Investigations  
8. Deputy Chief/Special Operations  
9. Deputy Chief/Airport  
10. every Commander  
11. every Civilian Director

E. an electronic copy, in the original electronic format, with all headers, metadata, timestamps, attachments, appendices, exhibits, and inline images, except those explicitly exempted by the Ordinance, of the most recent 10 conversations (whether individual or group chats) of all OFFICIAL government account(s) of the following person in [Signal]:  
1. Chief of Police  
2. Asst. Chief/Chief of Staff  
3. Asst. Chief/Operations  
4. Deputy Chief/Administration  
5. Executive Director/Strategic Management  
6. Deputy Chief/Field Operations  
7. Deputy Chief/Investigations  
8. Deputy Chief/Special Operations  
9. Deputy Chief/Airport  
10. every Commander  
11. every Civilian Director

F. an electronic copy, in the original electronic format, with all headers, metadata, timestamps, attachments, appendices, exhibits, and inline images, except those explicitly exempted by the Ordinance, of the most recent 10 conversations (whether individual or group chats) of all OFFICIAL government account(s) of the following person in [SMS/MMS/text messages]:  
1. Chief of Police  
2. Asst. Chief/Chief of Staff  
3. Asst. Chief/Operations  
4. Deputy Chief/Administration  
5. Executive Director/Strategic Management  
6. Deputy Chief/Field Operations  
7. Deputy Chief/Investigations  
8. Deputy Chief/Special Operations  
9. Deputy Chief/Airport  
10. every Commander  
11. every Civilian Director

G.an electronic copy, in the original electronic format, with all headers, metadata, timestamps, attachments, appendices, exhibits, and inline images, except those explicitly exempted by the Ordinance, of the most recent 10 conversations (whether individual or group chats) of all PERSONAL account(s) of the following person in [Facebook Messenger], solely to the extent that such conversations are regarding the public's business and disclosable under relevant statute and case law, including but not limited to City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017). If NO such conversations exist for each entry, remember you must state under Govt Code 6253(c) that there are no responsive records.  
1. Chief of Police
2. Asst. Chief/Chief of Staff
3. Asst. Chief/Operations
4. Deputy Chief/Administration
5. Executive Director/Strategic Management
6. Deputy Chief/Field Operations
7. Deputy Chief/Investigations
8. Deputy Chief/Special Operations
9. Deputy Chief/Airport
10. every Commander
11. every Civilian Director

H. an electronic copy, in the original electronic format, with all headers, metadata, timestamps, attachments, appendices, exhibits, and inline images, except those explicitly exempted by the Ordinance, of the most recent 10 conversations (whether individual or group chats) of all PERSONAL account(s) of the following person in [Telegram], solely to the extent that such conversations are regarding the public's business and disclosable under relevant statute and case law, including but not limited to City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017). If NO such conversations exist for each entry, remember you must state under Govt Code 6253(c) that there are no responsive records.

1. Chief of Police
2. Asst. Chief/Chief of Staff
3. Asst. Chief/Operations
4. Deputy Chief/Administration
5. Executive Director/Strategic Management
6. Deputy Chief/Field Operations
7. Deputy Chief/Investigations
8. Deputy Chief/Special Operations
9. Deputy Chief/Airport
10. every Commander
11. every Civilian Director

I. an electronic copy, in the original electronic format, with all headers, metadata, timestamps, attachments, appendices, exhibits, and inline images, except those explicitly exempted by the Ordinance, of the most recent 10 conversations (whether individual or group chats) of all PERSONAL account(s) of the following person in [Slack], solely to the extent that such conversations are regarding the public's business and disclosable under relevant statute and case law, including but not limited to City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017). If NO such conversations exist for each entry, remember you must state under Govt Code 6253(c) that there are no responsive records.

1. Chief of Police
2. Asst. Chief/Chief of Staff
3. Asst. Chief/Operations
4. Deputy Chief/Administration
5. Executive Director/Strategic Management
6. Deputy Chief/Field Operations
7. Deputy Chief/Investigations
8. Deputy Chief/Special Operations
9. Deputy Chief/Airport
10. every Commander
11. every Civilian Director

J. an electronic copy, in the original electronic format, with all headers, metadata, timestamps, attachments, appendices, exhibits, and inline images, except those explicitly exempted by the Ordinance, of the most recent 10 conversations (whether individual or group chats) of all PERSONAL account(s) of the following person in [Google Hangouts], solely to the extent that such conversations are regarding the public's business and disclosable under relevant statute and case law, including but not limited to City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017). If NO such conversations exist for each entry,
remember you must state under Govt Code 6253(c) that there are no responsive records.

1. Chief of Police
2. Asst. Chief/Chief of Staff
3. Asst. Chief/Operations
4. Deputy Chief/Administration
5. Executive Director/Strategic Management
6. Deputy Chief/Field Operations
7. Deputy Chief/Investigations
8. Deputy Chief/Special Operations
9. Deputy Chief/Airport
10. every Commander
11. every Civilian Director

K.an electronic copy, in the original electronic format, with all headers, metadata, timestamps, attachments, appendices, exhibits, and inline images, except those explicitly exempted by the Ordinance, of the most recent 10 conversations (whether individual or group chats) of all PERSONAL account(s) of the following person in [ Signal ], solely to the extent that such conversations are regarding the public's business and disclosable under relevant statute and case law, including but not limited to City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017). If NO such conversations exist for each entry, remember you must state under Govt Code 6253(c) that there are no responsive records.

1. Chief of Police
2. Asst. Chief/Chief of Staff
3. Asst. Chief/Operations
4. Deputy Chief/Administration
5. Executive Director/Strategic Management
6. Deputy Chief/Field Operations
7. Deputy Chief/Investigations
8. Deputy Chief/Special Operations
9. Deputy Chief/Airport
10. every Commander
11. every Civilian Director

L.an electronic copy, in the original electronic format, with all headers, metadata, timestamps, attachments, appendices, exhibits, and inline images, except those explicitly exempted by the Ordinance, of the most recent 10 conversations (whether individual or group chats) of all PERSONAL account(s) of the following person in [ text/SMS/MMS messaging ], solely to the extent that such conversations are regarding the public's business and disclosable under relevant statute and case law, including but not limited to City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017). If NO such conversations exist for each entry, remember you must state under Govt Code 6253(c) that there are no responsive records.

1. Chief of Police
2. Asst. Chief/Chief of Staff
3. Asst. Chief/Operations
4. Deputy Chief/Administration
5. Executive Director/Strategic Management
6. Deputy Chief/Field Operations
7. Deputy Chief/Investigations
8. Deputy Chief/Special Operations
9. Deputy Chief/Airport
10. every Commander
11. every Civilian Director

PART 3: all instruments used to inquire of each official as to whether they possess any responsive records above, and all of their responses
Sincerely,
Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 76435-93915115@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:
%3Fnext%3D%252Faccounts%252Fagency_login%252Fsan-francisco-police-department-367%252Femail-and-electronic-
communications-audit-sfpd-
76435%252F%253Femail%253Dsupervisor.records%252540sfcityatty.org&url_auth_token=AAAlho6-kUH0n-qo3T6PAL_wX5Q%3A1kRqFt%3Afh0kgKn3kGbl16bAES1OXZ3DvLU
Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 76435
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.
Dennis Herrera  
Attn. General Government Team  
City Attorney/Supervisor of Records  
City Hall, Room 234  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Via email to supervisor.records@sfcityatt.org

RE: SFPD Request P008260-071519

Supervisor of Records Dennis Herrera,

This is an SFAC 67.21(d) petition against the SFPD. Please determine, in writing, within 10 days, whether each of the contested records or parts of records enumerated below are public, and order their disclosure.

On Oct. 7, 2020, in SOTF 19098 Anonymous v. SFPD, the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force unanimously (with the support of the new commissioners) ruled against SFPD in this request on four violations:

- SFAC 67.21(b) for failing to provide copies of electronic records by printing and scanning them instead,
- 67.21(k) (which requires complying with the CPRA), by failing to search for all personally-held public records within the scope of City of San Jose v. Superior Court (2017),
- 67.26 by withholding partially text message records namely the To and From of each message and also by withholding all email metadata namely email headers, and
- 67.26 (again) by failing to key each redaction with a footnote or other clear reference to a justification.

I present three issues for you to determine:

ISSUE 1. On Oct. 8, 2020, SFPD admitted that there were in fact “responsive documents that he sent from his personal email to his SFgov email” for two of the custodians (then-DC Admin., and Commander Admin.). You previously stated on Nov. 12, 2019 that this City of San Jose issue was beyond your jurisdiction. However, SFAC 67.21(d), which describes your jurisdiction, applies not only when records or parts thereof are withheld, but instead states “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.” In failing to search for and provide all personally-held public records pursuant to City of San Jose, SFPD failed to comply or incompletely complied with my request. You must determine that these personally-held records about the conduct of public business are public and order them disclosed. As of this petition filing they have not been disclosed. Determining whether or not a record about the conduct of public business but stored on personal property is a public record falls squarely within 67.21(d).

ISSUE 2. In the same Oct. 8 email, SFPD stated that three of the custodians for this July 2019 request are no longer with SFPD. It appears the SFPD is refusing to provide San Jose records for those custodians and/or did not retain them when I made the request last year. However, per your Good Government Guide, even if there is no general retention requirement for such records, once I requested them they must be retained by SFPD: “Even if a document does not meet the definition of “record” for retention purposes, if the department receives a public records request for the document, it may not destroy it or otherwise dispose of it.” (Good Govt Guide, p. 124). You must determine that the records for the then-Directors of Public Policy,
Communication, and IT are public and order them disclosed. The SFPD may have made it impossible for it
to now lawfully comply with my request due its unlawful handling of my request last year (i.e. by not
retaining the responsive records when I requested them), but that does not absolve you of the responsibility to
issue a written determination of whether the records are public.

ISSUE 3.

Determine that the To and From for text messages is public, and order that information disclosed. Here is an
description of the text message records that they provided in a “Tab Separated Value” database format. Note
the columns of various metadata and also content. The “To” and “From” columns - indicating which
government official is speaking to which other official - are not exempt under any law, and SFPD has in fact
provided the To and From in response to other text message requests.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ThreadId</th>
<th>MessageId</th>
<th>Date (UTC)</th>
<th>Network Message Type</th>
<th>Attachment Count</th>
<th>Body</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2854114307</td>
<td></td>
<td>7/15/19 19:29</td>
<td>AT&amp;T Message 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Chief... FYI ONLY... I'm leaving at 2:30pm for a DMV appointment in Daly City. I'm applying for that REAL ID as my CDL expires on Aug 1, 2019.&lt;***&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2854114307</td>
<td></td>
<td>7/15/19 19:49</td>
<td>AT&amp;T Message 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Got it. Hopefully you won't be waiting too long.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2854114307</td>
<td></td>
<td>7/15/19 23:18</td>
<td>AT&amp;T Message 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;I'm finally done with applying for my REAL ID... sooo crazy here at the Daly City DMV!!! See you tomorrow Chief!!&lt;***&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2854114307</td>
<td></td>
<td>7/15/19 23:18</td>
<td>AT&amp;T Message 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;I'm finally done with applying for my REAL ID... sooo crazy here at the Daly City DMV!!! See you tomorrow Chief!!&lt;***&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2858998928</td>
<td></td>
<td>7/15/19 19:24</td>
<td>AT&amp;T Message 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;I saw your target and knew we were in trouble. Good shooting! But beware, I'm on your heels.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2858998928</td>
<td></td>
<td>7/15/19 19:29</td>
<td>AT&amp;T Message 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;LOL, thank you. With my eye sight these days the distance shooting is a challenge.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2858998928</td>
<td></td>
<td>7/15/19 19:31</td>
<td>AT&amp;T Message 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Obviously a challenge you overcome.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2858069950</td>
<td></td>
<td>7/15/19 15:47</td>
<td>AT&amp;T Message 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;FYI I went to the lake by mistake. Going to the Airport now. I may be late.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2858930440</td>
<td></td>
<td>7/15/19 22:54</td>
<td>AT&amp;T Message 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Si Other (Suspicious Package) - Oracle Park UPDATED - Notification Status: Update REDACTED 6254(F) GC OPEN INVESTIGATION AND/OR RECORD OF INTELLIGENCE&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3rd St/Berry St)</td>
<td>Current Time: 15:53:55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Chief tomorrow we will be assisting Concord PD in serving an arrest and search warrant on a REDACTED 6254(F) GC OPEN INVESTIGATION AND/OR RECORD OF INTELLIGENCE&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2876610504</td>
<td></td>
<td>7/16/19 01:22</td>
<td>AT&amp;T Message 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Chief tomorrow we will be assisting Concord PD in serving an arrest and search warrant on a REDACTED 6254(F) GC OPEN INVESTIGATION AND/OR RECORD OF INTELLIGENCE&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2876610504</td>
<td></td>
<td>7/16/19 01:23</td>
<td>AT&amp;T Message 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Copy&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2876610504</td>
<td></td>
<td>7/16/19 01:24</td>
<td>AT&amp;T Message 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Copy. Thanks&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that your prior “reasonable segregation” arguments have no bearing on this request. I issued a request
for a copy of a record, not for inspection of a record in person. Only inspections of records are held to a
“reasonable segregation” standard - which, as you cited, is in Gov Code 6253(a), not 6253(b, c) which apply
to requests for copies. This is common sense - when inspecting a record in person redaction is not possible,
but it is on a copy. Your own Good Government Guide teaches that these are separate rights which may be
invoked (pg. 92). In fact, given that the City has clearly easily redacted small portions of these databases
(note above the redaction “REDACTED 6254(F) GC OPEN INVESTIGATION” replacing some parts of the
messages), your “reasonable segregation” arguments would not hold water even if it was relevant (which it is
not), as the To/From columns were clearly “segregated” from the other ones already (by deleting them).

Sincerely,

Anonymous

NOTE: Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied,
including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special,
direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this
e-mail is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any
confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the government all be disclosable public records.
Buta, Odaya (CAT)

From: 105583-94464348@requests.muckrock.com
Sent: Wednesday, December 30, 2020 9:40 AM
To: Supervisor Records (CAT)
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (SFSD)

December 30, 2020

This is a follow up to a previous request:

Supervisor of Records Dennis Herrera,

The Sheriff and his office/department refuse to comply in any way to the below December 5, 2020 request - no response whatsoever. Please determine in writing that one or more records are parts thereof not disclosed are public and order them disclosed.

Sincerely,
Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 105583-94464348@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:
%3Fnext%3D%252Faccounts%252Fagency_login%252Fsan-francisco-sheriffs-department-5169%252Ftext-and-chat-
messages-immediate-disclosure-request-san-francisco-universal-search-sfsd-
105583%252F%253Femail%253Dsupervisor.records%252540sfcityatty.org&url_auth_token=AAAeXMQjppA7_DTBO9lRf
NVpXQ%3A1kufSS%3AFxuxC0udyYj1hDyQTvG0luLbLU

Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 105583
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.

---

On Dec. 5, 2020:
Subject: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (SFSD)
To San Francisco Sheriff's Department and its Department Head or Elected Official:
** DO NOT DESTROY ANY RESPONSIVE RECORDS. YOU MUST PRESERVE AND ORDER YOUR EMPLOYEES TO PRESERVE RECORDS DURING THE PENDENCY OF ALL APPEALS. WE WILL APPEAL ALL REDACTIONS OR WITHHOLDINGS. **

Immediate Disclosure Request.

Every department head/elected official must preserve and maintain all correspondence in a professional and businesslike manner (SFAC 67.29-7(a)) and also separately must comply with retention policies (SFAC 67.29-1). Note that if your retention policies do not retain text messages, I will argue before the SOTF and court that this is a failure to maintain **all correspondence** in a professional and businesslike manner.

Relevant precedent: SOTF 19098 - Anonymous v SFPD. Unanimous finding of violation for unlawfully withholding text message metadata (including the to/from/etc. - note SFPD had provided the dates and times, and you must as well), and also for unlawfully printing and scanning electronic records which does not constitute a "copy" of an electronic record. See also prior rulings in my favor in SOTF 19044, 19047, 19091, 19098, 19103, and 19108 which ruled against the City for email, text messages, past and future calendar entries, meeting details, electronic metadata, and attachments.

The Mayor's Office appears to have destroyed their copies of certain text messages. I'd be happy to get them from her, if she preserved every record. Alas she did not, therefore we must now conduct a universal search of the City. You cannot refer me to another department unless you search and determine that you have no copies in your department. If this is causing more work for you, ask your Mayor to stop destroying her public records.

Note there are many anonymous requesters using MuckRock - I am just one of them. If you previously produced some subset of these records to a MuckRock email address, please reference that prior response so you do not duplicate work. If I am unable to get the prior MuckRock response because it is someone else's and they have marked it private, you will however need to provide me a copy here as well.

1. This is an immediate disclosure request for text, chat, or instant messages between the Department Head/Elected Official and either Sean Elsbernd, Andrea Bruss, London Breed, Harlan Kelly, Jr., Naomi Kelly, Hank Heckel, or Walter Wong, including all group messages, and all messages in threads, in any form and any app (including, but not limited to, SMS, MMS, text, iMessage, Teams, Discord, WeChat, QQ, Signal, Telegram, WhatsApp, Facebook, Facebook Messenger, Twitter, Instagram, Hangouts, Meet, Slack, Skype, Viber, Snapchat, Line, Kik, FaceTime, Wickr Me, Chatroulette, Threema, KakaoTalk, Duo, GroupMe, Wire, Voxer, Allo, Tango, Bumble, Grindr, Tinder, Olive, Taimi, but NOT including email), on any government accounts/devices or on personal accounts or devices regarding the conduct of public business, including all participant names, message text, images, attachments, dates, and times, including any in trash or deleted folders or similar (see Good Government Guide - if the records have not been permanently deleted as of the time you receive this request, you must retrieve them from the so-called trash folders and provide them). Provide rolling responses. Provide exact copies including all metadata. There is no limitation by subject or date. If the total pages to produce numbers over 500, inform me of the rough dates, employees involved, and subject matter, and I may be willing to narrow the initial production, AS LONG AS YOU PRESERVE ALL THE RECORDS.

2. This is a regular records request for text, chat, or instant messages between any non-department head/elected official (i.e. the other dept employees) and either Sean Elsbernd, Andrea Bruss, London Breed, Harlan Kelly, Jr., Naomi Kelly, Hank Heckel, or Walter Wong, including all group messages, and all messages in threads, in any form and any app (including, but not limited to, SMS, MMS, text, iMessage, Teams, Discord, WeChat, QQ, Signal, Telegram, WhatsApp, Facebook, Facebook Messenger, Twitter, Instagram, Hangouts, Meet, Slack, Skype, Viber, Snapchat, Line, Kik, FaceTime, Wickr Me, Chatroulette, Threema, KakaoTalk, Duo, GroupMe, Wire, Voxer, Allo, Tango, Bumble, Grindr, Tinder, Olive, Taimi, but NOT including email), on any government accounts/devices or on personal accounts or devices regarding the conduct of public business, including all participant names, message text, images, attachments, dates, and times, including any in trash or deleted folders or similar (see Good Government Guide - if the records have not been permanently deleted as of the time you receive this request, you must retrieve them from the so-called trash folders and provide them). Provide rolling responses. Provide exact copies including all metadata. There is no limitation by subject or date. If the total pages to produce numbers over 500, inform me of the rough dates, employees involved, and subject matter, and I may be willing to narrow the initial production, AS LONG AS YOU PRESERVE ALL THE RECORDS.
Please provide only those copies of records available without any fees. If you determine certain records would require fees, please instead provide the required notice of which of those records are available and non-exempt for inspection in-person if we so choose.

Your non-exhaustive obligations:
- All withholding of any information must be justified in writing by specific statutory authority (SFAC 67.27).
- Every redaction must be keyed by footnote or by other clear reference to the specific justification for that redaction, and only the minimal exempt portion of any record may be withheld (SFAC 67.26).
- You must respond to emailed requests (SFAC 67.21(b)).
- You must notify us of whether or not responsive records exist and/or were withheld for each above request (Gov Code 6253(c), 6255(b)).
- You must state the name and title of each person responsible for withholding any information (Gov Code 6253(d)).
- Do not impose any end-user restrictions upon me (Santa Clara Co. vs Superior Ct, 170 Cal.App 4th 1301); so if you use a third-party website to publish records, please make them completely public without any login or sign-in.

Your agency must do all of the above things in your response, and you cannot wait until we file complaints.

****** We have no duty to, and we will not again, remind the City of its obligations. Instead, we will file complaints for every Sunshine Ordinance or CPRA violation. We will continue to file complaints until the City's procedures are modified to fully comply with the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA, without caveat or exception. ******

I look forward to your lawful response.

NOTE: THE EMAIL ADDRESS SENDING THIS REQUEST IS A PUBLICLY-VIEWABLE MAILBOX. Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 105583-94464348@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly: 

Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 105583
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516
PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.
Supervisor of Records Dennis Herrera,

This is a 67.21(d) petition against Sgt. Rodriguez and SFPD. I requested: "All messages in the thread "190149152 / Carmody / SVRCFL Lab # SV-19-0033" including all replies and forwards and the original email in the email account brodriguez@rcfl.gov ". SFPD responded: "There are responsive records in Sgt. Rodriguez’s rcfl.gov email account. The documents pertain to an open investigation and are exempt from release under 6254(f) GC / Open Investigation."

First I would argue that this investigation is no longer actually open. Second, even if currently open, SFPD waived any applicable exemptions for at least some of the records at issue in the instant request through prior voluntary disclosure, and thus must disclose them here pursuant to Gov Code 6254.5. In earlier records request P8985, SFPD disclosed an email from Lt. Torres to Chief Moser, attached. That email included a forward of a body and partial headers of the email at issue in this request from Sgt. Rodriguez. Therefore, the SFPD must release at least that single email sent by Rodriguez to Torres, even if it wishes to for example withhold attachments and other documents allegedly exempt under 6254(f) that were not previously disclosed.

(the remainder of the requests are not at issue in this petition).

NOTE: 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

------- Original Message -------
On Wednesday, January 13th, 2021 at 5:39 PM, Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:

Thank you for the written response.

As you know, I argued that you have previously waived any available
exemptions, including Gov Code 6254(f), for at least the original email from Rodriguez to Torres with the subject line "190149152 / Carmody / SVRCFL Lab # SV-19-0033", and I believe SOTF agreed with me, but I don't have the final motion noted down about exactly what they ordered you to disclose, so I will follow up with you as soon as SOTF posts the minutes online. I believe the motion was, 6yes - 1no, to find that Police Department, Sgt. Rodriguez, Sgt. Andraychak, and Chief Scott violated SF Admin Code 67.27 for failing to justify withholding in writing, [another violation I did not catch], and order you to disclose the email thread "190149152 / Carmody / SVRCFL Lab # SV-19-0033".

Please review Gov Code 6254.5 with your attorneys re: waiver of exemption due to prior disclosure. Your prior disclosure has been shared publicly for a very long time, including with the media, and cannot be retracted at this time.

NOTE: Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and will not hold in confidence any of your messages.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

------ Original Message ------
On Wednesday, January 13th, 2021 at 4:10 PM, Andraychak, Michael (POL) <michael.andraychak@sfgov.org> wrote:

Mr. Anonymous,

Thank you for your patience.

Please see responses below in red.

(1) All messages in the thread "190149152 / Carmody / SVRCFL Lab # SV-19-0033" including all replies and forwards and the original email in the email account brodriguez@rcfl.gov

There are responsive records in Sgt. Rodriguez’s rcfl.gov email account. The documents pertain to an open investigation and are exempt from release under 6254(f) GC / Open Investigation.

(2) All messages in the thread "190149152 / Carmody / SVRCFL Lab # SV-19-0033" including all replies and forwards and the
original email in the email account
brian.rodriguez@sfgov.org

There are no responsive records on Sgt. Rodriguez’s sfgov.org email.

(3) All messages in the thread "190149152 / Carmody / SVRCFL Lab # SV-19-0033" including all replies and forwards and the original email in the email account bdrodriguez@fbi.gov

There are no responsive records on Sgt. Rodriguez’s fbi.gov email.

Michael Andraychak #457
Sergeant of Police
Public Information Officer
Media Relations Unit
San Francisco Police Department
1245 - 3rd Street, 6th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94158
(415) 837-7395
Regular Days Off: Sat & Sun
http://www.sanfranciscopolice.org/

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake and delete this e-mail from your system. If you are not the intended recipient you are notified that disclosing, copying, distributing or taking any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited.

From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 12, 2021 2:26 PM
To: Andraychak, Michael (POL) <michael.andraychak@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Rodriguez, Brian (POL) <Brian.Rodriguez@sfgov.org>; SOTF, (BOS) <sotf@sfgov.org>
Cc: Leger, Cheryl (BOS) <cheryl.leger@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: SOTF 19128 - Please respond
Chief Moser,

Can you provide some direction regarding Sgt. Rodriguez’s email?

Also, there are other loose odds and ends that need to be addressed regarding Sgt. Obidi’s case. We will not do anything further without your direction.

Thank you,

Lieutenant Pilar E. Torres #597
San Francisco Police Department
Investigative Services Detail
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, Ca. 94158
Desk- 415.882.8425

---

From: Brian Rodriguez <brodriguez@rcfl.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, May 28, 2019 10:26 AM
To: Obidi, Joseph (POL)
Cc: Torres, Pilar (POL); Braconi, William (POL); Kwok, Sherman (SF) (FBI); Penni Price
Subject: 190149152 / Carmody / SVR CFL Lab # SV-19-0033

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

Hi Joe-

In light of all the stuff going on with this case, we have not gone any further with this first request with the two laptops. All that happened here is that I forensically imaged both laptops and Penni prepared to process them. We stopped once we heard the evidence was being picked up. As you know, all submitted evidence was returned to SFPD on 5/20/19. Nothing at all was done on the second request (SV-19-0033-2) with the tower PC and loose
HDDs - a written report is forthcoming detailing that.

I do have a question on this first request (with the two laptops)...since I forensically imaged both laptops, we have a couple of options:

1) Close our exam (which hasn't really started) and return the master copy tape (containing the forensic images of the laptops) along with a written report in case you/someone wants to examine these laptops for evidence at a later date.
2) Close our exam (which hasn't really started) and DESTROY the master copy tape (containing the forensic images of the laptops), which means the laptops can never be examined unless they are seized from the subject again.
3) Hold - since we have forensic images of the two laptops (only) and wait for further instruction to possibly examine them.

Please advise!

Thanks!

B-Rod

Sgt. Brian Rodriguez # 4075
San Francisco Police Department
Deputy Director / TFO - Silicon Valley Regional Computer Forensics Laboratory
Desk Phone (650) 289-3012 / brodriguez@rcfli.gov / brian.rodriguez@sfgov.org / bdrodriguez@fbi.gov

This communication contains neither recommendations nor conclusions of the FBI. It is the property of the FBI and is loaned to your agency; it and its contents or attachments are not to be distributed outside your agency.
Thank you Mr. Givner for the detailed SoR response. DA's office: you have not *yourself* ever completely responded to this request (attached). You cannot rely on the SoR for your records responses.

**Supervisor of Records** - in part C below, I further petition you under SFAC 67.21(d) to determine parts of records are public and order them disclosed.

**SOTF:**

Please file a new complaint *Anonymous* (104501-34643874@requests.muckrock.com) vs *Chesa Boudin and Office of District Attorney*, under SFAC 67.21(b) incomplete response, 67.26 failure to keep withholding to a minimum, 67.26 failure to provide footnote or other clear reference to justification for redactions, 67.27 withholding without written justification, 67.24(g,i) prohibited public interest balancing test, and CPRA Gov Code 6253(c) untimely response.

**A. Request:**

I requested Nov 3, 2020 from the DA (among other records not at issue in this complaint):

1. All Brady, Giglio, potential impeachment, or unreliable witness lists ever created by the District Attorney's office, including every version you currently retain in any form. Such records do not escape the exceptions to the exemptions of PC 832.7 merely because the persons do not work for your office, Becerra v Superior Court (First Amendment Coalition, 2020).

2. All Brady, Giglio, potential impeachment, or unreliable witness lists ever created by any other party in the possession of your office, including every version you currently retain in any form. Such records do not escape the exceptions to the exemptions of PC 832.7 merely because the persons do not work for your office, Becerra v Superior Court (First Amendment Coalition, 2020).

3. In simple terms, I want all SB 1421 records you have retained, and I want a quantity/existence/form statement, even if you believe their contents are exempt. Just like the AG in Becerra v Superior Court, if you retained any misconduct records you must release your own copies, regardless of what SFPD/DPA/SFSD do. But here's the full request: *(see attachment)*

**B. Complaint for Request #3 (SFAC 67.26, 67.27, 67.24(g,i)):**

Respondents have begun producing rolling responses to #3 for me as they are doing for the public at large, but their responses lack specific written justification and footnotes or keys for redactions. They claim as an overall justification:
"Records of attorney work product have been withheld in accordance to Cal. Govt. Code § 6254(k); Cal. Code Civ. Proc. §2018.030. Appropriate redactions have also been made pursuant to Penal Code Section 832.7(b)(5) and (6)."

First, Penal Code 832.7(b)(5) is not a single justification - it has 4 different subparts, A, B, C, and D, which exempt completely different information. They must cite which subsections are being used. See SOTF 19140 Malloy vs Dept of Human Resources.

Second, redactions must be keyed to specific justifications. No keys for any redaction are evident in the productions provided by DA. Respondents should look to the Police Commission - every redaction in an SB1421 record is keyed with a number to an index indicating exactly which subsection of Penal Code 832.7(b)(5) (there are 4 of them) or other exemption is used. (SFPD has begun correctly producing their records as all new SB1421 SFPD records have redaction keys; DPA claims to both SOTF and Police Commission that DPA is correcting its practices but I have seen no evidence as of yet.)

Third, PC 832.7(b)(6) is a prohibited public-interest balancing test. Like the Police Commission (who had the same problem), DA should find other specific explicit justifications instead of using this catch-all. Furthermore, even if you consider such a balancing test applicable, you should conclude that the balance weighs in favor of disclosure. Sadly, we have no idea what the DA has withheld/redacted under this provision. The Police agencies claim to use this exemption for gruesome photos, but such subjective censorship has no place in San Francisco. (If a photo is a specific photo of a deceased body taken for the coroner, there is a separate, valid, exemption to be used, Code Civ. Proc., § 129. But subjectively gruesome photos of injured - but not dead - people have no exemption.)

Fourth, it is very likely that this written justification is actually incomplete and wrong. SFPD, Police Commission, and DPA correctly note various other justifications: CLETS, attorney-client privilege, Constitutional personal privacy, coroner photography, and much more. It is almost certain that such exemptions also apply to the DA but were not provided in the written justifications.

Because the justification was incorrect or prohibited and no redaction keys were provided at the time of the complaint, you should find a violation of 67.26, 67.27, and/or 67.24(g,i).

C. Complaint for Request #1 and 2 (67.21(b), GC 6253(c), 67.26, 67.27):

Background:

Brady/Giglio lists refer to lists of certain persons, like police officers, whose involvement in a criminal case the District Attorney must notify defendants of, pursuant to SCOTUS ruling Brady v. Maryland (1963) holding that prosecutors must disclose exculpatory evidence to defendants and their attorneys, because not doing so would violate due process under the Fourteenth Amendment. Giglio v United States (1972) expanded the ruling in Brady to include a requirement for prosecutors to disclose information about dishonest witnesses.

A sustained determination of dishonesty against a peace officer causes all related records to be disclosable under SB 1421 (Penal Code 832.7(b)(1)(C)). Specifically, these records are disclosable notwithstanding other exemptions, most importantly Penal Code 832.7(a) (police
personnel records) and Gov Code 6254(f) (police investigations).

Narrative:

On Nov 24, 2020 the DA indefinitely extended the response to these requests 1 and 2, but has never given a final written response. (There is a third request in this set, but that request, for SB1421 material, is being responded to, and not at issue here.)

Instead the only response I've ever gotten is from the Supervisor of Records, denying all access to the DA's records. Please note that this failure by DA to make their own decision is not compliant with the CPRA or the Sunshine Ordinance, and constitutes an incomplete response and a failure to justify withholding in writing. Without a DA response, all I have to go on is the SoR response. I can only hope that the DA does, as the law requires, provide me a legal written justification themselves, and

My complaint challenges the following portions of this SoR reply, specifically for #2 (lists produced by other agencies and in the custody of DA). I do not, in this complaint, but without conceding the point, challenge the SoR's determination that records responsive to #1 constitute privileged attorney work-product.

- SoR Response A. "The only lists in the requested categories that are created by an outside agency and maintained by the SFDA’s office are lists provided to the SFDA by the San Francisco Police Department (“SFPD”), and such lists are exempt from disclosure in their entirety under Government Code sections 6254.5(e) and 6254(k), and under Evidence Code 1040(b)(2) (the official information privilege), as the lists were provided to the SFDA by the SFPD with an explicit confidentiality designation, and the public interest in withholding the records outweighs the public interest in disclosure because disclosure of the requested lists would impede the SFDA’s ability to comply with its Brady and Giglio obligations while protecting the integrity of ongoing and future investigations."
  - Gov Code 6254.5(e) does not exempt information - it merely prevents specific types of inter-agency disclosure from constituting a waiver of other exemptions. So let's put that aside.
  - Evid Code 1040(b)(2) (used under Gov Code 6254(k)) requires not only that information be received in confidence and that disclosure be "against 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." This is not a "plain" public interest balancing test. Respondents must show that disclosure would harm the interest of justice. Justice is improved, not harmed, by the fact that the public knows which police officers cannot be relied upon to give honest testimony in Court. However, it will make it harder for the DA to use dishonest/unethical police officers to prosecute members of the public - but that interest of the DA in the outcome of its proceedings cannot be considered. The very notion that the SCOTUS requires disclosure of the presence of such persons in criminal proceedings to be disclosed indicates that justice requires disclosure.

22nd Annual SOR Report
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SoR Response B. "Information in the lists that reflects peace officer personnel record information under Penal Code section 832.7 is protected from disclosure under that section, under Government Code section 6254(c), under Government Code section 6254(k), and under Article I, Section 1 of the California constitution because disclosure would constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy. To the extent certain responsive information falls within the categories of peace officer information covered by SB 1421, which amended Penal Code section 832.7 to remove the confidentiality restrictions over specific categories of peace officer personnel records relating to several types of officer misconduct, that information is nonetheless subject to withholding on the bases set forth above. California courts have recognized that SB 1421 did not abrogate other exemptions available under the CPRA with regard to records made public by that bill. See Becerra v. Superior Ct., 44 Cal. App. 5th 897, 923-29 (2020). Records that reflect complaints to and investigations conducted by a law enforcement agency, or are maintained in the investigative files of a law enforcement agency, are protected from disclosure under Government Code section 6254(f), even after the investigation is completed, as disclosure may impede ongoing or future investigations and prosecutions. See also Rivero, 54 Cal. App. 4th 1048."

- Penal Code 832.7(b) explicitly prohibits reliance on Gov Code 6254(f) if the matter is regarding the four SB 1421 issues (shootings, great-bodily injury/death, sexual assault, dishonesty).
- The knowledge that a police officer - because they shot, injured, sexually assaulted, or lied - cannot be trusted on the stand has no relationship to their personal privacy. Police officers' testimony at Court is certainly the conduct of public business, as is alleged or sustained misconduct. Furthermore, SB 1421 modifies the personal privacy exemption as it applies to SB 1421-disclosable records, under: Penal Code 832.7(b)(5)(C) requires that information be withhold on the basis of unwarranted invasion of personal privacy if that invasion "clearly outweighs the strong public interest in records about misconduct and serious use of force by peace officers and custodial officers."
- Note also that Penal Code 832.7(b)(5)(A) specifically does not exempt "names and work-related information of peace and custodial officers" - the name of an officer on this list is thus not exempt.
- Thus, in so far as peace officers are on Brady/Giglio lists for acts covered by Penal Code 832.7(b) (i.e. SB 1421), the portions of the lists identifying those officers and their SB 1421-related acts should be produced. SF Admin Code 67.26 require those portions of the lists be disclosed even if the other officers' info is not disclosable under Penal Code 832.7(b)(4) (and they may be redacted).

--Anonymous

NOTE: Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the government all be disclosable public records.
Sincerely,

Anonymous
November 20, 2020

Anonymous
104501-34643874@requests.muckrock.com

Re: Your Public Record Act request received on November 3, 2020.

To whom it may concern:

This letter is in response to your Public Record Act request received by our office via email on November 3, 2020, making the following request:

“1. All Brady, Giglio, potential impeachment, or unreliable witness lists ever created by the District Attorney's office, including every version you currently retain in any form. Such records do not escape the exceptions to the exemptions of PC 832.7 merely because the persons do not work for your office, Becerra v Superior Court (First Amendment Coalition, 2020).

2. All Brady, Giglio, potential impeachment, or unreliable witness lists ever created by any other party in the possession of your office, including every version you currently retain in any form. Such records do not escape the exceptions to the exemptions of PC 832.7 merely because the persons do not work for your office, Becerra v Superior Court (First Amendment Coalition, 2020).

3. In simple terms, I want all SB 1421 records you have retained, and I want a quantity/existence/form statement, even if you believe their contents are exempt. Just like the AG in Becerra v Superior Court, if you retained any misconduct records you must release your own copies, regardless of what SFPD/DPA/SFSD do. But here's the full request: Pursuant to Becerra v Superior Court (First Amendment Coalition, 2020), provide all records (where "record(s)" is defined specifically by Penal Code 832.7(b)(2), and REGARDLESS of whether they are prepared by or for your agency or its employees) of all incidents involving the discharge of a firearm at a person by a peace officer or custodial officer; all incidents in which the use of force by a peace officer or custodial officer against a person resulted in death, or in great bodily injury; all records relating to an incident in which a sustained finding was made by any law enforcement agency or oversight agency that a peace officer or custodial officer engaged in sexual assault involving a member of the public; all records relating to an incident in which a sustained finding was made by any law enforcement agency or oversight agency of dishonesty by a peace officer or custodial officer directly relating to the reporting, investigation, or prosecution of a crime, or directly relating to the reporting of, or investigation of misconduct by, another peace officer or custodial officer, including, but not limited to, any sustained finding of perjury, false statements, filing false reports, destruction, falsifying, or concealing of evidence. Note: The potential exception..."
that the State AG may have under Gov Code 6255 / public-interest balancing test, which the Court of Appeal found may apply if Becerra had asked for it, DOES NOT APPLY TO YOUR OFFICE, pursuant to SFAC 67.24(g and i).”

Under the Public Records Act and the Sunshine Ordinance, a “public record” is broadly defined to include “any writing containing information relating to the conduct of the public’s business prepared, owned, used or retained by any state or local agency, regardless of the physical form or characteristics.” Cal. Govt. Code §6252(e). If the department has no records responsive to the specific request, the department has no duty to create or recreate one.

Given the new laws and regulations we are consulting with an outside agency who has substantial interest in the request. We will be back to you with a response as soon as possible.

Sincerely,
San Francisco District Attorney’s Public Records
NOTE: THE EMAIL ADDRESS SENDING THIS REQUEST IS A PUBLICLY-VIEWABLE MAILBOX. Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Below are new Immediate Disclosure Requests (SF Admin Code 67.25(a)) directed to your agency. Your initial response is required by Nov 4, 2020. Rolling records responses are requested (SFAC 67.25(d)) if you are unable to immediately produce records. Exact copies of every responsive record are requested (Gov Code 6253(b)) - do not: provide mere URLs, print and scan electronic records, convert native files to PDFs, or provide black and white versions of any color record. Provide only copies of records not requiring fees and in-person inspection of all other records (GC 6253).

Your non-exhaustive obligations:
- All withholding of any information must be justified in writing by specific statutory authority (SFAC 67.27).
- All withholdings by masking or deletion (aka redactions) must be keyed by footnote or other clear reference to the specific justification for that redaction, and only the minimal exempt portion of any record may be withheld (SFAC 67.26).
- You must respond to emailed requests (SFAC 67.21(b)).
- You must notify us of whether or not responsive records exist and/or were withheld for each below request (Gov Code 6253(c), 6255(b)).
- You must state the name and title of each person responsible for withholding any information (Gov Code 6253(d)).
- Do not impose any end-user restrictions upon me (Santa Clara Co. vs Superior Ct, 170 Cal.App 4th 1301); so if you use a third-party website to publish records, please make them completely public without any login or sign-in or Terms of Service.

Your agency must do all of the above things in your response, and you cannot wait until we file complaints. We have and will continue to file appeals and complaints for every public records violation committed by the city (see rulings in our favor in SOTF 19044 Anonymous v City Attorney’s Office, 19047 Anonymous v Breed, 19091 Anonymous v Office of the Mayor, 19098 Anonymous v SFPD, 19108 Anonymous v Herrera, 19112 Anonymous v Scott).

***** We have no duty to, and we will not again, remind the City of its obligations. Instead, we will file complaints for every Sunshine Ordinance or CPRA violation. We will continue to file complaints until the City’s procedures are modified to fully comply with the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA, without caveat or exception. *****
1. All Brady, Giglio, potential impeachment, or unreliable witness lists ever created by the District Attorney's office, including every version you currently retain in any form. Such records do not escape the exceptions to the exemptions of PC 832.7 merely because the persons do not work for your office, Becerra v Superior Court (First Amendment Coalition, 2020).

2. All Brady, Giglio, potential impeachment, or unreliable witness lists ever created by any other party in the possession of your office, including every version you currently retain in any form. Such records do not escape the exceptions to the exemptions of PC 832.7 merely because the persons do not work for your office, Becerra v Superior Court (First Amendment Coalition, 2020).

3. In simple terms, I want all SB 1421 records you have retained, and I want a quantity/existence/form statement, even if you believe their contents are exempt. Just like the AG in Becerra v Superior Court, if you retained any misconduct records you must release your own copies, regardless of what SFPD/DPA/SFSD do. But here's the full request: Pursuant to Becerra v Superior Court (First Amendment Coalition, 2020), provide all records (where "record(s)" is defined specifically by Penal Code 832.7(b)(2), and REGARDLESS of whether they are prepared by or for your agency or its employees) of all incidents involving the discharge of a firearm at a person by a peace officer or custodial officer; all incidents in which the use of force by a peace officer or custodial officer against a person resulted in death, or in great bodily injury; all records relating to an incident in which a sustained finding was made by any law enforcement agency or oversight agency that a peace officer or custodial officer engaged in sexual assault involving a member of the public; all records relating to an incident in which a sustained finding was made by any law enforcement agency or oversight agency of dishonesty by a peace officer or custodial officer directly relating to the reporting, investigation, or prosecution of a crime, or directly relating to the reporting of, or investigation of misconduct by, another peace officer or custodial officer, including, but not limited to, any sustained finding of perjury, false statements, filing false reports, destruction, falsifying, or concealing of evidence. Note: The potential exception that the State AG may have under Gov Code 6255 / public-interest balancing test, which the Court of Appeal found may apply if Becerra had asked for it, DOES NOT APPLY TO YOUR OFFICE, pursuant to SFAC 67.24(g and i).

Do not destroy or discard any responsive records - we will appeal all withholdings or Sunshine violations.

FYI - If you haven't read Becerra v Superior Court, the Court of Appeals held: "We conclude, as a matter of statutory interpretation, that section 832.7 generally requires disclosure of all responsive records in the possession of the Department, regardless whether the records pertain to officers employed by the Department or by another public agency and regardless whether the Department or another public agency created the records. Although we also determine, as a matter of statutory interpretation, that the so-called "catchall exemption" of the CPRA, codified at Government Code section 6255, may apply to records that are subject to disclosure under section 832.7, our independent review leads us to conclude the Department did not adequately demonstrate that the public interest served by nondisclosure of the records at issue clearly outweighs the public interest in their disclosure."

However, no San Francisco agency or official can use the catchall exemption/6255 due to SF Admin Code 67.24(g and i).

Thank you for your anticipated cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,
Anonymous
Thank you for your email. We cite Mayor London Breed’s March 13, 2020 declaration suspending Administrative Code sections 67.25(a) and 67.25(b) and her March 30, 2020 Temporary Modification of Public Records Law During COVID-19 Local Emergency for additional time to respond in light of the pandemic. Our estimate is that we will respond within fourteen additional days, but this may change. We but we will keep you informed and encourage you to check in.

Good evening,

SFAC 67.25(d) (rolling responses) is not suspended. You must provide records no more than 1 business day after you have reviewed those specific records. Namely, you may not wait until all of the records have been received and redacted.

Thanks,
Anonymous

Please see the attached response. Thank you.

Anonymous Muckrock 11.24

Good evening. You received the request on Nov. 3. You had until Nov 13 under Gov Code 6253 to reply within 10 days either determining that you the records are disclosable or not (you failed to do this) or declaring a maximum of 14 day extension to consult this other agency.
You have a total of 24 days, which is Nov. 27, to determine whether or not these records are disclosable. An appeal will be filed immediately if you fail to comply.

Sincerely,
Anonymous

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From: San Francisco District Attorney's office</th>
<th>11/25/2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Brady, Giglio, and Police Misconduct Records (SB 14...</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you for your response. As we mentioned in our response yesterday, we are conferring with another agency and will send you a final response as soon as possible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As we stated in our original email response, “We cite Mayor Breed’s March 30, 2020 Temporary Modification of Public Records Law During COVID-19 Local Emergency for additional time to respond in light of the pandemic”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That being said, we are moving to process this as expeditiously as possible given the circumstances. Thank you for your patience and cooperation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincerely,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFDA Public Records</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~WRD0005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Download</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From: Anonymous Person</th>
<th>11/25/2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Brady, Giglio, and Police Misconduct Records (SB 14...</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm referring to the CPRA, not the Sunshine Ordinance, deadlines. The Mayor has no authority to suspend any portion of the CPRA, which is state law. Because Nov. 27 is a holiday, your response determining which of these records are disclosable will be due the next business day.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you have a good reason, like who is being consulted and why, then I'm happy to extend the deadline by my discretion, but I'll expect something more specific than what you have stated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you for your expected compliance with the law.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincerely,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From: San Francisco District Attorney's office</th>
<th>11/25/2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Brady, Giglio, and Police Misconduct Records (SB 14...</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you for the clarification. We will hopefully have a response to you by Monday. If it looks like it will take longer, we will let you know.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~WRD2836</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Download</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From: San Francisco District Attorney's office</th>
<th>11/30/2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Brady, Giglio, and Police Misconduct Records (SB 14...

Please find an updated response to your request. Thank you again for your patience.
Sincerely,
SFDA Public Records.

Anonymous Muckrock 11.30
- Download

From: Anonymous Person 11/30/2020

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Brady, Giglio, and Police Misconduct Records (SB 14...

1) The hyperlinks to your SB 1421 do not work in your pdf - please provide the full URLs in the email.
2) Since you have refused to within 24 days provide notice of disclosable public records for requests 1 and 2, appeals will be filed immediately.

--Anonymous

From: San Francisco District Attorney's office 11/30/2020

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Brady, Giglio, and Police Misconduct Records (SB 14...

Here are the hyperlinks you requested: https://app.box.com/folder/82573004142? s=7pj7dwzx7025v1xmv24a1frp7vtnpm9
https://sfdistrictattorney.org/policy/independent-investigations-bureau/

~WRD1839
- Download

From: Anonymous Person 11/30/2020

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Brady, Giglio, and Police Misconduct Records (SB 14...

Thank you. Since you have denied access to some portions of records (i.e the SB 1421 redactions),
1) you must provide me the name and title of the person responsible for the denial pursuant to
CPRA.
2) you must key each redaction by footnote or clear reference to a lawful justification, pursuant to
SFAC 67.26

For example, the Police Commission
uses https://cdn.muckrock.com/foi_files/2020/11/12/Commission_Redaction_Index.pdf as the key,
and then puts the associated key number on every redaction in their SB 1421 records.

Have you forgotten to provide me this key, or has the DA not complied with that law?
From: Anonymous Person
12/10/2020
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Brady, Giglio, and Police Misconduct Records (SB 14...

Since you have violated the law (SFAC 67.26) and refused to answer, further appeals will be filed.

From: Anonymous Person
12/10/2020
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Brady, Giglio, and Police Misconduct Records (SB 14...

Supervisor of Records Dennis Herrera,

This is a 67.21(d) petition for a determination in writing whether any part of the following records not produced by the DA (which is "your office" below) are public and an order for their disclosure.

1. All Brady, Giglio, potential impeachment, or unreliable witness lists ever created by the District Attorney's office, including every version you currently retain in any form. Such records do not escape the exceptions to the exemptions of PC 832.7 merely because the persons do not work for your office, Becerra v Superior Court (First Amendment Coalition, 2020).

2. All Brady, Giglio, potential impeachment, or unreliable witness lists ever created by any other party in the possession of your office, including every version you currently retain in any form. Such records do not escape the exceptions to the exemptions of PC 832.7 merely because the persons do not work for your office, Becerra v Superior Court (First Amendment Coalition, 2020).

--Anonymous

From: Muckrock Staff
12/28/2020

From: San Francisco District Attorney's office
12/30/2020
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Brady, Giglio, and Police Misconduct Records (SB 14...

Thank you for your inquiry. We will respond to your Supervisor of Records petition dated December 10, 2020, no later than January 15, 2021.

~WRD000

Download

From: San Francisco District Attorney's office
01/12/2021
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Brady, Giglio, and Police Misconduct Records (SB 14...

Please see the attached response to your petition.

SOR petition response_Brady-Giglio_1.12.21_FINAL

Download

~WRD000

January 12, 2021

Sent via email (104501-34643874@requests.muckrock.com)

Re: Petition to Supervisor of Records

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter responds to your December 10, 2020, petition to the Supervisor of Records seeking a determination whether the San Francisco District Attorney (“SFDA”) unlawfully withheld “Brady, Giglio, potential impeachment, or unreliable witness lists” created by the San SFDA, or created by another party but in the SFDA’s possession, in response to your November 3, 2020, request.

We have reviewed the SFDA’s response to your request and the categories of responsive records withheld by the SFDA, and we determine that the SFDA properly withheld all Brady, Giglio, potential impeachment, or unreliable witness lists in the SFDA’s possession because all responsive records are exempt from disclosure under California Public Records Act, Government Code 6250, et seq. and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance.

The Requested Lists Are Exempt from Disclosure in Their Entirety.

The requested lists created by the SFDA’s office are exempt from disclosure in their entirety as attorney work product under Government Code section 6254(k), Penal Code section 1054.5, and Code of Civil Procedure section 2018.030. The only lists in the requested categories that are created by an outside agency and maintained by the SFDA’s office are lists provided to the SFDA by the San Francisco Police Department (“SFPD”), and such lists are exempt from disclosure in their entirety under Government Code sections 6254.5(e) and 6254(k), and under Evidence Code 1040(b)(2) (the official information privilege), as the lists were provided to the SFDA by the SFPD with an explicit confidentiality designation, and the public interest in withholding the records outweighs the public interest in disclosure because disclosure of the requested lists would impede the SFDA’s ability to comply with its Brady and Giglio obligations while protecting the integrity of ongoing and future investigations. For the same reasons, the lists are exempt from disclosure in their entirety under Government Code section 6255 based on the fact that the interest in withholding these materials outweighs the public interest in disclosure. To the extent disclosure of the requested lists would impede the SFDA’s core state law prosecutorial function, the SFDA is not bound by any provision in the Sunshine Ordinance that would compel disclosure of these lists. See Rivero v. Superior Ct., 54 Cal. App. 4th 1048 (1997). In addition, the Mayor’s Fifth Supplement to the Proclamation of Local Emergency, dated March 23, 2020, at Section 7(d), waived the prohibition in Administrative Code section 67.24(g) and (i) on withholding records in reliance on the general balancing test in Government Code Section 6255.

//
**Additional Privileges or Exemptions Apply to Much or All Included Information.**

Much or all of the content of the lists are also exempt from disclosure on the following bases:

- Information in the lists that reflects peace officer personnel record information under Penal Code section 832.7 is protected from disclosure under that section, under Government Code section 6254(c), under Government Code section 6254(k), and under Article I, Section 1 of the California constitution because disclosure would constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy. To the extent certain responsive information falls within the categories of peace officer information covered by SB 1421, which amended Penal Code section 832.7 to remove the confidentiality restrictions over specific categories of peace officer personnel records relating to several types of officer misconduct, that information is nonetheless subject to withholding on the bases set forth above. California courts have recognized that SB 1421 did not abrogate other exemptions available under the CPRA with regard to records made public by that bill. See Becerra v. Superior Ct., 44 Cal. App. 5th 897, 923-29 (2020).

- Records that reflect complaints to and investigations conducted by a law enforcement agency, or are maintained in the investigative files of a law enforcement agency, are protected from disclosure under Government Code section 6254(f), even after the investigation is completed, as disclosure may impede ongoing or future investigations and prosecutions. See also Rivero, 54 Cal. App. 4th 1048.

- Criminal offender record information is protected from disclosure under Penal Code section 13102.

For the reasons stated above, your petition is denied.

Very truly yours,

DENNIS J. HERRERA
City Attorney

/s/ Jon Givner

JON GIVNER
Deputy City Attorney
Buta, Odaya (CAT)

From: Anonymous <arecordrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 5, 2021 7:27 AM
To: MayorSunshineRequests, MYR (MYR); Supervisor Records (CAT)
Subject: RE: Banned withholdings - immediate disclosure request

Supervisor of Records,

This is a 67.21(d) petition against the Mayor's Office for disclosure of information withheld as ongoing contract negotiations and/or under Gov Code 6255 public interest balancing test.
I requested all information withheld previously to others under the purported Mayoral covid emergency orders (except records requested by this email address). Please determine that one or more of the records are public and order their disclosure.

The Mayor purports to have changed the exemptions under the CPRA in San Francisco by removing the following prohibitions on exemption in her Fifth Supplemental COVID order (which we do not concede are valid regardless):

(c) The requirement in Administrative agencies prepare and provide documents and inf negotiations.

(d) The restriction in Administrative C prohibiting City departments from relying upon similar provision as the basis for withholding an paragraph does not suspend Administrative Cod "deliberative process" exemption.

The Mayor's Office explicitly claims that all the information previously withheld to other requesters is still exempt to me and in my request under the same exemptions.

However, since in many of these cases the City is not in "the course of contract negotiations" as of my January 10, 2021, these exemptions are not valid as of the date of my request (if they were ever valid at the time of the older requests made by others, which we do not concede).

Furthermore, the public interest in withholding all of this information never clearly outweighed the public interest in disclosure because there is in fact substantial interest in the public understanding how the Mayor is using her
unprecedented emergency powers. As the executive branch claims ever increasing powers, the only meaningful check and balance on that power is the people's knowledge of what the government is up to, so they can then petition the government for redress.

**NOTE:** 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

----- Original Message ------
On Thursday, February 4th, 2021 at 11:51 PM, MayorSunshineRequests, MYR (MYR) <mayorsunshinerequests@sfgov.org> wrote:

Anonymous,

Please see the attached records responsive to your request below. Any redactions or withholding of the underlying requested materials are based on the justifications provided in the responses and remain redacted or withheld for the reasons stated therein.

These documents will be provided in batches due to file size.

Regards,

Hank Heckel

Compliance Officer

Office of the Mayor

City and County of San Francisco
Anonymous,

This responds to your request below on behalf of the Office of the Mayor. Please note that we are invoking an extension of up to 14 days to further respond due to the need to consult with another department. See Cal. Gov. Code § 6253(c) and San Francisco Admin. Code § 67.25(b).

Regards,

Hank Heckel
Compliance Officer
Office of the Mayor
City and County of San Francisco
Mayor Breed, Mayor's Office, Dennis Herrera, City Attorney's Office:

This is an immediate disclosure request for all:

(a) responses (to records requests) from Jan 1, 2020 to present which you have justified a withholding or redaction by Gov Code 6255, because they are documents and information during the course of contract negotiations, the deliberative process privilege, Penal Code 832.7(b)(6), Times Mirror Co v Superior Court (1991), or any other public-interest balancing test,

(b) underlying unredacted, original records for which you claimed any of the redactions/withholdings in (a) (that's not the same as (a) - read carefully - I want the cover letters and also the original records)

EXCLUDED are:

(c) responses to this specific From email address at protonmail. Do NOT assume that responses to anonymous people on MuckRock are me, or exclude on that basis. Since the Scott/Breed homeless texts went viral there are a large number of people making similar requests on MuckRock, often copy-pasting my verbiage and legalese from my requests.

I intend to ensure you justify all those refusals to me in this request (which I will then appeal while the earlier requesters may not) and to preserve all such original records pending appeals until after COVID orders expire or are thrown out by the Board or a Court, and then also to re-request all of those records at that time. I am already appealing 100% of your responses to this email address, so I don't need those here.

NOTE: Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the government all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous
Buta, Odaya (CAT)

From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 5, 2021 3:03 PM
To: Vien, Veronica (DPH); Colfax, Grant (DPH); aragon@berkeley.edu; tomas.aragon@cdph.ca.gov; Karin.Schwartz@cdph.ca.gov
Cc: Ethics Commission, (ETH); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Supervisor Records (CAT); SOTF, (BOS)
Subject: Public Records Act and Sunshine Ordinance Complaint against Tomas Aragon, Veronica Vien, Grant Colfax, and SF Dept of Public Health
Attachments: Exhibit-A.pdf; signature.asc

SOTF Complaint and Supervisor of Records Petition against SF Department of Public Health, Veronica Vien, Tomas Aragon, and Grant Colfax:
This is a complaint to the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force under SF Admin Code 67.21(e) to find violations of the CPRA/Sunshine Ordinance and order records disclosure, and a petition to the Supervisor of Records under SFAC 66.21(d) to determine that records or parts thereof are public and order their disclosure.

On June 4, 2020 I made a Public Records Act and Sunshine Ordinance request via email from 94374-74128043@requests.muckrock.com to then-SF Health Officer Tomas Aragon using Aragon's SF government email tomas.aragon@sfdph.org, subject "California Public Records Act Request: Inter-Agency Text Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF Health Officer Tomas Aragon)" including, inter alia:
"All text or chat messages (including group messages) in any form or application (including but not limited to SMS, MMS, WhatsApp, WeChat, Signal, Instagram, Twitter, Facebook, Hangouts, Skype,Teams)
- a) sent by you to/cc/bcc any of Mayor London Breed, Sean Elsbernd, SFPD Chief William Scott, Dennis Herrera, Grant Colfax, Jeff Kositsky, Mohammed Nuru, Alaric Degrofinried, Andy Lynch, Hank Heckel, Mary Ellen Carroll, or Abigail Stewart-Kahn (the "Named Public Officials") OR
- b) sent by any of the Named Public Officials and received by you (and possibly others, such as in a group message) OR
- c) sent by a third party and received by both you and any of the Named Public Officials (such as in a group message), with timestamps between Jan 1, 2019 and June 3, 2020 (inclusive), including personal property search under City of San Jose vs Superior Court (2017)."

No records have ever been produced.

Per Community Youth Athletic Center v City of National City: At the time of my request these records existed and were in the constructive possession of the City/SFDPH (due to City of San Jose v Superior Court). That they no longer may be in the possession of the City/SFDPH has no bearing as it is the City/DPH's fault for failing to perform the search at the time the request was made in June 2020. Purported good faith has no bearing on the CPRA violation. "No bad faith finding was required to support the finding there was a PRA violation." "The effect of the City's inability or unwillingness to locate the records had the same effect as withholding requested information from the public."

Against Tomas Aragon and associated entities:
Mr. Aragon violated and continues to violate the Public Records Act and the Sunshine Ordinance by ignoring my records request until he left the employment of the City of San Francisco, though he remains a public official subject to the Public Records Act as the state Health Officer and a UC professor. Mr. Aragon: You must still respond to this records request.

If Mr. Aragon continues to refuse to produce these records (or has since destroyed any of them, or does not provide them under the stricter requirements of the Sunshine Ordinance as opposed to the weaker requirements of the PRA), action for mandamus under PRA and suit under the Sunshine Ordinance will be filed against him personally, CDPH, UC Berkeley, and the City of San Francisco. Mr. Aragon's responsibility to provide public records on his personal accounts or devices continues (City of San Jose vs Superior Court (2017)). Furthermore, pursuant to that decision, individual local
officials (as Aragon was in June 2020) are considered "local agencies" subject to the PRA; and as a state officer he is and has always been subject to the PRA as well.

Against current SF persons (Vien, SFDPH, Colfax):

The City of San Francisco has apparently permanently lost these public records and the SF public will never know exactly what its Health Officer - possessing extraordinary emergency powers - did during the pandemic, and how he came to the decisions he did, communicating with the Mayor and others (the Mayor too has apparently destroyed all of her copies of records, if any existed):

- DPH (for which Colfax as department head is legally responsible for) willfully ignored my records request on June 4, 2020, on June 15, 2020, on June 30, 2020, and on July 15, 2020 (when email followups were sent).
- Regardless of what suspensions of Sunshine Ordinance deadlines the Mayor purported to impose, DPH violated the Public Records Act, Gov Code 6253(c) by failing to inform me by June 14 (10 days) whether or not responsive records existed and reasons therefor.
- On August 26, 2020, DPH asked if I would identify keywords to narrow the request. On August 27, I declined by email to narrow the request by keywords.
- On Sept 1, 2020 DPH unlawfully closed my request with no further response.
- On Jan 4, 2021, DPH reopened the request only after Aragon had left the City's employ. DPH acted willfully to obstruct my access to these public records until they could now no longer produce them.
- On Feb 5, 2021, DPH informed me that they had unlawfully failed to preserve the Aragon records at the time of my request in June 4, 2020 and could only produce a subset that may be on Colfax's own accounts (since they could no longer access Aragon's personal accounts or devices).
- Apparently, the City has permanently lost the public records I requested originally. Alternatively: the City can negotiate with Aragon on how to produce all requested records to me.

Therefore, Respondents violated:

- SF Admin Code 67.21(b) for failing to provide a copy of the requested records,
- 67.25(d) for failing to provide rolling response,
- 67.29-7 for failing to preserve all correspondence in a professional and businesslike manner,
- 67.27 for withholding the responsive records without a lawful justification,
- 67.21(k) for violating the CPRA, namely failing to search and produce records on Aragon's personal accounts and devices as required by City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017), and
- CPRA Gov Code 6253(c) for failing to respond within 10 days,
- Further Colfax as department head willfully violated the Sunshine Ordinance and committed official misconduct (SFAC 67.34) by refusing to search for records until after the subject employee (his subordinate) had terminated their employment thus making it now potentially impossible to lawfully produce the requested records.

This request is a prime example of why Admin Code 67.29-7 demanding preservation of all correspondence must be enforced rigorously against wayward City officials.

NOTE: 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.
Sincerely,

Anonymous
Health Officer Tomas Aragon:

Below are new Immediate Disclosure Requests (SF Admin Code 67.25(a)) directed to you. Your response is required by June 5, 2020. Rolling records responses are requested (SFAC 67.25(d)) if you are unable to immediately produce records. Exact copies of every responsive record are requested (Gov Code 6253(b)) - do not: provide mere URLs, print and scan electronic records, convert native files to PDFs, or provide black and white versions of any color images. Provide only copies of records not requiring fees and in-person inspection of all other records (GC 6253).

Your non-exhaustive obligations:
- All withholding of any information must be justified in writing (SFAC 67.27).
- All withholdings by masking or deletion (aka redactions) must be keyed by footnote or other clear reference to the specific justification for that redaction, and only the minimal exempt portion of any record may be withheld (SFAC 67.26).
- You must respond to emailed requests (SFAC 67.21(b)).
- You must notify us of whether or not responsive records exist and/or were withheld for each below request (Gov Code 6253(c), 6255(b)).
- You must state the name and title of each person responsible for withholding any information (Gov Code 6253(d)).
- Do not impose any end-user restrictions upon me (Santa Clara Co. vs Superior Ct, 170 Cal.App 4th 1301); so if you use a third-party website like NextRequest to publish records, please make them completely public without any login or sign-in.

Your agency must do all of the above things in your response, and you cannot wait until we file complaints.

****** We have no duty to, and we will not again, remind the City of its obligations. Instead, we will file complaints for every Sunshine Ordinance or CPRA violation. We will continue to file complaints until the City's procedures are modified to fully comply with the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA, without caveat or exception. ******

1. All text or chat messages (including group messages) in any form or application (including but not limited to SMS, MMS, WhatsApp, WeChat, Signal, Instagram, Twitter, Facebook, Hangouts, Skype, Teams):
   - a) sent by you to/cc/bcc any of Mayor London Breed, Sean Elsbernd, SFPD Chief William Scott, Dennis Herrera, Grant Colfax, Jeff Kositsky, Mohammed Nuru, Alaric Degrafinried, Andy Lynch, Hank Heckel, Mary Ellen Carroll, or Abigail Stewart-Kahn (the "Named Public Officials") OR
   - b) sent by any of the Named Public Officials and received by you (and possibly others, such as in a group message) OR
   - c) sent by a third party and received by both you and any of the Named Public Officials (such as in a group message),
   with timestamps between Jan 1, 2019 and June 3, 2020 (inclusive), including a personal property search under City of San Jose vs Superior Court (2017). While the phone numbers are not needed, the following must be preserved: the timestamps, the textual content, attachments, and images, and also ALL sender and recipient names (including groups). Pursuant to SF Admin Code 67.21(l), which requires you to use any electronic format that we request, please provide the records in spreadsheet format. For an example of the format of the response, see SFPD Chief Scott’s prior response here: https://cdn.muckrock.com/foia_files/2020/04/14/Text_Messages_Breed_Scott_Redacted.pdf
and clearly referenced redaction justifications here: https://cdn.muckrock.com/foia_files/2020/04/14,ChiefOfficeResponse201.pdf (though I do not concede all of them are appropriate redactions). Please provide rolling responses, starting with the most recent records going backwards. Messages to/from before your current department head became the department must still be provided.

Do not destroy or discard any responsive records - we will appeal all withholdings or Sunshine violations. Remember your department head has an obligation to maintain in a professional and businesslike manner correspondence and release them as public records (SF Admin Code 67.27-9(a)); and we will cross-check your responses with all other parties to ensure you have not destroyed or withheld records improperly.

Thank you for your anticipated cooperation in this matter.

NOTE: Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. The email address sending this request is a publicly viewable mailbox. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,
Anonymous

From: Muckrock Staff 06/15/2020
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Inter-Agency Text Messages - Immediate Disclosure ...

To Whom It May Concern:

I wanted to follow up on the following California Public Records Act request, copied below, and originally submitted on June 4, 2020. Please let me know when I can expect to receive a response.

Thanks for your help, and let me know if further clarification is needed.

From: Muckrock Staff 06/30/2020
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Inter-Agency Text Messages - Immediate Disclosure ...

To Whom It May Concern:

I wanted to follow up on the following California Public Records Act request, copied below, and originally submitted on June 4, 2020. Please let me know when I can expect to receive a response.

Thanks for your help, and let me know if further clarification is needed.
From: Muckrock Staff  
07/15/2020

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Inter-Agency Text Messages - Immediate Disclosure ...

To Whom It May Concern:

I wanted to follow up on the following California Public Records Act request, copied below, and originally submitted on June 4, 2020. Please let me know when I can expect to receive a response.

Thanks for your help, and let me know if further clarification is needed.

From: Muckrock Staff  
07/30/2020

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Inter-Agency Text Messages - Immediate Disclosure ...

To Whom It May Concern:

I wanted to follow up on the following California Public Records Act request, copied below, and originally submitted on June 4, 2020. Please let me know when I can expect to receive a response.

Thanks for your help, and let me know if further clarification is needed.

From: Department of Public Health  
07/31/2020

Subject: Your first record request #20-2942 has been opened.

City and County of San Francisco

Hi there

Your first City and County of San Francisco record request (request number #20-2942) has been submitted. It is currently unpublished and is not available for the general public to view.

As the requester, you can always see the status of your request by signing into the City and County of San Francisco Public Records portal here.

If you haven't already activated your account, click here to get started.
Once your account is activated, your request will be visible at the following link: Request #20-2942.

Questions about your request? Reply to this email or sign in to contact staff at City and County of San Francisco.

Technical support See our a href='https://www.nextrequest.com/support'>help page</a>

From: Department of Public Health  
08/26/2020
Subject: [External Message Added] City and County of San Francisco public records request #20-2942

City and County of San Francisco

Hi there

A message was sent to you regarding record request #20-2942:

Hi,

Can you help us identify keywords you would like us to search between the listed individuals in your request? This will help us narrow down the broad search for records.

Thank you for your help. We will clarify the final search terms with you before conducting the search.

Thank you.

Questions about your request? Reply to this email or sign in to contact staff at City and County of San Francisco. See our help page.

From: Anonymous Person
08/27/2020

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request #20-2942

request 20-2942:

no keywords - i want to see the conversations with the named officials as laid out in the original request.

From: Department of Public Health
09/01/2020

Subject: Your City and County of San Francisco public records request #20-2942 has been closed.

City and County of San Francisco

Hi there

Record request #20-2942 has been closed. The closure reason supplied was:

We did not hear back from you when we asked for more clarification about your request. Since we are unable to conduct a diligent search for responsive records without your guidance, we consider your request closed. If you are still interested in your request, you are welcome to submit a new request with more details at any time here: https://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/requests/new.

Questions about your request? Reply to this email or sign in to contact staff at City and County of San Francisco.
From: Department of Public Health 01/04/2021

Subject: Your City and County of San Francisco public records request #20-2942 has been reopened.

City and County of San Francisco

Hi there

Record request #20-2942 has been reopened. You can see it anytime at the link below.

Questions about your request? Reply to this email or sign in to contact staff at City and County of San Francisco. See our help page.

From: Anonymous Person 01/06/2021

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request #20-2942

You seem to be confused re 20-2942. There are different requests to DPH from different muckrock email addresses at different times. Please be sure to respond to EVERY records request.

From: Department of Public Health 01/12/2021

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request #20-2942

Hi Anonymous,

We appreciate your email to help clarify the difference in the PRA requests.

In regards to Request #20-2942, you are requesting for:
1. All text or chat messages (including group messages) in any form or application (including but not limited to SMS, MMS, WhatsApp, WeChat, Signal, Instagram, Twitter, Facebook, Hangouts, Skype, Teams):
   - a) sent by you to/cc/bcc any of Mayor London Breed, Sean Elsbernd, SFPD Chief William Scott, Dennis Herrera, Grant Colfax, Jeff Kositsky, Mohammed Nuru, Alaric Degrainried, Andy Lynch, Hank Heckel, Mary Ellen Carroll, or Abigail Stewart-Kahn (the "Named Public Officials") OR
   - b) sent by any of the Named Public Officials and received by you (and possibly others, such as in a group message) OR
   - c) sent by a third party and received by both you and any of the Named Public Officials (such as in a group message), with timestamps between Jan 1, 2019 and June 3, 2020 (inclusive), including a personal property search under City of San Jose vs Superior Court (2017).

Will you kindly help clarify who are you are referring to when you state “you” as highlighted in the above three items? Once we have a clearer understanding of your request, we will be able to diligently conduct a search for responsive records.
Hi there

A message was sent to you regarding record request #20-2942:

Hi Anonymous,

We appreciate your email to help clarify the difference in the PRA requests.

In regards to Request #20-2942, you are requesting for:

* All text or chat messages (including group messages) in any form or application (including but not limited to SMS, MMS, WhatsApp, WeChat, Signal, Instagram, Twitter, Facebook, Hangouts, Skype, Teams):
  - a) sent by you to/cc/bcc any of Mayor London Breed, Sean Elsbernd, SFPD Chief William Scott, Dennis Herrera, Grant Colfax, Jeff Kositsky, Mohammed Nuru, Alaric Degrafinried, Andy Lynch, Hank Heckel, Mary Ellen Carroll, or Abigail Stewart-Kahn (the "Named Public Officials") OR
  - b) sent by any of the Named Public Officials and received by you (and possibly others, such as in a group message) OR
  - c) sent by a third party and received by both you and any of the Named Public Officials (such as in a group message),

with timestamps between Jan 1, 2019 and June 3, 2020 (inclusive), including a personal property search under City of San Jose vs Superior Court (2017).

Will you kindly help clarify who are you are referring to when you state “you” as highlighted in the above three items? Once we have a clearer understanding of your request, we will be able to diligently conduct a search for responsive records.

Thank you for your help with this,
Veronica Vien

Questions about your request? Reply to this email or sign in to contact staff at City and County of San Francisco. Technical support See our help page

From: Anonymous Person
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request #20-2942
01/13/2021

It was right at the top of the request. It was addressed to Mr. Aragon. This request was emailed to Aragon on June 4.
I hope you at that time preserved the requested records.
If you failed to do so, it may be now impossible for you to comply with the PRA.

Thank you,
Anonymous

From: Department of Public Health
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request #20-2942
02/05/2021

Dear Requester,

Thank you for your clarification.

We no longer have records of Tomas Aragon's text or chat messages (including group messages) in any form or application from his mobile device. However, we propose conducting a search through Grant Colfax's mobile device for text or chat messages with Tomas Aragon, to help fulfill your request.

We anticipate Grant Colfax to have exchanged thousands of texts with Tomas Aragon from 2019-2020. In light of the current pandemic and local health emergency, this request will take a great deal of time to process and involve use of scarce public resources. We would prefer to work with you to get you responsive records in a reasonable manner. Therefore, we are asking for your help to narrow the timeframe of the search and review, to help facilitate the review. Can you please let us know which month(s) you are most interested in searching first? Additionally, we welcome any concepts or terms you can provide that can help narrow the search and review, to help facilitate the review.

We look forward to working with you.

Thank you for your understanding.

Veronica

From: Department of Public Health
Subject: [External Message Added] City and County of San Francisco public records request #20-2942
02/05/2021

City and County of San Francisco
Hi there

A message was sent to you regarding record request #20-2942:

We no longer have records of Tomas Aragon's text or chat messages (including group messages) in any form or application from his mobile device. However, we propose conducting a search through Grant Colfax's mobile device for text or chat messages with Tomas Aragon, to help fulfill your request.

We anticipate Grant Colfax to have exchanged thousands of texts with Tomas Aragon from 2019-2020. In light of the current pandemic and local health emergency, this request will take a great deal of time to process and involve use of scarce public resources. We would prefer to work with you to get you responsive records in a reasonable manner. Therefore, we are asking for your help to narrow the timeframe of the search and review, to help facilitate the review. Can you please let us know which month(s) you are most interested in searching first? Additionally, we welcome any concepts or terms you can provide that can help narrow the search and review, to help facilitate the review.

We look forward to working with you.

Thank you for your understanding.

Questions about your request? Reply to this email or sign in to contact staff at City and County of San Francisco. Technical support See our help page

https://www.nextrequest.com/support
Buta, Odaya (CAT)

From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 12, 2021 3:57 PM
To: Supervisor Records (CAT); SOTF, (BOS)
Cc: Henderson, Paul (DPA); Hawkins, Sarah (DPA); Oldfather, Newton (DPA); dpa.legalteam@sfgov.org
Subject: 67.21(d) petition, and for SOTF File 19144 - against DPA for SB 1421 records - PART 1 of 2
Attachments: 67.21(d) petition and SOTF 19144 - DPA 20210212-min copy 2 Z.pdf; signature.asc

**Supervisor of Records:** This is a 67.21(d) petition against DPA for a written determination that records or parts thereof are public and an order for their disclosure.

**SOTF:** DPA has, now on February 12, 2021, appeared to start producing redaction keys on a single record. These keys and written justifications and withholdings however are still not compliant with the law.

1. Redaction justifications and keys are not compliant
2. Records not generated as part of the complaint investigation but physically located in the complaint file must not use PC 832 justifications as they are not police personnel records under *Eureka* and *LBPOA*
3. Audio and video records must be produced
4. Indices (whatever that means) must be produced

The full petition and exhibits are attached (PART 1 of 2 due to attachment size. You need both parts).

**NOTE:** 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous
**Supervisor of Records:** This is 67.21(d) petition that some or all of the parts of records withheld below are public and an order against DPA for their disclosure, re: DPA file 0658-08.

**SOTF re File 19144:** On Feb 12, 2021, the DPA for the first time produced written justifications and redaction keys for a single record, however they remain non-compliant for the following reasons.

I. **Redaction justifications and keys are not compliant**

Every redaction must be keyed to a specific written justification. It is unclear why DPA is using a more vague redaction key than the Police Commission. DPA is for unknown reasons grouping together Attorney-Client and Attorney-Work Product privileges - which are different exemptions under different sections in the Evidence Code; SOTF has previously held this to be unlawful violating SFAC 67.27. DPA is for unknown reasons grouping together CLETS and CORI which are exempt under different sections of law. DPA also groups together California Penal Code § 832.7(b)(5)(C) and Welfare and Institutions Code § 5328 which are distinct justifications.

Some of the redactions are keyed to a non-existent key, like redaction “O” on Bates #000360 which is challenged.

II. **Records not generated as part of the discipline/complaint process are not redactable or withholdable under the police personnel file rules**

The mere physical presence of a public record in a police complaint file does not make the record a police personnel record subject to the heightened confidentiality of Penal Code 832.7, unless that record was “generated in connection with” the complaint investigation.

The Court of Appeal considered this issue in *City of Eureka v. Superior Court of Humboldt Cnty.* (2016), and the Supreme Court considered it in *Long Beach Police Officers Assn. v. City of Long Beach* (2014). As the Court of Appeal held in *Eureka* (pp 763-64, the emphasis on “generated” comes from the original decision; bold and underline is mine):

> The arrest video does not come within section 832.8, subdivision (d), which defines “personnel records” as those relating a police officer's “advancement, appraisal, or discipline.” *Long Beach Police Officers Assn. v. City of Long Beach* (2014) 59 Cal.4th 59, 172 Cal.Rptr.3d 56, 325 P.3d 460 *(LBPOA )* supports our conclusion. There, our high court considered a public records act request for the identities of police officers involved in various shootings. *(Id. at p. 71, 172 Cal.Rptr.3d 56, 325 P.3d 460.)* The California Supreme Court concluded the information was not covered by the *Pitchess* statutes, explaining: “Although the *Pitchess* statutes limit public access to personnel records [citation], including officer names if they are linked to information in personnel records [citation], many records routinely maintained by law enforcement agencies are not personnel records. For example, the information contained in
the initial incident reports of an on-duty shooting are typically not ‘personnel records’ as that term is defined in ... section 832.8. It may be true that such shootings are routinely investigated by the employing agency, resulting eventually in some sort of officer appraisal or discipline. **But only the records generated in connection with that appraisal or discipline would come within the statutory definition of personnel records [citation.]** We do not read the phrase ‘records relating to ... [¶] ... [¶] ... [e]mployee ... appraisal[ ] or discipline’ [citation] so broadly as to include every record that might be considered for purposes of an officer's appraisal or discipline, for such a broad reading of the statute would sweep virtually all law enforcement records into the protected category of ‘personnel records' [citation].” (Ibid .)

**Here as in LBPOA, the City has not demonstrated the arrest video was “generated in connection” with Sergeant Laird’s appraisal or discipline.**

In this case, the appropriate portion of Penal Code 832.8 defining a personnel record is (a)(5) “Complaints, or investigations of complaints, concerning an event or transaction in which he or she participated, or which he or she perceived, and pertaining to the manner in which he or she performed his or her duties.” Many of the records withheld/redacted were not generated in connection with the complaint or the investigation of the complaint. Therefore, DPA unlawfully redacted at least the following documents in record 0658-08:

1. Starting on Bates #000163, a public court case document has been redacted. This document was not submitted under seal and does not constitute a police officer personnel record and therefore is not subject to Penal Code 832.7(a) restrictions. All redactions are challenged. Moreover the POBRA and CI redactions therein cannot even apply to such a record. In fact, by performing a PACER and Internet search, I identified the improperly redacted document as Case 4:09-cv-00174-PJH, Document 29, which is completely publicly available on the N.D. Cal's public court website. The court’s record is attached as Exhibit B. That analysis indicates that the purportedly confidential identity of Charles Haynes is also not actually confidential. Furthermore, such a record is not subject at all to the Penal Code 832.7(a) restrictions because the court document was not created by the City in connection with the complaint. The document was created by the City's legal opponent’s attorney, Mr. Burris. It cannot possibly be part of the City's police personnel records.

2. Incident report on Bates #000060 and 61. Such incident reports are explicitly called out by the Supreme Court in Long Beach. The incident report number cannot be redacted. The name of the person arrested cannot be redacted (Gov Code 6254(f)). The two "POBRA"-keyed redactions are invalid because the POBRA does not in fact include incident reports pursuant to Long Beach. Whatever is behind those two redactions was not generated in connection with the complaint - it was generated for
the arrest which is just normal police business and not a police personnel record.

3. The “Unsealed Portion” of the officer’s deposition on Bates #000305 through #000597. All redactions are challenged since these records are unsealed and publicly available. Moreover, the CI and POBRA-keyed redactions are challenged because those portions of the Penal Code do not apply to this record, which was created by an outside party as part of a civil suit not generated by the City’s complaint investigation process.

III. Audio and video recordings must be produced and are not exempt due to cost of production

The DPA has withheld video recordings (instead producing some still photographs) and withheld audio recordings (instead producing some transcripts). DPA has no authority to produce only a different set of records because it is cheaper to do so - that justification does not comply with SFAC 67.27 because it does not constitute an exemption. Per local law and the state Supreme Court, the City must bear the entire cost of properly redacting the records (Admin Code 67.26; Natl Lawyers Guild v City of Hayward (2020)) and may charge me solely the physical cost of a copy, which is $0 since the records are being provided online via NextRequest. Furthermore, videos of the incident are not even subject to the limited disclosure requirements of Penal Code 832.7, because such video footage does not constitute a police personnel record (unless it is a video-taped interview of the officers during the complaint process), because it could not possibly have been generated as part of the investigation into the officer (see Eureka and LBPOA above).

IV. Indices have been withheld for unknown reasons.

"Several indices" were withheld. It is unclear what this refers to and no legal justification for withholding was given. They must be produced.

Sincerely,

Anonymous
arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com
EXHIBIT A

Portions of 0658-08 release to me on Feb 12, 2021
Public Records Release

The Department of Police Accountability ("DPA") is producing records in response to a public records request made under California Penal Code § 832.7.

The responsive records in this production include documents related to SF DPA Case No. 0658-08. The case files are available to view or download on https://sfdpa.nextrequest.com/requests/20-5 in a folder labeled "0658-08."

As a preliminary matter, some of the above referenced file contains allegations of misconduct that are not subject to disclosure. Penal Code § 832.7 requires that peace officer personnel files be confidential except for four categories: (1) officer involved shootings, (2) uses of force that cause great bodily harm, (3) sustained findings of sexual assault, or (4) sustained findings of dishonesty. If a file therefore qualifies for disclosure under one of those four categories but also contains additional, unrelated misconduct, the unrelated conduct remains confidential pursuant to Penal Code § 832.7 and is redacted.

Redactions have been made to these records pursuant to the following exemptions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Redaction Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 PII</td>
<td>Personally Identifiable Information. California Penal Code § 832.7(b)(5)(A). Government Code 6254.3 §§ (a), (b)(1). Personal data or information, such as a home address, telephone number, or identities of family members, other than the names and work-related information of peace and custodial officers. Personal employee information such as social security numbers, birth dates, personal email addresses, and confidential law enforcement identification numbers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ID</td>
<td>Identity of Complainants and Witnesses. California Penal Code § 832.7(b)(5)(B); SF Admin. Code §§ 67.24(d)(1), (3) – To preserve the anonymity of complainants, witnesses, and confidential sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 CI</td>
<td>Confidential Information. California Penal Code § 832.7(b)(5)(C). Welfare and Institutions Code § 5328. To protect confidential medical, financial, or other information of which disclosure is specifically prohibited by federal law or would cause an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy that clearly outweighs the strong public interest in records about misconduct and serious use of force by peace officers and custodial officers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 SD</td>
<td>Significant Danger. California Penal Code § 832.7(b)(5)(D) – Disclosure of the record would pose a significant danger to the physical safety of the peace officer, custodial officer, or another person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 POBRA (also NDCM)</td>
<td>Public Safety Officers Procedural Bill of Rights Act. California Penal Code § 832.7(a) - Except as provided in subdivision (b), the personnel records of peace officers and custodial officers and records maintained by any state or local agency pursuant to Section 832.5, or information obtained from these records, are confidential and shall not be disclosed in any criminal or civil proceeding except by discovery pursuant to Sections 1043 and 1046 of the Evidence Code.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>PIND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>CSD/CLETS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>LEI/M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>CCP129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>E1040</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note that the DPA has elected to produce transcripts in lieu of audio recordings. The DPA has taken this approach because redacting and producing audio files is time consuming and expensive. If you remain interested in certain recorded materials after reviewing the transcripts, please identify the materials and the DPA will provide you with a cost sheet for reproducing the recordings. You may then select which recordings you would like produced.

Please note that the DPA has elected to produce still images in lieu video recordings. The DPA has taken this approach because redacting and producing video files is time consuming and expensive. If you remain interested in certain recorded materials after reviewing the images, please identify the materials and the DPA will provide you with a cost sheet for reproducing the recordings. You may then select which recordings you would like produced.

Please note that several indexes were withheld for expediency purposes and are available upon request.

Please note that this is the first in a series of productions related to this case.
EXHIBIT B

Public court record through California Northern District federal court
I. INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff Charles Haynes opposes Defendants’ Motion for Partial Summary Judgment of his claim of civil rights violations pursuant to 42 U.S.C. section 1983, and also alleging state law causes of action. This Court should reject Defendants Motion for Partial Summary Judgment as it relies upon this Court resolving disputed material factual questions in favor of the Defendants.

In conjunction with this Opposition, Plaintiff has filed the Declaration of Benjamin Nisenbaum (hereinafter cited as the “Nisenbaum Declaration”), which includes: excerpts of the
Deposition testimony of Plaintiff Haynes, percipient witness Kellen Greathouse, and Defendant Officer Paulo Morgado, as well an authenticated videotape of the subject-incident, Defendant Morgado’s police report of the subject incident, multiple other complaints and civil dockets of other lawsuits alleging civil rights violations committed by members of the San Francisco Police Department, and the Stipulation of the Parties for Purposes of the Motion for Partial Summary Judgment—references to which are filed under seal. In addition, Plaintiff asks the Court to take judicial notice of pleadings and orders filed in the other lawsuits alleging civil rights violations against other San Francisco Police Department members that are under seal.
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MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

IV. STATEMENT OF FACTS

On March 8, 2008, Plaintiff Charles Haynes assisted his friend, Kellen Greathouse, a DJ, to provide music at a party held at Zeke’s nightclub in San Francisco. (See Deposition Testimony of Charles Haynes 56:23, 63:21-64:5, attached as Exhibit A to the Nisenbaum Declaration, hereinafter cited as “Haynes Depo”.) Plaintiff Haynes is an MC and served as a “hype man” and performed crowd control by speaking to the partygoers, while Mr. Greenhouse, actually played the music. (Haynes Depo at 72:12-14) Through the course of the night, Plaintiff Haynes recalled drinking two (and possibly a third) alcoholic drinks. (Haynes Depo at 73:18-23.) Plaintiff Haynes was not drunk, and did not feel “buzzed” or any other effects of alcohol upon consuming the drinks. (Haynes Depo at 77:21-78:6.)

Between approximately 1 a.m. and 2 a.m., after the party ended, Plaintiff Haynes crossed the street directly in front of the nightclub, walked a woman partially to her car, and then headed back to the nightclub. (Haynes Depo at 56:23, 82:9-15.) As Plaintiff Haynes approached the crosswalk, he observed two police officers walking towards him. (Haynes Depo at 91:6, 92:3.) Plaintiff Haynes and the officers walked past each other while in the crosswalk and there was no physical contact between him and the officers. (Haynes Depo at 93:3-10, 94:9-18.) As Plaintiff Haynes passed the officers, Defendant San Francisco Police Officer Paulo Morgado, who was the officer nearest him and was only a few feet away, told Plaintiff, “to get off the fucking street, boy.” (Haynes Depo at 97:2-98:19.) Plaintiff Haynes heard Defendant Morgado’s comment very clearly, was instantly upset and offended and reacted by saying, “fucking faggot.” (Haynes Depo at 99:7-23, 100:7-101:11.) Plaintiff Haynes then continued to walk across the street and approached the nightclub. (Haynes Depo at 102:15, 103:1-4.)

Defendant Morgado turned to follow Plaintiff Haynes and yelled and cursed at him as approached. (Haynes Depo at 103:6-14.) When Plaintiff Haynes reached the entrance of the nightclub he turned to face Defendant Morgado who then shoved him in his chest causing the Plaintiff to stumble backwards, hit the wall behind him and fall to the ground. (Haynes Depo at 107:3-20.) Plaintiff hit the back of his head, arms and back against the wall, fell and landed on his
bottom and stood back up. (Haynes Depo at 108:2-22.) During this time Defendant Morgado continue to yell at and berate Plaintiff Haynes, including calling him a “piece of shit.” (Haynes Depo at 110:12-25.) Plaintiff suffered a scrape to his hand and bump on the back of head as well as some emotional consequences as a result of this incident. (Haynes Depo at 116:3, 119:19-120:16.) Defendant Morgado arrested Plaintiff without cause to believe Plaintiff had committed any crime whatsoever, and instead falsely claimed that Plaintiff was drunk and a danger to himself. (See Deposition Testimony of Paulo Morgado 195:6-12, 216:12-18, attached as Exhibit B to the Nisenbaum Declaration, hereinafter cited as “Morgado Depo.”)

Just as Plaintiff Haynes walked past the officers, Mr. Greathouse had begun videotaping his helpers load his DJ equipment and captured the entire incident between Plaintiff Haynes and Defendant Morgado on video.¹ (See Deposition Testimony of Kellen Greathouse 22:1-8, attached as Exhibit C to the Nisenbaum Declaration, hereinafter cited as “Greathouse Depo.”) Mr. Greathouse provided the original tape of the incident to San Francisco Police investigators upon their request. (Greathouse Depo at 20:24-21:10, 27:14-18.)

V. ARGUMENT

A. STANDARD FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

Summary judgment is proper when the “pleadings, depositions, answers to interrogatories, and admissions on file, together with affidavits, if any, show that there is no genuine issue as to any material fact and that the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law.” Fed.R.Civ.P. §56(c). Material facts are those which may affect the outcome of the case. Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 447 U.S. 242, 248 (1986). A dispute as to a material fact is “genuine” if there is sufficient evidence for a reasonable trier of fact to return a verdict for the nonmoving party. Id. at pp. 248-249.

When considering a motion for summary judgment, the court may not weigh disputed evidence with respect to a disputed material fact, or make credibility determinations, and is required

¹ Plaintiff has attached an authenticated video of the subject-incident as Exhibit D to the Nisenbaum Declaration (hereinafter referred to as Exhibit C). Contrary to Defendants’ claim and as discussed infra, Plaintiff submits that the video footage of the arrest is relevant to Plaintiff’s Monell claim against Defendant City. The video footage stands in stark contrast to the representations Defendant Morgado made in his incident report and is illustrative of the type of dishonesty that he routinely employs.
to draw all inferences in a light most favorable to the non-moving party. *Nelson v. City of Davis*, 571 F.3d 924, 928-929 (9th Cir 2009). In addition, the Court should not grant summary judgment where there are undisputed facts which reasonably lend themselves to different inferences. *Sankovich v. Life Ins. Co. of N. Am.* 638 F.2d 136 (9th Cir. 1981). The court must evaluate the evidence and reasonable inferences to determine whether there is sufficient probative evidence to permit “a finding in favor of the opposing party based on more than mere speculation, conjecture, or fantasy.” *O.S.C. Corp. v. Apple Computer, Inc.*, 792 F.2d 1464, 1466-1467 (9th Cir. 1986), quoting *Barnes v. Arden Mayfair, Inc.*, 759 F.2d 676, 681 (9th Cir. 1985).

A principal purpose of the summary judgment procedure is to identify and dispose of factually unsupported claims. *Celotex Corp. v. Catrett*, 477 U.S. 317, 323-24 (1986). The party seeking summary judgment bears the initial burden of identifying those portions of the pleadings, discovery, and affidavits which demonstrate the absence of a genuine issue of material fact. *Celotex, supra*, at p. 323. Where the moving party will have the burden of proof on an issue at trial, it must affirmatively demonstrate that no reasonable trier of fact could find other than for the moving party. *Id.; Southern California Gas Co. v. City of Santa Ana*, 336 F.3d 885, 888 (9th Cir. 2003). Once the moving party meets this initial burden, the nonmoving party must go beyond the pleadings and by its own evidence “set forth specific facts showing that there is a genuine issue for trial.” Fed.R.Civ.P. 56(e). The nonmoving party must “identify with reasonable particularity the evidence that precludes summary judgment.” *Keenan v. Allan*, 91 F.3d 1275, 1279 (9th Cir.1996) (quoting *Richards v. Combined Ins. Co.*, 55 F.3d 247, 251 (7th Cir.1995)).

**B. DEFENDANT CITY’S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT MUST FAIL**

Defendants claim that Plaintiff lacks evidence to prove that Defendant City fails to effectively monitor its officers’ conduct and to address officer conduct appropriately and urges that Plaintiff’s *Monell* claim must fail. Plaintiff maintains that Defendant City is liable pursuant to *Monell v. Department of Social Services*, 436 U.S. 658 (1978).
Factual Background

After the subject-incident Defendant Morgado prepared an incident report including the following narrative:

“On the above date and time, Ofc. Forneris #2106 and I responded to 3rd St./Brannan for a report of shot fired. Upon arrival, we saw a large crowd of unknown people. When trying to disperse the crowd, I was approached by (B) Haynes in the middle of the crosswalk at 3rd St./Brannan.

Haynes said something to me that I could not understand so I asked him what he needed. At that time, Haynes said, “Fuck you little bitch.” I then told Haynes to get on the sidewalk for his safety so that he would not get hit by passing vehicles. Haynes said, “Fuck you little bitch.” While talking to Haynes I could smell a strong odor of alcoholic beverage on his breath. It should be noted that Haynes had slurred speech and was very agitated (sic). It was unclear what else he had said to me because he appeared to be extremely intoxicated. I then tried to detain Haynes for his own safety for fear that he would be struck by passing vehicles. Haynes then walked away back towards the sidewalk. I told Haynes to stop several times at which point he turned around and came towards me in an aggressive manner. In an attempt to detain Haynes I pushed Haynes up against a wall where I then took him into custody.

Haynes was booked at CJ9 for 647(f) PC RWS with the approval of Sgt. Roualdes #1551.”

(See San Francisco Police Department incident report no. 080-219-447, dated 3/1/08, attached to Nisenbaum Declaration as Exhibit E, hereinafter cited as “Incident Report.”) This representation of the subject-incident stands in stark contrast to the video footage of Plaintiff Haynes’ arrest which shows that there was no repeated back and forth between Plaintiff Haynes and Defendant Morgado, that Plaintiff Haynes’ speech was not slurred, that he was not extremely agitated but calm, and that there was no imminent traffic danger. (See Incident Report, narrative portion.)

Plaintiff alleges that Defendant Morgado also made false statements in the incident report and during his deposition testimony pertaining to the wrongful death of Asa Sullivan which occurred on June 6, 2006 at 2 Garces Drive in San Francisco, CA. (See Espinosa, et al. v. City and County of San Francisco, et al. Northern District case no. C 06 04686 JSW attached as Exhibit F to the Nisenbaum Declaration.) In that case, Defendant Morgado claimed security guards authorized his warrantless entry into a residence after they confirmed with property management that the owners on the lease had moved out the previous weekend. However, the evidence revealed that the property management
told the security guards that the unit was still rented as the owners had given notice but had not yet moved out of the apartment, and the security guards told Defendant Morgado that the unit was still rented and no one had moved out; and that Defendant Morgado never sought or received consent to search the property. (See Order Re Parties’ Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment at 7:7-14, Document 175 in Espinosa, et al. v. City and County of San Francisco, et al. case no. C 06 04686 JSW, attached to the Nisenbaum Declaration as Exhibit G.)

In James Henry Washburn, Jr. v. San Francisco Police Officers Paulo Morgado, et al. USDC Northern District Case No. C 03 02973 JSW (MEJ), Defendant Morgado was accused of yelling at a man “You bitch!” and using excessive force and falsely arresting the man. Defendant Morgado claimed in his incident report that Mr. Washburn pulled and broke his little finger which caused Mr. Washburn to face felony charges of battery on an officer. However, Defendant Morgado admitted in the preliminary hearing in that case, that he had concealed an earlier injury to the same finger, and that his punching Mr. Washburn may have caused the fracture to his finger. (See Reporter’s Transcript of Proceedings (Preliminary Hearing Transcript), People v. James Washburn, Court No. 2047359 at 26:23-28:28, 32:22-33:3, attached to Nisenbaum Declaration as Exhibit H, hereinafter cited as “Preliminary Hearing.”)

Moreover, Plaintiff alleges that on numerous occasions other members of the San Francisco Police Department have used false claims of public intoxication as a cover for arresting people without probable cause to arrest. Notably, several lawsuits filed against San Francisco Police Department Officer Jesse Serna have alleged that Officer Serna falsely claimed that people he arrested and/or used force against were publicly intoxicated in violation of Penal Code section 647(f) (see, e.g., Marco Maestrini v. City and County of San Francisco, Jesse Serna, et al. Northern District case no. C 07 2941 PJH, among many other cases) which is similar to underlying facts of the subject-incident.

According to the Stipulation of the Parties for Purposes of the Motion for Partial Summary Judgment, FILED UNDER SEAL (See Stipulation of Case 4:09-cv-00174-PJH Document 29 Filed 06/16/10 Page 9 of 17)
Legal Analysis

Pursuant to Monell v. Department of Social Services, supra, “Congress did not intend for municipalities to be held liable unless action pursuant to official municipal policy of some nature cause a constitutional tort.” Id. at p. 691. In order to establish that Defendants City and Chief Fong are liable, Plaintiff must show that he: “(1) possessed a constitutional right of which he was deprived; (2) that the County had a policy; (3) that the policy ‘amounts to deliberate indifference’ to the constitutional right; and (4) that the policy is the ‘moving force behind the constitutional violation.’” Anderson v. Warner, 451 F.3d 1063, 1070 (9th Cir.2006) (quoting Oviatt v. Pearce, 954 F.2d 1470, 1474 (9th Cir.1992) (in turn quoting City of Canton v. Harris, 489 U.S. 378, 389-91 (1989)). “There also must be a ‘direct causal link’ between the policy or custom and the injury,” and Plaintiff “must be able to demonstrate that the injury resulted from a ‘permanent and well settled practice.’” (Ibid. (quoting McDade v. West, 223 F.3d 1135, 1141 (9th Cir.2000) (internal quotations omitted)). A municipality may not be held liable under Section 1983 where no injury or constitutional violation has occurred. Jackson v. City of Bremerton, 268 F.3d 646, 653 (9th Cir.2001). The failure to train or supervise may give rise to a “policy or custom” sufficient to impose liability on the City. City of Canton, supra, 489 U.S. at 389-90.

A plaintiff may prove the existence of a custom or informal policy with evidence of repeated constitutional violations for which the errant municipal officials were not discharged or reprimanded. See Gillette v. Delmore, 979 F.2d 1342, 1348 (9th Cir. 1992); Nadell v. Las Vegas Metro Police Dept., 979 F.3d 924, 930 (9th Cir. 2001) (finding no municipal liability because there was no evidence at trial establishing that the use of excessive force was a formal policy, that there was a widespread practice of the police department or that previous violations had occurred for which there was no reprimand or discharge); Gomez v. Vernon, 255 F.3d 1118, 1127 (9th Cir. 2001) (holding that
correctional department administrators may not take “blind-eye” approach and that condoning unconstitutional acts by the failure to investigate or correct the repeated violations constitutes a policy or custom under *Monell*). In *Fiacco v. City of Rensselaer, N.Y.*, 783 F.2d 319, 328 (Cir. 2nd 1986), the Second Circuit Court stated:

We have no doubt that, in the context of a theory that the City negligently supervised its officers in their use of force, the evidence that a large number of claims of police brutality had been made by other persons against the City, together with evidence as to the City’s treatment of these claims, was relevant. Whether or not the claims had validity, the very assertion of a number of such claims put the City of notice that there was a possibility that its police officers had used excessive force. The City’s knowledge of these allegations, and the nature and extent of its efforts to investigate and record the claims were pertinent to Fiacco’s contention that the City had a policy of nonsupervision of its policemen that reflected a deliberate indifference to their use of excessive force. **The fact that none of the claims had yet been adjudicated in favor of the claimant was not material; if the City’s efforts to evaluate the claims were so superficial as to suggest that its official attitude was one of indifference to the truth of the claim, such an attitude would bespeak an indifference to the rights asserted in those claims.**… Proof that other claims were met with indifference for their truth may be one way of satisfying the plaintiffs’ burden.

The Ninth Circuit stated in *Henry v. County of Shasta*, 132 F.3d 512, 519 (9th Cir. 1997), that when a municipality “turn[s] a blind eye to severe violations of inmates’ constitutional rights—despite having received notice of such violations—a rational fact finder may properly infer the existence of a previous policy or custom of deliberate indifference.”

Plaintiff asserts that the focus of the Defendant City’s system of review of its officers’ behavior focuses on excessive force and does not focus on dishonesty and perjury in incident reports.

FILED UNDER SEAL (See Stipulation at ¶5.)

(See Preliminary Hearing Transcript at 28:15-28.) FILED UNDER SEAL (See Morgado Depo at 114:4-11.)
Given Defendant Morgado’s brazen and audacious misrepresentations in the incident report of the subject-incident and history of dishonesty and penchant for providing perjuries and false testimony under oath, a reasonable fact finder can determine that it is unreasonable for Defendant City to have never disciplined this officer on these types of offenses. Moreover, a reasonable fact finder may conclude that Defendant City has a policy or custom of authorizing or permitting false incident reporting by its officers. Defendant City cannot claim that it was unaware of Defendant Morgado’s penchant for misrepresenting, exaggerating, and/or outright falsifying statements to justify unlawful arrests or unlawful courses of action, such as the warrantless entry leading to the killing of Asa Sullivan, as some of these abuses have been exposed through other litigation.

Strikingly, Defendant Morgado testified in deposition that no investigating agent of the San Francisco Police Department has questioned the credibility of his statements concerning what information security guards either did (according to Morgado) or did not (according to the security guards) provide him leading to the warrantless entry into 2 Garces Drive.

This Court must reject Defendants’ argument on this point.

C. PLAINTIFF’S CLAIMS PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA CIVIL CODE ARE PROPERLY ADVANCED, SUPPORTED BY THE EVIDENCE AND MUST GO FORWARD

    Defendants also contend that they are entitled to judgment as a matter of law as to Plaintiff’s claims of violation of California Civil Code sections 51.7 and 52.1, claiming that these claims are not supported by the evidence. Defendants are mistaken.

    1. California Civil Code Section 51.7

        Defendants argue that Plaintiff has no evidence to support the claim that Officer Morgado’s actions against Plaintiff were motivated by racial animus. Defendants are mistaken. The record reveals that the underlying impetus for the amount of force used and animus directed at and ultimately the false arrest of Plaintiff Haynes was due to his race as of an African American Man.

        California Civil Code section 51.7 protects against the use of “violence, or intimidation by threat of violence, committed against their persons or property. . . on account of” a protected
characteristic. Cal. Civil Code § 51.7(a). The characteristics protected by Civil Code section 51.7 include those characteristics identified under Civil Code section 51(b), which states: “All persons within the jurisdiction of this state are free and equal, and no matter what their sex, race, color, religion, ancestry, national origin, disability, medical condition, marital status, or sexual orientation are entitled to the full and equal accommodations, advantages, facilities, privileges, or services in all business establishments of every kind whatsoever.” (Emphasis added.)

Here, Plaintiff is readily recognizable as an African American man. Without provocation or reason, Defendant Morgado told him, “to get out of the fucking street, boy?” (See Haynes Depo at 97:2-7.) The term “boy” has a long and commonly-known history of being a racial epithet—especially when uttered, as under these circumstances, by a Caucasian law enforcement officer to a fully grown and mature black man. A reasonable finder of fact can determine that by making this remark, Defendant Morgado invoked the historic, most offensive and racially charged usage of the term “boy.” Moreover, given that Defendant Morgado’s use of this epithet was completely unprovoked, a reasonable finder of fact can also determine that Plaintiff’s race was the motivating reason for defendant use of the term and resulting use of excessive force on and false arrest of Plaintiff Haynes.

Defendants’ claim that Officer Morgado arrested Plaintiff Haynes due to his comment “fucking faggot” is disingenuous and is a dizzying attempt to split hairs. According to Plaintiff Haynes, as he passed the two officers in the crosswalk, Defendant Morgado for no reason at all told him to “get out of the fucking street, boy,” and Plaintiff Haynes instinctively and without thinking reacted by calling Defendant Morgado a “fucking faggot.” (Haynes Depo at 100:7-17) As Plaintiff Haynes testified and the videotape reveals, he did not act aggressively toward the Defendant officer. In addition, according to Defendant Morgado he did not arrest Plaintiff Haynes because of his comment but rather because Plaintiff was obviously intoxicated and was a danger to himself and others. Indeed, Defendant Morgado claimed to not be fazed by Plaintiff Haynes’ comment as he used insults being hurled at him. (Morgado Depo at 203:2-10.) Officer Morgado also testified that what Plaintiff said to him was not a basis to arrest him. (Morgado Depo at 236:23-237:9.)
Clearly, the evidence supports Plaintiff’s claims of violation of California Civil Code section 51.7 based on racial discrimination.

2. California Civil Code section 52.1

Defendants argue that Plaintiff’s claim under California Civil Code section 52.1 should fail because there is no evidence that Defendant Morgado’s use of force was intended to interfere with a separate right. In so arguing, Defendants reveal a mistaken understanding of the requirements of the statute; as such, this argument must be rejected.

Citing Jones v. Kmart Corp., 17 Cal.4th 329, 334 (1998), Defendants argue that California Civil Code section 52.1 violations require that Plaintiff show “both ‘threats, intimidation and coercion’ and an interference or attempted interference with a constitutional right,” and Plaintiff, somehow, impermissibly conflates these separate elements into one. California Civil Code section 52.1 provides for the institution of a civil action against a person who “interferes by threats, intimidation, or coercion, or attempt to interfere by threats, intimidation, or coercion, with the exercise or enjoyment by any individual . . . of rights secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or . . . of this state.” Defendants’ reliance on Jones is misplaced here, because the Jones Court found that the plaintiffs failed to prove a California Civil Code section 52.1 claim because there was no state action, and thus, there was no attempted or completed interference with a constitutional right. Jones, supra, at pp. 333-34. In addition, Defendants’ discourse on CACI No. 3025, while interesting, is not persuasive, as jury instruction are no substitute for statutory and case law directly on point as Plaintiff presents here. The clear language of California Civil Code section 52.1 is that the “threats, intimidation, or coercion” refers to the manner in which the violation is committed.

To establish a claim under California Civil Code section 52.1, a plaintiff needs to establish that the defendants “interfered with the plaintiff[‘s] constitutional rights by the requisite threats, intimidation, or coercion.” Austin v. Escondido Union School Dist., 149 Cal.App.4th 869, 882 (2007). The word “interferes” under this statute means “violates.” Id. at p. 883. “The essence of [this] claim is that the defendant, by the specified improper means (i.e., “threats, intimidation or coercion”), tried to or did prevent the plaintiff from doing something that he or she had the right to do under the law or
force the plaintiff to do something that he or she was not required to do under the law.” Ibid. Use of law enforcement authority to effectuate a seizure and a search can constitute interference by “threats, interference, or coercion” if the police officer lacked a justification to seize and search a person. Cole v. Doe 1 thru 2 Officers of City of Emeryville Police Dept., 387 F.Supp.2d 1084, 1102-1103 (N.D. Cal. 2005).

Here, Defendant Morgado used excessive force by pushing and shoving Plaintiff Haynes, used excessive force to violate Plaintiff’s First Amendment rights and intimidate him from calling Defendant Morgado an insulting name (although it was only in response to Morgado’s use of a racially charged epithet), and ultimately to affect the false arrest of Plaintiff.

Defendants are mistaken that Plaintiff Haynes comment is not protected by the guarantees of the First Amendment right to free speech. The First Amendment to the United States Constitution protects the rights of citizens to verbally oppose and even challenge police action so long as that challenge does not involve a threat or fighting words. Gulliford v. Pierce County, 136 F.3d 1345, 1349 (9th Cir. 1998) (citing City of Houston, Texas v. Hill, 482 U.S. 451, 461-63, 107 S.Ct. 2502, 2509-11, 96 L.Ed.2d 398 (1987)(internal quotations omitted)(finding “[t]he Supreme Court has consistently held that the First Amendment protects verbal criticism, challenges, and profanity directed at police officers unless the speech is “‘shown likely to produce a clear and present danger of a serious substantive evil that rises far above public inconvenience, annoyance or unrest.’”) This protection includes opprobrious language and gestures. See Guillford, supra, at p. 1349 (holding that yelling “…get the fuck off the island.” Did not constitute fighting words and did not rise to the level of probable cause for arrest); Duran v. City of Douglas, Arizona, 904 F.2d 1372, 1374-75 (9th Cir. 1990) (finding that yelling obscenities and making obscene gestures did not constitute fighting words). In U.S. v. Poocha, 259 F.3d 1077, 1082 (9th Cir. 2001), the Ninth Circuit Court found that “[c]riticism of the police, profane or otherwise, is not a crime,” and determined that “speech is not stripped of its constitutional protection simply because it is accompanied by [] aggressive gestures….”

Here, Plaintiff Haynes reacted to Defendant Morgado’s racial insult by making his comment and continuing to walk away. Plaintiff was not aggressive or confrontational but responsive to being
insulted by Defendant Morgado. Notably, he did not yell the insult, he merely spoke it. (Morgado Depo at 195:3-4; Haynes Depo at 100:23.) Defendant Officer Morgado had insulted him first, and Plaintiff merely responded in a calm and controlled manner, and then walked away, toward the sidewalk as Defendant Morgado had ordered him to do. The exchange was over from Plaintiff’s perspective. As the Ninth Circuit rationalized, “while police, no less than anyone else, may resent having obscene words and gestures directed at them, they may not exercise the awesome power at their disposal to punish individuals for conduct that is not merely lawful, but protected by the First Amendment.” Duran, supra, 904 F.2d at 1378. Defendant Morgado then charged at, berated, shoved and injured, and ultimately falsely arrested Plaintiff Haynes merely because of something he mistakenly thought Plaintiff had said (a different insult, “Little Bitch” which Morgado might have taken to reference his height. Officer Morgado is 5’7”). As shown on video, Plaintiff is significantly shorter than Officer Morgado. Plaintiff in fact is 5’00”. (See Morgado Depo at 182:7-10, 183:22-23.)

As such, Defendants’ arguments must fail and this issue should be decided by the trier of fact.
VI. CONCLUSION

Defendants’ Motion for Partial Summary Judgment should be denied. This Court should reject the Defendants’ argument that Plaintiff’s causes of action only serve to obfuscate the legal issues for the trier of fact. Plaintiff’s claims are properly pleaded and supported by the evidence and should go forward.

Dated: June 16, 2010

The Law Offices of John L. Burris

/s/ Benjamin Nisenbaum
Benjamin Nisenbaum
Attorney for Plaintiffs
Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:

**Supervisor of Records:** This is a 67.21(d) petition against DPA for a written determination that records or parts thereof are public and an order for their disclosure.

**SOTF:** DPA has, now on February 12, 2021, appeared to start producing redaction keys on a single record. These keys and written justifications and withholdings however are still not compliant with the law.

1. Redaction justifications and keys are not compliant
2. Records not generated as part of the complaint investigation but physically located in the complaint file must not use PC 832 justifications as they are not police personnel records under *Eureka* and *LBPOA*
3. Audio and video records must be produced
4. Indices (whatever that means) must be produced

The full petition and exhibits are attached (PART 1 of 2 due to attachment size. You need both parts).

**NOTE:** 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous
This is a distinct Supervisor of Records 67.21(d) petition regarding DPA's production of case 0164-16; please determine in writing the information or parts thereof are public and order them disclosed. No redaction key was provided. However, the following written justification was provided:

"The DPA has redacted graphic photographs and autopsy reports of decedent, Luis Demeterio Gongora. The DPA has concluded that the privacy of Mr. Gongora's family outweighs the public's interest in seeing graphic photographs and autopsy reports. If you obtain a notarized release from Mr. Gongora's parents to release the photographs and/or autopsy reports, we will do so."

Contrary to the requirements of SF Admin Code 67.27, there is no legal citation nor a court ruling that would create civil liability for the City. What court ruling allows a decedent's parents to control access to public records when the decedent was not a minor at the time of death which are not exempt under a specific law (Marsh v. County of San Diego)? Mr. Gongora's parents have no authority over what the City must release. This condition is stated nowhere in the CPRA or SB 1421 or Sunshine Ordinance. The DPA has simply invented its own legal justifications.

Some of these records may in fact be exempt under CCP sec 129 but ONLY the portions which are "photograph, negative, or print, including instant photographs and video recordings, of the body, or any portion of the body, of a deceased person, taken by or for the coroner at the scene of death or in the course of a post mortem examination or autopsy." That does not include all gruesome photographs, nor all autopsy report information. Pursuant to Prop 59, the City cannot broaden this exemption beyond exactly what it says. Photos or bodycam footage taken by the SFPD that are not "for the coroner" are not exempt.

**NOTE:** 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous
Sgt. Andraychak:
I've already spoken to Carmody's attorneys re: Herrera's release of similar documents without any redactions; I am not sure how that affects this records request.
But what about the rest of the record without his id number? Why isn't that being provided to me? You can't blame Carmody for SFPD not complying with its own CPRA requirements.

Supervisor of Records Herrera:
This is a 67.21(d) petition by 84031-44127205@requests.muckrock.com for the entire unredacted record known as P00995_f2_Redacted which was disclosed by SFPD on Jan 16, 2020 and then requested retracted on Aug 5, 2020 by the SFPD when I informed them there was an id number in it. It is now Feb 18, 2021. Please determine in writing that some or all of the record is public and order it disclosed. I already have parts of similar records from non-SFPD sources and will verify any alleged withholdings by corroborating the records.

NOTE: 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

------ Original Message ------
On Thursday, February 18th, 2021 at 12:07 PM, Andraychak, Michael (POL) <michael.andraychak@sfgov.org> wrote:

Hello,

Thank you for the email. I am working on this. I also reached out to Mr. Carmody and explained the situation.

Best,

Michael Andraychak #457
OIC/Sergeant of Police
Public Information Officer
Media Relations Unit
San Francisco Police Department
1245 - 3rd Street, 6th Floor
Its been over a month....

NOTE: 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

Sent from ProtonMail Mobile

On Mon, Jan 11, 2021 at 4:44 PM, Andraychak, Michael (POL) <michael.andraychak@sfgov.org> wrote:

Hi,

I'm reviewing the document and will also need to consult with our Legal Division and City Atty.

Sorry,
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake and delete this e-mail from your system. If you are not the intended recipient you are notified that disclosing, copying, distributing or taking any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited.

From: Anonymous <arecordrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, January 10, 2021 1:38 PM
To: Andraychak, Michael (POL) <michael.andraychak@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>
Subject: Fw: Re: Privacy rights failure by Herrera re: Bryan Carmody Warrants - Complaint

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.
Buta, Odaya (CAT)

From: 105574-62708219@requests.muckrock.com
Sent: Tuesday, February 23, 2021 7:35 PM
To: Supervisor Records (CAT)
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request #P020722-120720
Attachments: P20722_-_2021.02.23_sfpd_response201.pdf

San Francisco Police Department
PRA Office
1245 3rd Street
SF, CA 94158

February 23, 2021

This is a follow up to request number P020722-120720:

Supervisor of Records,

Sfpd has failed to comply with my request from this email described in the attached exhibit.

They have unreasonably delayed any response, and have also not complied with Gov Code 6253c. There is one 14 day extension they can notice me with, within 10 days. Not infinite 14 day extensions.

Under 67.21d please determine the requested records or parts thereof are public and order then disclosed.

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 105574-62708219@requests.muckrock.com
%3Fnext%3D%252Faccounts%2Fagency_login%2Fsan-francisco-police-department-367%252Ftext-and-chat-messages-immediate-disclosure-request-san-francisco-universal-search-sfpd-
105574%252Femail%252Dsupervisor.records%252D2021%252D02%252D23%252Dresponse201.pdf

Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 105574
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.

---
On Feb. 23, 2021:
Subject: Public Records Request :: P020722-120720
Attachments:
P20722_-_2021.02.23_sfpd_response.pdf

February 23, 2021 Via email 105574-62708219@requests.muckrock.com
San Francisco, CA
RE: Public Records Request, dated December 07, 2020, Reference # P020722-120720
Dear Anonymous:
In response to your request, please see attached document.
Thank you for your attention.
Sincerely,
Lieutenant R. Andrew Cox #287
Officer in Charge
Risk Management ‐ Legal Division
To monitor the progress or update this request please log into the SFPD Public Records Center.

--- Please respond above this line ---

Dear Anonymous,

In response to your request, please see attached document.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,

Lieutenant R. Andrew Cox #287
Officer in Charge
Risk Management ‐ Legal Division
To monitor the progress or update this request please log into the SFPD Public Records Center.

--- Please respond above this line ---

On Feb. 9, 2021:
Subject: Public Records Request :: P020722-120720
Attachments:
P20722_-_2021.02.09_sfpd_response.pdf

--- Please respond above this line ---

February 9, 2021 Via email 105574-62708219@requests.muckrock.com
San Francisco, CA
RE: Public Records Request, dated December 07, 2020, Reference # P020722-120720
Dear Anonymous:
In response to your request, please see attached document.
Thank you for your attention.
Sincerely,
Lieutenant R. Andrew Cox #287
Officer in Charge
Risk Management ‐ Legal Division
To monitor the progress or update this request please log into the SFPD Public Records Center.

--- Please respond above this line ---
February 09, 2021 Via email 105574-62708219@requests.muckrock.com
San Francisco, CA
RE: Public Records Request, dated December 07, 2020, Reference # P020722-120720
Dear Anonymous:
In response to your request, please see attached document.
Thank you for your attention.
Sincerely,
Lieutenant R. Andrew Cox #287
Officer in Charge
Risk Management - Legal Division
To monitor the progress or update this request please log into the SFPD Public Records Center.

January 26, 2021 Via email 105574-62708219@requests.muckrock.com
San Francisco, CA
RE: Public Records Request, dated December 07, 2020, Reference # P020722-120720
Dear Anonymous:
In response to your request, please see attached document.
If you have any questions, please contact Briseida Walton at 415-837-7180.
Thank you for your attention.
Sincerely,
Lieutenant R. Andrew Cox #287
Officer in Charge
Risk Management - Legal Division

To monitor the progress or update this request please log into the SFPD Public Records Center.

On Jan. 12, 2021:
Subject: Public Records Request :: P020722‐120720
Attachments:
P20722_-_2021.01.12_sfpd_response.pdf

---

January 12, 2021
Via email 105574‐62708219@requests.muckrock.com
RE: Public Records Request, dated December 07, 2020, Reference # P020722-120720

Dear Anonymous:
In response to your request, please see attached document.
Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,
Lieutenant R. Andrew Cox #287
Officer in Charge
Risk Management - Legal Division

---

--- Please respond above this line ---

January 12, 2021 via Email 105574-62708219@requests.muckrock.com
RE: Public Records Request, dated December 07, 2020, Reference # P020722-120720
Dear Anonymous:
In response to your request, please see attached document.
Thank you for your attention.
Sincerely,

--- Please respond above this line ---
On Dec. 29, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request #P020722-120720
Lt. Cox and SFPD: You will provide your response on Dec 31 - which is 24 days (the CPRA maximum) after Dec 7 receipt of my request - or immediate complaints will be filed. You don't get more than 24 days to consult.
---

On Dec. 5, 2020:
Subject: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (SFPD)
To San Francisco Police Department and its Department Head or Elected Official:

** DO NOT DESTROY ANY RESPONSIVE RECORDS. YOU MUST PRESERVE AND ORDER YOUR EMPLOYEES TO PRESERVE RECORDS DURING THE PENDENCY OF ALL APPEALS. WE WILL APPEAL ALL REDACTIONS OR WITHHOLDINGS. **

Immediate Disclosure Request.

Every department head/elected official must preserve and maintain all correspondence in a professional and businesslike manner (SFAC 67.29-7(a)) and also separately must comply with retention policies (SFAC 67.29-1). Note that if your retention policies do not retain text messages, I will argue before the SOTF and court that this is a failure to maintain **all correspondence** in a professional and businesslike manner.

Relevant precedent: SOTF 19098 - Anonymous v SFPD. Unanimous finding of violation for unlawfully withholding text message metadata (including the to/from/etc. - note SFPD had provided the dates and times, and you must as well), and also for unlawfully printing and scanning electronic records which does not constitute a "copy" of an electronic record. See also prior rulings in my favor in SOTF 19044, 19047, 19091, 19098, 19103, and 19108 which ruled against the City for email, text messages, past and future calendar entries, meeting details, electronic metadata, and attachments.

The Mayor's Office appears to have destroyed their copies of certain text messages. I'd be happy to get them from her, if she preserved every record. Alas she did not, therefore we must now conduct a universal search of the City. You cannot refer me to another department unless you search and determine that you have no copies in your department. If this is causing more work for you, ask your Mayor to stop destroying her public records.

Note there are many anonymous requesters using MuckRock - I am just one of them. If you previously produced some subset of these records to a MuckRock email address, please reference that prior response so you do not duplicate work. If I am unable to get the prior MuckRock response because it is someone else's and they have marked it private, you will however need to provide me a copy here as well.

1. This is an immediate disclosure request for text, chat, or instant messages between the Department Head/Elected Official and either Sean Elsbernd, Andrea Bruss, London Breed, Harlan Kelly, Jr., Naomi Kelly, Hank Heckel, or Walter Wong, including all group messages, and all messages in threads, in any form and any app (including, but not limited to, SMS, MMS, text, iMessage, Teams, Discord, WeChat, QQ, Signal, Telegram, WhatsApp, Facebook, Facebook Messenger, Twitter, Instagram, Hangouts, Meet, Slack, Skype, Viber, Snapchat, Line, Kik, FaceTime, Wickr Me, Chatroulette, Threema, KakaoTalk, Duo, GroupMe, Wire, Voxer, Allo, Tango, Bumble, Grindr, Tinder, Olive, Taimi, but NOT including email), on any government accounts/devices or on personal accounts or devices regarding the conduct of public business, including all participant names, message text, images, attachments, dates, and times, including any in trash or deleted folders or similar (see Good Government Guide - if the records have not been permanently deleted as of the time you receive this request, you must retrieve them from the so-called trash folders and provide them). Provide rolling responses. Provide exact copies including all metadata. There is no limitation by subject or date. If the total pages to
produce numbers over 500, inform me of the rough dates, employees involved, and subject matter, and I may be willing to narrow the initial production, AS LONG AS YOU PRESERVE ALL THE RECORDS.

2. This is a regular records request for text, chat, or instant messages between any non-department head/elected official (i.e. the other dept employees) and either Sean Elsbernd, Andrea Bruss, London Breed, Harlan Kelly, Jr., Naomi Kelly, Hank Heckel, or Walter Wong, including all group messages, and all messages in threads, in any form and any app (including, but not limited to, SMS, MMS, text, iMessage, Teams, Discord, WeChat, QQ, Signal, Telegram, WhatsApp, Facebook, Facebook Messenger, Twitter, Instagram, Hangouts, Meet, Slack, Skype, Viber, Snapchat, Line, Kik, FaceTime, Wickr Me, Chatroulette, Threema, KakaoTalk, Duo, GroupMe, Wire, Voxer, Allo, Tango, Bumble, Grindr, Tinder, Olive, Taimi, but NOT including email), on any government accounts/devices or on personal accounts or devices regarding the conduct of public business, including all participant names, message text, images, attachments, dates, and times, including any in trash or deleted folders or similar (see Good Government Guide - if the records have not been permanently deleted as of the time you receive this request, you must retrieve them from the so-called trash folders and provide them). Provide rolling responses. Provide exact copies including all metadata. There is no limitation by subject or date. If the total pages to produce numbers over 500, inform me of the rough dates, employees involved, and subject matter, and I may be willing to narrow the initial production, AS LONG AS YOU PRESERVE ALL THE RECORDS. Please provide only those copies of records available without any fees. If you determine certain records would require fees, please instead provide the required notice of which of those records are available and non-exempt for inspection in-person if we so choose.

Your non-exhaustive obligations:
- All withholding of any information must be justified in writing by specific statutory authority (SFAC 67.27).
- Every redaction must be keyed by footnote or by other clear reference to the specific justification for that redaction, and only the minimal exempt portion of any record may be withheld (SFAC 67.26).
- You must respond to emailed requests (SFAC 67.21(b)).
- You must notify us of whether or not responsive records exist and/or were withheld for each above request (Gov Code 6253(c), 6255(b)).
- You must state the name and title of each person responsible for withholding any information (Gov Code 6253(d)).
- Do not impose any end-user restrictions upon me (Santa Clara Co. vs Superior Ct, 170 Cal.App 4th 1301); so if you use a third-party website to publish records, please make them completely public without any login or sign-in.

Your agency must do all of the above things in your response, and you cannot wait until we file complaints. ****** We have no duty to, and we will not again, remind the City of its obligations. Instead, we will file complaints for every Sunshine Ordinance or CPRA violation. We will continue to file complaints until the City's procedures are modified to fully comply with the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA, without caveat or exception. ******

I look forward to your lawful response.

NOTE: THE EMAIL ADDRESS SENDING THIS REQUEST IS A PUBLICLY-VIEWABLE MAILBOX. Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,
February 23, 2021

Via email 105574-62708219@requests.muckrock.com

RE: Public Records Request, dated December 07, 2020, Reference # P020722-120720

Dear Anonymous:

The San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) received your Public Records Act request, dated December 05, 2020, on December 07, 2020.

On December 7, SFPD acknowledged your request, and informed you that the 10-day maximum deadline to respond applies. Please refer to California Government Code Section 6253(c).

You requested, "To San Francisco Police Department and its Department Head or Elected Official:

** DO NOT DESTROY ANY RESPONSIVE RECORDS. YOU MUST PRESERVE AND ORDER YOUR EMPLOYEES TO PRESERVE RECORDS DURING THE PENDENCY OF ALL APPEALS. WE WILL APPEAL ALL REDACTIONS OR WITHHOLDINGS. ** Immediate Disclosure Request.

Every department head/elected official must preserve and maintain all correspondence in a professional and businesslike manner (SFAC 67.29-7(a)) and also separately must comply with retention policies (SFAC 67.29-1). Note that if your retention policies do not retain text messages, I will argue before the SOTF and court that this is a failure to maintain **all correspondence** in a professional and businesslike manner.

Relevant precedent: SOTF 19098 - Anonymous v SFPD. Unanimous finding of violation for unlawfully withholding text message metadata (including the to/from/etc. - note SFPD had provided the dates and times, and you must as well), and also for unlawfully printing and scanning electronic records which does not constitute a "copy" of an electronic record. See also prior rulings in my favor in SOTF 19044, 19047, 19091, 19098, 19103, and 19108 which ruled against the City for email, text messages, past and future calendar entries, meeting details, electronic metadata, and attachments.

The Mayor’s Office appears to have destroyed their copies of certain text messages. I'd be happy to get them from her, if she preserved every record. Alas she did not, therefore we must now conduct a universal search of the City. You cannot refer me to another department unless you search and determine that you have no copies in your department. If this is causing more work for you, ask your Mayor to stop destroying her public records.
Note there are many anonymous requesters using MuckRock - I am just one of them. If you previously produced some subset of these records to a MuckRock email address, please reference that prior response so you do not duplicate work. If I am unable to get the prior MuckRock response because it is someone else's and they have marked it private, you will however need to provide me a copy here as well.

1. This is an immediate disclosure request for text, chat, or instant messages between the Department Head/Elected Official and either Sean Elsbernd, Andrea Bruss, London Breed, Harlan Kelly, Jr., Naomi Kelly, Hank Heckel, or Walter Wong, including all group messages, and all messages in threads, in any form and any app (including, but not limited to, SMS, MMS, text, iMessage, Teams, Discord, WeChat, QQ, Signal, Telegram, WhatsApp, Facebook, Facebook Messenger, Twitter, Instagram, Hangouts, Meet, Slack, Skype, Viber, Snapchat, Line, Kik, FaceTime, Wickr Me, Chatroulette, Threema, KakaoTalk, Duo, GroupMe, Wire, Voxer, Allo, Tango, Bumble, Grindr, Tinder, Olive, Taimi, but NOT including email), on any government accounts/devices or on personal accounts or devices regarding the conduct of public business, including all participant names, message text, images, attachments, dates, and times, including any in trash or deleted folders or similar (see Good Government Guide - if the records have not been permanently deleted as of the time you receive this request, you must retrieve them from the so-called trash folders and provide them). Provide rolling responses. Provide exact copies including all metadata. There is no limitation by subject or date. If the total pages to produce numbers over 500, inform me of the rough dates, employees involved, and subject matter, and I may be willing to narrow the initial production, AS LONG AS YOU PRESERVE ALL THE RECORDS.

2. This is a regular records request for text, chat, or instant messages between any non-department head/elected official (i.e. the other dept employees) and either Sean Elsbernd, Andrea Bruss, London Breed, Harlan Kelly, Jr., Naomi Kelly, Hank Heckel, or Walter Wong, including all group messages, and all messages in threads, in any form and any app (including, but not limited to, SMS, MMS, text, iMessage, Teams, Discord, WeChat, QQ, Signal, Telegram, WhatsApp, Facebook, Facebook Messenger, Twitter, Instagram, Hangouts, Meet, Slack, Skype, Viber, Snapchat, Line, Kik, FaceTime, Wickr Me, Chatroulette, Threema, KakaoTalk, Duo, GroupMe, Wire, Voxer, Allo, Tango, Bumble, Grindr, Tinder, Olive, Taimi, but NOT including email), on any government accounts/devices or on personal accounts or devices regarding the conduct of public business, including all participant names, message text, images, attachments, dates, and times, including any in trash or deleted folders or similar (see Good Government Guide - if the records have not been permanently deleted as of the time you receive this request, you must retrieve them from the so-called trash folders and provide them). Provide rolling responses. Provide exact copies including all metadata. There is no limitation by subject or date. If the total pages to produce numbers over 500, inform me of the rough dates, employees involved, and subject matter, and I may be willing to narrow the initial production, AS LONG AS YOU PRESERVE ALL THE RECORDS.

Please provide only those copies of records available without any fees. If you determine certain records would require fees, please instead provide the required notice of which of those records are available and non-exempt for inspection in-person if we so choose.
Your non-exhaustive obligations:
- All withholding of any information must be justified in writing by specific statutory authority (SFAC 67.27).
- Every redaction must be keyed by footnote or by other clear reference to the specific justification for that redaction, and only the minimal exempt portion of any record may be withheld (SFAC 67.26).
- You must respond to emailed requests (SFAC 67.21(b)).
- You must notify us of whether or not responsive records exist and/or were withheld for each above request (Gov Code 6253(c), 6255(b)).
- You must state the name and title of each person responsible for withholding any information (Gov Code 6253(d)).
- Do not impose any end-user restrictions upon me (Santa Clara Co. vs Superior Ct, 170 Cal.App 4th 1301); so if you use a third-party website to publish records, please make them completely public without any login or sign-in.”

On December 15, 2020, SFPD invoked the extension of time to respond to your request pursuant to Government Code section 6253(c) because of the need to consult with another division of the agency.

On December 29, January 12, 2021, January 26, and February 9, SFPD informed you that we were still consulting with other divisions for responsive records.

SFPD is still in the process of consulting with another division for responsive records. We will continue to be in contact with you and provide you with an update by March 9.

Thank you for your courtesy in this regard.

Sincerely,

Lt. R. Andrew Cox #287
Risk Management - Legal Division
This is a follow up to request number 20-4354:

Supervisor of Records Herrera,

PUC has failed, refused, or incompletely complied with my requests from this email address of July 17, 2020 and August 7, 2020 (attached).
Please determine the records - or any parts thereof - public and order them disclosed.

Most interestingly, they have not replied in any way to request #1 for various text messages of Harlan Kelly. He was a city employee on July 17 and August 7.

If the City failed to search for government and personal records of Kelly, and preserve the records, at the time of my request, because the records were in the constructive possession of the City's employee when I requested them (City of San Jose v Superior Court), the City is deemed to have effectively withheld the records in violation of the PRA (Community Youth Athletic Center v. City of National City).

I requested records and petitioned them - and you determine whether they are public and order them disclosed if so. The fact that the City may find it impossible to comply with the law due to their own fault is not your problem and not relevant to a determination.

--Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 98376-38688291@requests.muckrock.com
Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.
On Jan. 4, 2021:
Subject: [External Message Added] City and County of San Francisco public records request #20-4354
City and County of San Francisco

************************************************************************

Hi there

A message was sent to you regarding record request #20-4354:

Dear Requester,

Below is a link that contains files that are responsive to your request for:

☒ 8. All payments, invoices, or transactions from the City, your agency, or your department head to any of the Named Parties, or vice-versa, from Jan 1, 2010 to present. In addition to government accounts, you must search personal accounts subject to City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017).

https://sfpuc.sharefile.com/d-s9b2e4b80099f44a0a466c93d7ffa5b6f

If you have any issues with accessing the link, please let us know.

Best regards,

SFPUC Public Records

************************************************************************

Questions about your request? Reply to this email or sign in to contact staff at City and County of San Francisco. Technical support: See our help page

---

On Nov. 16, 2020:
Subject: Your City and County of San Francisco public records request #20-4539 has been closed.
City and County of San Francisco

************************************************************************
Hi there

Record request #20-4539 has been closed. The closure reason supplied was:

************************************************************************
<em>Questions about your request?</em> Reply to this email or sign in to contact staff at City and County of San Francisco.<br><em>Technical support:</em> See our <a href='https://www.nextrequest.com/support'>help page</a>

---

On Nov. 16, 2020:
Subject: [External Message Added] City and County of San Francisco public records request #20-4539
City and County of San Francisco

************************************************************************

Hi there

A message was sent to you regarding record request #20-4539:

Dear Requester,

Please use the link below to access records that are responsive to your request.

https://sfpuc.sharefile.com/d-s3205dd3eacbe499

Due to privacy concerns, the files have been redacted. Please be advised that information in certain records responsive to your request have been redacted because these records contain information, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy. Specifically, we have redacted personal email addresses, phone numbers, and IP addresses, based on the California Constitution, article I, section 1, and California Government Code section 6254(c). These provisions guard against disclosure of information that would invade personal privacy.

We now consider your request closed.

Please be advised that we are responding to your records request on behalf of the SFPUC only, and only as to records that are within the SFPUC’s possession. Each City department receives, searches, and responds to public records requests on behalf of its own department, not Citywide.

Best regards,
Hi there

Your record request #20-4539 has been submitted. It is currently under review and is not available for the general public to view.

As the requester, you can always see the status of your request by signing in to the City and County of San Francisco Public Records Request site here. If you haven't already signed in to your account, you may need to activate your account to sign in.

Questions about your request? Reply to this email or sign in to contact staff at City and County of San Francisco. Technical support: See our help page.

---

On Nov. 5, 2020:
Subject: [ACTION REQUIRED] Your City and County of San Francisco public records portal account
Use this to confirm your account. The link is only valid for 24 hours.

City and County of San Francisco

Hello Anonymous via Muckrock!

You can confirm your City and County of San Francisco public records portal account by copying and pasting the URL below into your web browser. This link is only valid for the next 24 hours.

Magic link: http://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/users/confirmation?confirmation_token=wqGD8n8oGv3n6Aeyfcsz

Questions? Check out our help page (https://www.nextrequest.com/support) or email us at support@nextrequest.com.
On July 17, 2020:
Subject: California Public Records Act Request: Walter Wong, Mlok Consulting, RDJ Enterprises, Young Community Developers, Jaidin Consulting, and other Records - Immediate Disclosure Request - SF PUC
Public Utilities Commission and Harlan Kelly Jr.,

Attached are new Immediate Disclosure Requests under the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA.

NOTE: Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. The email address sending this request is a publicly-viewable mailbox. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,
Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 98376-38688291@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:

Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 98376
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.
This is a follow up to a previous request:

City Attorney's Office has refused to comply to the request from this email address dated Sept 26, 2020. They gave themselves multiple extensions until Dec 10, 2020 and still refuse to respond. Herrera has already accepted that some of the email metadata is public and disclosable and now cannot go back. Furthermore, DT has a system to produce that metadata automatically.

This is a petition under 67.21(d) for a written determination that some or all of the records not provided are public and an order for their disclosure.

--Anonymous

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 101738
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the
requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.

---

On Feb. 25, 2021:
It's been months and there has been no response. Further complaints will be filed. And you've already seen that last time you argued that COVID allowed you to withhold metadata, SOTF compliance turned the argument around and argued COVID requires more disclosure, not less.

---

On Nov. 19, 2020:
Can your office be honest? What is taking so long to review 2-3 pages of documents? In far less time than it has taken you to review a single email, DPW - an organization that presumably lacks the expertise of DT - has produced dozens of redacted emails in metadata format...

---

On Nov. 19, 2020:
Dear Requester,

We apologize for the delay and would like to update that we need additional time to complete your request. We are expecting to have our review completed by 12/10/2020. Thank you for your patience.

Please send replies to cityattorney@sfcityatty.org

Sincerely,

[signature_540561676]Odaya Buta
Paralegal
Office of City Attorney Dennis Herrera
www.sfcityattorney.org

Find us on: Facebook Twitter Instagram

This message and any attachments are solely for the intended recipient and may include privileged or confidential information. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately, and permanently delete this message and any attachments.

---

On Nov. 5, 2020:
Then we will file complaints. This is a redaction of a 2-3 page document, tops. It can't take this long. DPW figured out how to do this for a single email in a matter of days after it was discussed. Dragging your feet won't help turn legally disclosable information into secret information.

--Anonymous

---
On Nov. 5, 2020:
Dear Requester,

We apologize for the delay and would like to update that we need additional time to complete your request. We are expecting to have our review completed by 11/19/2020. Thank you for your patience.

Please send replies to cityattorney@sfcityatty.org

Sincerely,
[signature_540561676]Odaya Buta
Paralegal
Office of City Attorney Dennis Herrera
www.sfcityattorney.org


This message and any attachments are solely for the intended recipient and may include privileged or confidential information. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately, and permanently delete this message and any attachments.

---

On Sept. 3, 2020:
Subject: California Public Records Act Request: Herrera Text Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request
Dennis Herrera and City Attorney’s Office:

Below are Immediate Disclosure Requests (SF Admin Code 67.25(a)). Your initial response is required by Sept 3, 2020. Rolling records responses are requested (SFAC 67.25(d)) if you are unable to immediately produce all records. Exact copies of every responsive record are requested (Gov Code 6253(b)) - do not or print and scan electronic records or provide black and white versions of any color record. Provide only copies of records not requiring fees and in-person inspection of all other records (GC 6253).

Your non-exhaustive obligations: All withholding of any information must be justified (SFAC 67.27). All withholdings by masking or deletion (aka redactions) must be keyed by footnote or other clear reference to justification and only the minimal exempt portion of a record may be withheld (SFAC 67.26). Respond to emailed requests (SFAC 67.21(b)). You must notify us of whether or not responsive records exist and/or were withheld for each below request (Gov Code 6253(c), 6255(b)). You must state the name and title of each person responsible for withholding any information (Gov Code 6253(d)). You must do all of this in your response, and you cannot wait until we file complaints. If you wait to comply with the Sunshine Ordinance until after we file complaints, we will not withdraw any complaints and request SOTF find you in violation, regardless of what you do after filing.

****** We have no duty to, and we will not again, remind the City of its obligations. Instead, we will file complaints for every Sunshine Ordinance or CPRA violation. We will continue to file complaints until your procedures are modified to fully comply with the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA, without caveat or exception. *****

1. The full text/chat message thread between Dennis Herrera and London Breed and William Scott on May 30-31 and June 1, 2020. Include all messages, timestamps, and attachments/images. Please search all text/chat apps including but not limited to SMS/MMS/Messages/iMessage/Messenger/Hangouts. This thread has been partially disclosed to us by other city agencies, so we know it is not completely attorney-client privileged, and we know it exists. Please search both
personal accounts/devices of Herrera, and, as your Good Govt Guide requires, search Herrera's deleted messages, trash, or similar folders.

Please indicate "no responsive records" for each request if that is true.

NOTE: Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. The email address sending this request is a publicly-viewable mailbox. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

--Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 101738-08172271@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:

Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 101738
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.
Thank you. This is a new immediate disclosure request:

7. An exact copy of the entire original email record, including but not limited to all email headers (names and values), for the single oldest email received by your office from requests@muckrock.com to cityattorney@sfcityatty.org. Please be sure to preserve (at least, but not only) email header names and at least the timestamps in the "Received" headers. Consult your own City CISO if you believe I'm wrong. If you claim GC 6255(a), it will be SOTF not you who still decides whether the interest in non-disclosure "clearly outweighs" the interest in disclosure. If you do not provide this single record with minimal redactions and footnotes or other clear references for justifications for each and every withheld portion of the record, an additional willful violation and official misconduct complaint will be filed against Dennis Herrera as department head on the basis of prior order SOTF 19044.

Please indicate "no responsive records" for each request if that is true.

Above are Immediate Disclosure Requests (SF Admin Code 67.25(a)). Your initial response is required by Sept 29, 2020. Rolling records responses are requested (SFAC 67.25(d)) if you are unable to immediately produce all records. Exact copies of every responsive record are requested (Gov Code 6253(b)) - do not or print and scan electronic records or provide black and white versions of any color record. Provide only copies of records not requiring fees and in-person inspection of all other records (GC 6253).

Your non-exhaustive obligations: All withholding of any information must be justified (SFAC 67.27). All withholdings by masking or deletion (aka redactions) must be keyed by footnote or other clear reference to justification and only the minimal exempt portion of a record may be withheld (SFAC 67.26). Respond to emailed requests (SFAC 67.21(b)). You must notify us of whether or not responsive records exist and/or were withheld for each below request (Gov Code 6253(c), 6255(b)). You must state the name and title of each person responsible for withholding any information (Gov Code 6253(d)). You must do all of this in your response, and you cannot wait until we file complaints. If you wait to comply with the Sunshine Ordinance until after we file complaints, we will not withdraw any complaints and request SOTF find you in violation, regardless of what you do after filing.

***** We have no duty to, and we will not again, remind the City of its obligations. Instead, we will file complaints for every Sunshine Ordinance or CPRA violation. We will continue to file complaints until your procedures are modified to fully comply with the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA, without caveat or exception. *****

NOTE: Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. The email address sending this request is a publicly-viewable mailbox. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.
---Anonymous

From: San Francisco City Attorney 10/13/2020
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Herrera Text Messages - Immediate Disclosure Req...

Dear Requester,

We would like to send an update that we need additional time to complete your request, and currently expect to have our review completed by 11/03/2020. Thank you for your patience.

Please send replies to cityattorney@sfcityatty.org

Sincerely,
Odaya

[sig] Odaya Buta
Paralegal
Office of City Attorney Dennis Herrera
www.sfcityattorney.org

Find us on: Facebook
Twitter
Instagram

This message and any attachments are solely for the intended recipient and may include privileged or confidential information. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately, and permanently delete this message and any attachments.

From: Anonymous Person 10/13/2020
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Herrera Text Messages - Immediate Disclosure Req...

This is a violation not just of the Sunshine Ordinance but of the CPRA as well. You were asked for a single email record on Sep. 26 (which is treated as if you received it on Sep. 28, Monday).
The CPRA, and Sunshine Ordinance, required a response in 10 days. You failed to provide me one. It is now the 15th day.
Under Gov Code 6253(a) you owed me in 10-days either a determination or an extension for 14 days. You failed to provide such determination and violated the law. You also unlawfully failed to state what unusual circumstance warrants an extension.

Your extension lasts until Oct 23, 2020 - 14 days from 10 days from constructive receipt of my request, and no further.

From your response in 19044 and from now multiple other City agencies' production of email metadata, I know that a single email worth of metadata is 2-3 pages to produce at even a large font. It's just not a lot.

If Dennis Herrera is willfully refusing to comply with the SOTF's orders to provide full disclosure, they will be held in violation as they have been previously.

https://www.muckrock.com/foil/san-francisco-141/herrera-text-messages-immediate-disclosure-request-101738/#follow-up
From: San Francisco City Attorney  
10/15/2020

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Herrera Text Messages - Immediate Disclosure Req...

Dear Requester,

We apologize for not sending a response to your email last week. Please accept this email as our acknowledgment that we do have a document that is responsive to your request. You asked us to produce an email from 101881-requests@muckrock.com, including certain metadata. We do have such an email, but we are invoking a 14-day extension to confer with other interested departments under Government Code § 6253 and Administrative Code § 67.25. We will send you a response by October 22, 2020.

Sincerely,

[signature_540561676]Odaya Buta  
Paralegal  
Office of City Attorney Dennis Herrera  

Find us on: Facebook<https://www.facebook.com/sfcityattorney/>  
Twitter<https://twitter.com/SFCityAttorney>  
Instagram<https://www.instagram.com/sfcityattorney/>

This message and any attachments are solely for the intended recipient and may include privileged or confidential information. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately, and permanently delete this message and any attachments.

From: San Francisco City Attorney  
10/22/2020

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Herrera Text Messages - Immediate Disclosure Req...

Dear Requester,

We would like to send an update that we need additional time to complete your request, and currently expect to have our review completed by 11/05/2020. Thank you for your patience.

Please send replies to cityattorney@sfcityatty.org<mailto:cityattorney@sfcityatty.org>

Sincerely,

Odaya

https://www.muckrock.com/foi/san-francisco-141/herrera-text-messages-immediate-disclosure-request-101738#follow-up
Good morning,

We will expect your compliant production of the single email metadata by Nov. 5.

We have now received mostly-compliant (though we have some disputes) responses from DPW: https://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/documents/5817767 and from DT: https://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/documents/5577453

Sincerely,
Anonymous

---

Dear Requester,

We apologize for the delay and would like to update that we need additional time to complete your request. We are expecting to have our review completed by 11/19/2020. Thank you for your patience.

Please send replies to cityattorney@sfcityatty.org

Sincerely,
[signature_540561676]Odaya Buta
Paralegal
Office of City Attorney Dennis Herrera

Find us on: Facebook<https://www.facebook.com/sfcityattorney/>
Twitter<https://twitter.com/SFCityAttorney>
From: Anonymous Person
11/05/2020
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Herrera Text Messages - Immediate Disclosure Req...

Then we will file complaints. This is a redaction of a 2-3 page document, tops. It can't take this long. DPW figured out how to do this for a single email in a matter of days after it was discussed. Dragging your feet won't help turn legally disclosable information into secret information.

--Anonymous

From: San Francisco City Attorney
11/19/2020
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Herrera Text Messages - Immediate Disclosure Req...

Dear Requester,

We apologize for the delay and would like to update that we need additional time to complete your request. We are expecting to have our review completed by 12/10/2020. Thank you for your patience.

Please send replies to cityattorney@sfcityatty.org
Sincerely,

[signature_540561676]Odaya Buta
Paralegal
Office of City Attorney Dennis Herrera

Find us on: Facebook<https://www.facebook.com/sfcityattorney/>
Twitter<https://twitter.com/SFCityAttorney>
Instagram<https://www.instagram.com/sfcityattorney/>

This message and any attachments are solely for the intended recipient and may include privileged or confidential information. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately, and permanently delete this message and any attachments.

From: Anonymous Person
11/19/2020
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Herrera Text Messages - Immediate Disclosure Req...

Can your office be honest? What is taking so long to review 2-3 pages of disclosure request 101738?#follow-up
**From:** Anonymous Person  
**Subject:** RE: California Public Records Act Request: Herrera Text Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request

It's been months and there has been no response. Further complaints will be filed. And you've already seen that last time you argued that COVID allowed you to withhold metadata, SOTF compliance turned the argument around and argued COVID requires more disclosure, not less.
DPA: You cannot charge me anything for public records in San Francisco - except the cost of any physical media provided to me, which, since you are releasing electronically on NextRequest, is zero. Your argument that audio and video records are expensive to redact is not an exemption. You must produce the video and audio records in Production 0658-08, and all other responses you have given to me that withhold such records.

**Supervisor of Records / 67.21(d) petition:** Please determine the video and audio records in Production 0658-08, and all video and audio records in other SB 1421 responses given to 83876-31149286@requests.muckrock.com, public and order them released. Just like SFPD, DPA must produce them, for free, with a key identifying which redaction is for which justification. I will not pay anything for them. See Admin Code 67.26, and also (though it is not needed locally due to 67.26) National Lawyers Guild v. City of Hayward.

**SOTF - please file in SOTF 19144.**

**NOTE:** 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous
Buta, Odaya (CAT)

From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 26, 2021 4:59 PM
To: Cox, Andrew (POL); Supervisor Records (CAT)
Subject: Petition - Re: Public Records Request :: P025718-020221
Attachments: ChiefOfficeResponse_Redaction_Codes_List.pdf; P25718_-_2021.02.26_sfpd_response.pdf; Scott_Calendar_03_2021_Redacted.pdf; signature.asc

Supervisor of Records Herrera,

NOTE: The fact that I am not challenging citation to Times Mirror in general in this petition does not mean that I concede that Times Mirror (which relies solely on Gov Code 6255) is ever a valid exemption (either pre-COVID with Admin Code 67.24(g, i); or during COVID with the COVID emergency orders); nor does it mean that I concede that the Mayor’s emergency order purporting to suspend Admin Code 67.24(g) and (i) is valid.

This is a petition under 67.21(d) to determine in writing that the following is public and order them disclosed in the Chief’s then-future calendar entries (all page numbers refer to attachment Scott_Calendar_03_2021_Redacted.pdf):

1. - page 6, both hyperlink urls
2. - page 1, first two sentences in the body description
3. - subject lines pg 3, 4, 7, 11, 12, 14, 16, 19, 39;
4. - body text on pg 15;
5. - names of Outlook fields on pg 17, 23, 38;
6. - location on pg 18;
7. - ALL info on pages 26, 31, 33, 61 (as it states, these are phone/conference calls - there is no physical security threat or procedure involved here);
8. - all redactions keyed '8' on pages 28, 54

NOTE: 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

------ Original Message ------
On Friday, February 26th, 2021 at 4:24 PM, Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:

Thank you. Through what date have you produced so far?

NOTE: 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event
shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

------ Original Message ------
On Friday, February 26th, 2021 at 4:07 PM, San Francisco Police Records Portal <sanfranciscopd@mycusthelp.net> wrote:

**Attachments:**
- ChiefOfficeResponse Redaction Codes List.pdf
- P25718 - 2021.02.26 sfpd response.pdf
- Scott Calendar 03 2021 Redacted.pdf

--- Please respond above this line ---

February 26, 2021

Via email arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com

Anonymous

San Francisco, CA

RE: Public Records Request, dated February 02, 2021, Reference # P025718-020221

Dear Anonymous:

In response to your request, please see attached documents.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,

Lieutenant R. Andrew Cox #287
Officer in Charge
Risk Management - Legal Division

To monitor the progress or update this request please log into the SFPD Public Records Center.
1. **Attorney/Client Privilege**

2. **California Constitution, Article I, §§1.3(b):** Unwarranted invasion of privacy.

3. **Penal Code Section 832.7,** Personnel records of peace officers are confidential.

4. **California Government Code Section 6254(c):** Personnel, medical, or similar files, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

5. **California Government Code Section 6254(f):** Records of complaints to and compiled by local police agencies when conducting an investigation:
   a. Intelligence information
   b. Security procedures
   c. Investigatory

   Notwithstanding any other provision of this subdivision, state and local law enforcement agencies shall make public the following information, except to the extent that disclosure of a particular item of information would endanger the safety of a person involved in an investigation or would endanger the successful completion of the investigation or a related investigation.


7. **California Government Code Section 6254(k):** Records, the disclosure of which is exempted or prohibited pursuant to federal or state law, including, but not limited to, provisions of the Evidence Code relating to privilege.

8. **California Government Code Section 6254.3(a)** The home addresses, home telephone numbers, personal cellular telephone numbers, and birth dates of all employees of a public agency shall not be deemed to be public records and shall not be open to public inspection.

9. **California Government Code Section 6255:** The facts of the particular case that the public interest served by not disclosing the record clearly outweigh this public interest served by disclosure of the record.

10. **Evidence Code Section 1040 (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.

All redactions, meeting location-specific dial-in information per Evidence Code §1040(2) preserve the confidentiality of information.

Redaction of cell phone per Evidence Code §1040(2) preserve the confidentiality of information.

11. **Times Mirror v. Superior Court, 53 Cal.3d 1325 (1991).**

**PLEASE NOTE:**
Columns “Sender” and “Recipients”
When a cell phone number has been redacted per Gov. Code §6254(f) and Evidence Code §1040(2), the name of the individual associated with the cell phone number is listed.

A search of the “Contact” folder on Chief William Scott’s department-issued cell phone is completed.

When the name of the contact associated with a redacted number has been identified, it is listed in the column next to both “Sender” and “Recipients” if the name appeared in the “Contact” folder.

If a name is not in the “Contact” folder of Chief William Scott, “unknown” is used.

**Unwarranted Invasion of Privacy**
Redactions have been made in these materials of personal information on the basis of privacy, pursuant to Section 6254(c) of the Public Records Act (California Government Code sec. 6254(c)) and Article I, sec. 1 of the California Constitution because disclosure of this information would constitute an unwarranted invasion of privacy.
February 26, 2021

Via email arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com

RE: Public Records Request, dated February 02, 2021, Reference # P025718-020221

Dear Anonymous:

The San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) received your Public Records Act request, dated February 02, 2021.

On February 2, SFPD acknowledged your request, and informed you that the 10-day maximum deadline to respond applies. Please refer to California Government Code Section 6253(c).

You requested, “Lt. Cox and Chief Scott:

See attached Herrera's change of mind re: future calendars. To quote Herrera's office:

In light of recent discussions at the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force regarding public officials’ disclosure of their future calendars, we have re-evaluated the legal question and consulted with the Police Department about security risks. Following that evaluation, we have concluded that in most circumstances the City Attorney may safely and legally disclose certain information about his future meetings, including the subject matter of the meeting and the attendees, if that information is recorded in his calendar, and the week during which the meeting will occur. Due to security concerns, we will continue to withhold the location, time, and specific date of each meeting. There may be circumstances in the future where information about the subject matter or attendees of a meeting should be withheld based on fact-specific security concerns or other legal grounds, but your current request does not raise those concerns.

The Mayor has also agreed to comply with her associated SOTF Order 19103. That leaves just you. This is an immediate disclosure request for all of Chief Scott's future, expected calendar entries for March 7 - May 21, 2021, in detailed Outlook PDF 'Memo Style' format (not a summary view).

NOTE: 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.”
On February 12, SFPD informed you that we intended to produce future calendar entries in the same manner as the City Attorney’s Office as soon as possible. We informed you that we were in the process of reviewing the records and applying any necessary redactions and invoked the extension of time to respond to your request pursuant to Government Code section 6253(c) because of the need to consult with another division of the agency.

Responsive records are included in this correspondence. Finally, we are still in the process of reviewing records and applying necessary redactions. We will continue to be in contact with you and provide you with an update by March 12, 2021.

Thank you for your courtesy in this regard.

Sincerely,

Lt. R. Andrew Cox #287  
Risk Management - Legal Division
Fountain, Christine (POL)

Subject: Policy Group
Location: Microsoft Teams Meeting

Start: 5 p.m., 10/11
End: 5 p.m., 10/11
Show Time As: Tentative

Recurrence: 5 p.m., 10/11
Recurrence Pattern: Daily

Meeting Status: Tentatively accepted

Organizer: Stevenson, Peg (CON)
Required Attendees: Power, Andres (MYR); Carroll, Maryellen (DEM); Chu, Carmen (ADM); Colfax, Grant (DPH); Elsbernd, Sean (MYR); Forbes, Elaine (PRT); Rhorer, Trent (HSA); Rosenfield, Ben (CON); Scott, William (POL); SMITH, JESSE (CAT); Stewart-Kahn, Abigail (HOM); Bukowski, Kenneth (ADM); Su, Maria (CHF); Nicholson, Jeanine (FIR); Isen, Carol (HRD); Yant, Abbie (HSS)

Optional Attendees: Howard, Kate (HRD); Yeung, Linda (DEM); Bobba, Naveena (DPH); Bechelli, Adrienne (DEM); Kayhan, Dariush (HSA); Marks, Jim (UCSF); Woods, David (DPH); Yu, Albert (DPH); Tang, Katy (DPH); Patterson, Kate (LIB)

Updating this meeting through the 5 p.m., 10/11.

For the next phase of COVID response, this group will meet on 5 p.m., 10/11.

Please don’t forward the invite without checking in.

Peg Stevenson 415 5 p.m., 10/11

5 p.m., 10/11. United States, San Francisco (Toll)

Conference ID: 5 p.m., 10/11.

5 p.m., 10/11. | Learn more about Teams 5 p.m., 10/11.
Fountain, Christine (POL)

Subject: Sean, Chief Scott & Dave/Lisa
Location: 5b., 10., 11.
Start: 5b., 10., 11.
End: 5b., 10., 11.
Recurrence: 5b., 10., 11.
Recurrence Pattern: 5b., 10., 11.
Meeting Status: Accepted
Organizer: Elsbernd, Sean (MYR)
Required Attendees: Elsbernd, Sean (MYR); Scott, William (POL)
Fountain, Christine (POL)

Subject: Meeting with AC Moser and IAD
Location:
Start: 5:00, 10.
End:
Recurrence: 5:00, 10.
Recurrence Pattern:
Meeting Status: Meeting organizer
Organizer: Scott, William (POL)
Required Attendees: Scott, William Chief (POL)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Fountain, Christine (POL)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject:</strong> Briefing with ACs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong> N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Start:</strong> 9 a.m., 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End:</strong> 9 a.m., 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recurrence:</strong> 9 a.m., 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recurrence Pattern:</strong> 9 a.m., 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meeting Status:</strong> Meeting organizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizer:</strong> Scott, William (POL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fountain, Christine (POL)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Start:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recurrence:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recurrence Pattern:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meeting Status:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizer:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fountain, Christine (POL)

Subject: HOLD - Chronicle, Justin Phillips (Dir. Dorsey)

Start: 8 a.m., 11.
End: 8 a.m., 11.

Recurrence: (none)

Meeting Status: Meeting organizer

Organizer: Scott, William (POL)

From: Dorsey, Matt (POL) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 9, 2021 3:00 PM
To: Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Moser, Bob (POL) <bob.moser@sfgov.org>; Carr, Rowena (POL) <Rowena.Carr@sfgov.org>
Subject: Fw: [EXT] SFPD and our reform initiatives

Promising news...

Nothing to schedule yet, but the Chronicle’s new Sunday columnist — Justin Phillips — just replied to the introductory email I sent him yesterday, which included a link to our Jan. 27 news release on our CRI progress.

In his email (see below), Justin acknowledged that SFPD "is doing such important work and it will definitely be a priority of mine to follow it."

He is also "100 percent interested in getting some time with the Chief."

Again, no schedule request yet, but it'll be high priority. Row, if it's not too early, can you look for an hour-long time slot in the next week or two? I'm expecting to hear from Justin tomorrow.

Thanks!

Best,
MATT DORSEY
Director of Strategic Communications

SAN FRANCISCO POLICE DEPARTMENT
1245 3rd Street, 6th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94158
+1 (415) 837-7242 Desk
Personal Info.
Fountain, Christine (POL)

Subject: Executive Covid Briefing

Location: 

Start: 5:45 PM
End: 5:45 PM

Recurrence: Every 1 day

Meeting Status: Accepted

Organizer: Carroll, Maryellen (DEM)

Required Attendees: Cretan, Jeff (MYR); Howard, Kate (HRD); Joanne HayesWhite; Jue, Tyrone (MYR); Sharon Redmond; Hussey, Deirdre (PRT); Bobba, Naveena (DPH); Groffenberger, Ashley (MYR); Kelly, Naomi (ADM); SMITH, JESSE (CAT); Kelly, Jr, Harlan (PUC); Madland, Sarah (REC); Suhr, Wendy (DEM); Bechelli, Adrienne (DEM); Moore, Jamie (DPH); Scarpulla, John (PUC); Power, Andres (MYR); Redmond, Michael (POL); Degraffinried, Alaric (DPW); McSpadden, Shireen (HSA); Kittler, Sophia (MYR); Colfax, Grant (DPH); Su, Maria (CHF); Scanlon, Olivia (FIR); Young, Teresa (PUC); Miyamoto, Paul (SHF); Breed, London (MYR); Carlin, Michael (PUC); Wyrsch, Victor (FIR); Stewart-Kahn, Abigail (HOM); Engler, Joseph (SHF); Bruss, Andrea (MYR); Hayes-White, Joanne (DEM); Pojman, Natalie (DPH); Rhorer, Trent (HSA); Velo, Jose (FIR); Chu, Carmen (ASR); Sun, Selina (MYR); Stevenson, Peg (CON); Forbes, Elaine (PRT); Rosenfield, Ben (CON); Kagan, Rachael (DPH); Scott, William (POL); Tyra Fennell; Torres, Joaquin (ECN); Nicholson, Jeanine (FIR); Kirkpatrick, Kelly (MYR); Tumlin, Jeffrey (MTA); Zamora, Francis (DEM); Moser, Bob (POL); Ginsburg, Phil (REC); Elsbernd, Sean (MYR); Davis, Sheryl (HRC)

Optional Attendees: Buick, Jeanne (HRD); Isen, Carol (HRD); Bukowski, Kenneth (ADM); Rubenstein, Bryan (FIR); Kelly Jr, Harlan; Hogan, Kristin (DEM); Taupier, Anne (ECN)

Mary Ellen Carroll is inviting you to a scheduled Zoom meeting.

Topic: Executive Covid Briefing
Time: This is a recurring meeting Meet anytime

Join Zoom Meeting

Meeting ID: 5:45 PM
One tap mobile

Dial by your location

22nd Annual SOR Report
APPENDIX - Page 1000
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject:</th>
<th>HOLD - Speak at Prof. Dent's Graduate Seminar (more to follow)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start:</td>
<td>8.b., 10., 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End:</td>
<td>8.b., 10., 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurrence:</td>
<td>(none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Status:</td>
<td>Meeting organizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizer:</td>
<td>Scott, William (POL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject:</td>
<td>8-Ball Association Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start:</td>
<td>5:00 p.m., 10th, 11th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End:</td>
<td>5:00 p.m., 10th, 11th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurrence:</td>
<td>5:00 p.m., 10th, 11th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Status:</td>
<td>Meeting organizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizer:</td>
<td>Scott, William (POL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fountain, Christine (POL)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject:</strong> Meeting with Dir. Oliva-Aroche</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Start:</strong> 12:00, 10. 11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End:</strong> 12:00, 10. 11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recurrence:</strong> 12:00, 10. 11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recurrence Pattern:</strong> 12:00, 10. 11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meeting Status:</strong> Meeting organizer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizer:</strong> Scott, William (POL)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fountain, Christine (POL)

Subject: JUSTIS Executive Council Meeting via Teams
Location: Microsoft Teams Meeting
Meeting Status: Accepted
Organizer: Legaspi, Doris (TIS)
Required Attendees: Gerull, Linda (TIS); Lee, Ivy (MYR); Raju, Manohar (PDR); Fletcher, Karen (ADP); Miyamoto, Paul (SHF); Miller, Katherine (JUV); Scott, William (POL); Yee, Norman (BOS); Carroll, Maryellen (DEM); Yuen, Michael (CRT); Boudin, Chesa (DAT); Bartley, Henry (TIS); Bukowski, Kenneth (ADM); Ellis, Kimberly (WOM); Linq, Kevin (TIS); Chu, Carmen (ADM)
Optional Attendees: Tyson, Pamela (DEM); Saenz, Johanna (SHF); Larrick, Herschell (WOM); Cowan, Sheryl (JUV); Carr, Rowena (POL); Auyong, Angela (PDR); Williams, LaShaun (ADP); Russom, Kelsey (DAT); Phan, Kay (ADM); Burke, Robyn (DAT); Zamora, Francis (DEM)

Microsoft Teams meeting

Join on your computer or mobile app

Or call in (audio only)

Phone Conference ID: 

United States, San Francisco

Learn More | Meeting options
Microsoft Teams meeting

Join on your computer or mobile app

Or call in (audio only)

Phone Conference ID:

Learn More | Meeting options
Fountain, Christine (POL)

Subject: CR Edited Meeting

Start: 5 b. 10. 11.
End: 5 b. 10. 11.
Show Time As: Tentative

Recurrence: Every b. 10. 11.
Recurrence Pattern: Unlimited

Meeting Status: Tentatively accepted

Organizer: Hilder, Candy (POL)

Required Attendees: Scott, William (POL); McEachern, Greg (POL); Yee, Greg (POL); Ali, Mikail (POL); Flaherty, Denise (POL); Perea, Daniel (POL); Walsh, Peter; Altorfer, Eric (POL); Crockett, Ryan (POL); Smith, Amber (POL); Wong, Nora (POL); Thompson, Bernadette (POL)

Optional Attendees: Sanson-Mosier, William (POL); McGuire, Catherine (POL); Butler, Rosland (POL); O'Sullivan, Robert (POL); Preston, Darryelle (POL); Tran, Jimmy (POL); Sutton, Tiffany (POL); Demafeliz, Kristine (POL); Moser, Bob (POL); Medina, Chandra (POL); Ewins, Teresa (POL); Dorsey, Matt (POL); Cunningham, Jason (POL); Ford, Steve (POL); Sanchez, John (POL); Gribi, Hinde (POL); Fong, Daryl (POL); Barnes, Torrie (POL); Lazar, David (POL); Mannix, Ann (POL); Basco, Bernice (POL); Vaswani, Raj (POL); Fountain, Christine (POL); Rivera, Gabriel (POL); Endo, Kevin (POL); Cheng, Gary (POL); Nelson, Lauren (POL); Pereira, Frank (POL); Redmond, Michael (POL); Leung, Sally (POL); Oliva-Aroche, Diana (POL); Harrell, Joelle (POL)

You will be sent an email when attachments are ready to be viewed.

5 b. 10. 11.
5 b. 10. 11. United States, San Francisco (Toll)
Conference ID: 5 b. 10. 11. Learn more about Teams 5 b. 10. 11.
Fountain, Christine (POL)

Subject: SAVE THE DATE - Stephen MR Covey to speak at all 3 LDI Cohorts

Start:
5 b., 10., 11.

End:
5 b., 10., 11.

Recurrence: (none)

Meeting Status: Meeting organizer

Organizer: Scott, William (POL)

Hello Cohort 1,

On 5 b., 10., 11., we are having Stephen MR Covey speak to all 3 cohorts of LDI (which includes the new Third Cohort also starting in March). We are expecting him to speak from 5 b., 10., 11. Mr. Covey was supposed to address LDI in October, but had to cancel. Mr. Covey is the author of the book "Speed of Trust" that we read as part of our class and he has crafted a presentation specifically tailored to SFPD and the challenges facing our profession.

He is tentatively scheduled to speak at the 5 b., 10., 11., but we may seek a remote format depending on the COVID status in San Francisco.

We will send more info out as the event gets closer. Please save the date if you would like to attend.

Thanks,
Leonard

Sgt Leonard Poggio #391
San Francisco Police Department
Leadership Development Institute Coordinator
415-401-4710
Fountain, Christine (POL)

Subject: Mayor Breed’s Department Head Meeting
Location: 6th, 10, 11
Start: 6th, 10, 11
End: 6th, 10, 11
Recurrence: 6th, 10, 11
Recurrence Pattern: Accepted

Meeting Status: Sun, Selina (MYR)
Organizer: Sun, Selina (MYR); MYR-ALL Department Heads; MYR-ALL Department Head Assistant; MYR-ALL Staff List; Schedule, Room201 (MYR); Jenica Bedford-Pugh; Jones, Alexander (ECN); Miller, Katherine (JUV); Tuqbenyoh, Mawuli (HRD); Boudin, Chesa (DAT)

Required Attendees: Sun, Selina (MYR); MYR-ALL Department Heads; MYR-ALL Department Head Assistant; MYR-ALL Staff List; Schedule, Room201 (MYR); Jenica Bedford-Pugh; Jones, Alexander (ECN); Miller, Katherine (JUV); Tuqbenyoh, Mawuli (HRD); Boudin, Chesa (DAT)

Optional Attendees: Ginsburg, Phil (REC); Tooko, Daphne (MYR); Robbins, Susannah (ECN); Badasow, Bridget (HSA); Elsbernd, Sean (MYR); Lambert, Michael (LIB); DaSilva, Christina (MYR); Kositsky, Jeff (DEM); Power, Andres (MYR); Buckley, Jeff (MYR); Alfaro, Nancy (ADM); Dick-Endrizzi, Regina (ECN); McSpadden, Shireen (HSA); White, Staci (REC); Davis, Sheryl (HRC); Su, Maria (CHF); Murray, Ashley (MYR); Cretan, Jeff (MYR); Weiland, Maggie (ADM); Roiz, Teresa (PUC); Penick, Andrico; Henderson, Paul (DPA); Carroll, Maryellen (DEM); Gerull, Linda (TIS); Legaspi, Doris (TIS); Corvino, Denise (HSA); Scott, William (POL); McCaffrey, Edward (MYR); Mezquita, Ingrid (HSA); Cukierman, Rachel (ASR); Sonnenschein, Jenny (FAM); Fletcher, Karen (ADP); Peacock, Rebecca (MYR); Collins, Robert (RNT); Yant, Abbie (HSS); Rhorer, Trent (HSA); Raphael, Deborah (ENV); Chu, Carmen (ASR); Noguchi, John (ADM); Beck, Bob (ADM); Royle, Karen (CSS); Forbes, Elaine (PRT); Pon, Adrienne (ADM); Lee, Mason (MYR); Lindler, Nicole (MYR); Auyong, Angela (PDR); Beckett, Caroline (CSS); Wagner, Greg (DPH); Luong, Susanna (HRD); Hayes-White, Joanne (FIR); Geithman, Kyra (MYR); Tajel Shah (tajel.shah@sfgov.org); Donohue, Virginia (ADM); Cohen, Emily (HOM); Johnson, Jillian (ADM); Fiore, Nina (ADM); Burke, Robyn (DAT); Groffenberger, Ashley (MYR); Fay, Abigail (MYR); Bohn, Nicole (ADM); Kirkpatrick, Kelly (MYR); Lam, Jenny (MYR); Jackson, Joselyne (MYR); Ivar Satero (AIR); Duning, Anna (MYR); Wong, Phillip (ECN); Huish, Jay (RET); Summers, Ashley (MYR); Mattias, Daniella (MYR); True, Judson (DPW); Rea, Diane (ADM); Bell, Marcia (LLB); Ekbberg, Natalie (HSS); Xu, Jay (MYR); Patil, Lillian (MYR); Lane, Maura (CON); Farley, Clair (ADM); Ma, Annie (HOM); Nicholson, Jeanine (FIR); Rosenberg, Julie (BOA); Smith, Jasmine (CSS); Zighera, Theresa (CFC); Kelly, Naomi (ADM); Griggs, Mitchell (HSS); Howard, Kate (HRD); Colfax, Grant (DPH); Raju, Manohar (PDR); Owens, Sarah (MYR); Rodriguez, Marisa (ADM); Gosiengfiao, Rachel (ADM); Caldon, John (WAR); Barnes, Maximilian (MYR); Rosenfield, Ben (CON); Lediju, Tonia (CON); Philhour, Marjan (MYR); Gordon, Rachel (DPW); Chris Arrigale (AIR); Thomas, Kenya (DPH); Tonia Lediju; Lynch, Andy (MYR); Caldwell, James (MYR); Owens, Morgan (MYR); Bruss, Andrea (MYR); Lynn, Andrea (MYR); Bangcaya, Matthew (MYR); Seifer, Jason (FAM); ikwon@calacademy.org; Jones, DeAnthony (MYR); Torres, Joaquin (ECN); Johnston, Jennifer (ADM); Legg, Douglas (ASR); Krell, Rebekah (DEM); Tumlin, Jeffrey (MTA); Miyamoto, Paul (SHF); Cowan, Sheryl (JUV); Kurella, Sailaja (ADM); Degrafinried, Alaric (DPW); Bukowski, Kenneth (ADM); Taufic, Camilla (MYR); Liu, Adrian (MYR); Sacco, Carol (WOM); Abigail Stewart-Kahn (Abigail.Stewart-kahn@sfgov.org); Bowyer, Julie (HOM); Isen, Carol (HRD); Remington, Ralph (ART)
Fountain, Christine (POL)

Subject: Crime Trends Briefing with Chief Scott
Location: Teams Meeting

Start: 5 b., 10., 11.
End: 5 b., 10., 11.

Recurrence: 5 b., 10.
Recurrence Pattern: 

Meeting Status: Accepted

Organizer: Carr, Rowena (POL)

Required Attendees: Scott, William (POL); Redmond, Michael (POL); Lazar, David (POL); McEachern, Greg (POL); Vaswani, Raj (POL); Mannix, Ann (POL); Perea, Daniel (POL); Ewins, Teresa (POL); Walsh, Peter; Dorsey, Matt (POL); Oliva-Aroche, Diana (POL); Sutton, Tiffany (POL); Andraychak, Michael (POL)

Optional Attendees: Lobsinger, Adam (POL); Maxie, Allison (POL); Fountain, Christine (POL); Rueca, Robert (POL); Basco, Bernice (POL); Garcia, Maria (POL); Thompson, Bernadette (POL); Crowder, Erika (POL)

The Crime Trends Briefing will be Teams Meeting until staff can meet in person.
### Fountain, Christine (POL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject:</th>
<th>Sean Elsbernd &amp; Chief Scott</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Chief Scott to call Sean's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start:</td>
<td>5.b., 10., 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End:</td>
<td>5.b., 10., 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurrence:</td>
<td>5.b., 10., 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurrence Pattern:</td>
<td>5.b., 10., 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Status:</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizer:</td>
<td>Elsbernd, Sean (MYR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Attendees:</td>
<td>Scott, William (POL)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fountain, Christine (POL)

Subject: Meeting with Mayor Breed
Location: ZOOM MEETING
Start: 5.b., 10., 11.
End: 5.b., 10., 11.
Recurrence: 5.b., 10., 11.
Recurrence Pattern: 5.b., 10., 11.
Meeting Status: Meeting organizer
Organizer: Scott, William (POL)
Required Attendees: Scott, William Chief (POL)

Susanna Conine-Nakano is inviting you to a scheduled Zoom meeting.

Topic: Police Chief Scott + Mayor Breed
Time: This is a recurring meeting Meet anytime

Join Zoom Meeting
5.b., 10., 11.

Meeting ID: 5.b., 10., 11.
Passcode: 5.b., 10., 11.
One tap mobile 5.b., 10., 11.

Dial by your location

Meeting ID: 5.b., 10., 11.
Passcode: 5.b., 10., 11.
Find your local number 5.b., 10., 11.

Join by SIP 5.b., 10., 11.

Join by H.323 5.b., 10., 11.
Meeting ID: b.b., 10., 11.
Passcode: b.b., 10., 11.

Join by Skype for Business
b.b., 10., 11.

Susanna Conine-Nakano
Scheduling Aide
Office of Mayor London N. Breed
City Hall Room 200
1 Dr Carlton B Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102
**Fountain, Christine (POL)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Subject:</strong></th>
<th>Police Commission Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
<td>City Hall - Room 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Start:</strong></td>
<td>Wed 3/10/21 5:30 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End:</strong></td>
<td>Wed 3/10/21 8:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recurrence:</strong></td>
<td>Weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recurrence Pattern:</strong></td>
<td>Occurs every Wednesday from 5:30 PM to 8:00 PM effective 2/1/2017. (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US &amp; Canada)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meeting Status:</strong></td>
<td>Meeting organizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizer:</strong></td>
<td>Scott, William (POL)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fountain, Christine (POL)

Subject: Policy Group
Location: Microsoft Teams Meeting

Start: 5 b. 10. 11.
End: 5 b. 10. 11.
Show Time As: Tentative

Recurrence: 5 b. 10. 11.
Recurrence Pattern: 5 b. 10. 11.

Meeting Status: Tentatively accepted

Organizer: Stevenson, Peg (CON)
Required Attendees: Carroll, Maryellen (DEM); Chu, Carmen (ASR); Colfax, Grant (DPH); Elsbernd, Sean (MYR); Forbes, Elaine (PRT); Rhorer, Trent (HSA); Rosenfield, Ben (CON); Scott, William (POL); SMITH, JESSE (CAT); Stewart-Kahn, Abigail (HOM); Bukowski, Kenneth (ADM); Su, Maria (CHF); Isen, Carol (HRD); Nicholson, Jeanine (FIR); Yant, Abbie (HSS)

Optional Attendees: Howard, Kate (HRD); Yeung, Linda (DEM); Power, Andres; Kayhan, Dariush (HSA); Bechelli, Adrienne (DEM); Bobba, Naveena (DPH); Marks, Jim (UCSF); Woods, David (DPH); Yu, Albert (DPH); Tang, Katy (DPH); Patterson, Kate (LIB)

Updating this meeting to extend through the 5 b. 10. 11.

For the next phase of COVID response, this group will meet on 5 b. 10. 11.

Please don’t forward the invite without checking in.

Peg Stevenson 415-5 b. 10.
Fountain, Christine (POL)

Subject: HSOC Principals Call
Location: Microsoft Teams Meeting

Start: 9:00 a.m., 10/11
End: 9:00 a.m., 10/11
Show Time As: Tentative

Recurrence: 9:00 a.m., 10/11
Recurrence Pattern: Tentatively accepted

Meeting Status: Tentatively accepted

Organizer: Kositsky, Jeff (DEM)
Required Attendees: Carroll, Maryellen (DEM); Colfax, Grant (DPH); Abigail Stewart-Kahn (Abigail.Stewart-kahn@sfgov.org); Degrafinried, Alaric (DPW); Scott, William (POL); Nicholson, Jeanine (FIR); Rosenfield, Ben (CON); Alfaro, Nancy (ADM); Tumlin, Jeffrey (MTA); Ginsburg, Phil (REC); Elsbernd, Sean (MYR); Fletcher, Karen (ADP); Forbes, Elaine (PRT); Miyamoto, Paul (SHF); Short, Carla (DPW); Redmond, Michael (POL); Stevenson, Peg (CON); Maimoni, Andy (ADM); Bobba, Naveena (DPH); Freeman, Matthew (SHF); Follin, Maja (REC); Johnston, Jennifer (ADM); Sawyer, Amy (MYR); Marshall, Laura (CON); Engler, Joseph (SHF); McCormick, Shawn (MTA); Lippi, Joseph (HOM)

Optional Attendees: Hogan, Kristin (DEM); Scanlon, Olivia (FIR)

United States, San Francisco (Toll)
From: Rahul Sidhu <rahul@spidrtech.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 4, 2021 12:24 AM
To: Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>
Cc: Carr, Rowena (POL) <Rowena.Carr@sfgov.org>; Elon Kaiserman <elon.kaiserman@spidrtech.com>
Subject: Re: Panel w/ SF DA last night + SFPD assistance

Hi Rowena,

I spoke with Chief Scott and he would like me to schedule a follow-up meeting that will include some of his colleagues. Can you help me schedule that appropriately? I think a 30 minute block would be sufficient, but 45 would allow us to accomplish more in the meeting. Can you help me schedule accordingly? Let me know what times may work next week or the week following, thank you so much!
### Fountain, Christine (POL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject:</th>
<th>Meeting with SF Pride Alliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Conference Call until we can meet in person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start:</td>
<td>5:00, 10, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End:</td>
<td>6:00, 10, 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Recurrence: | 5:00, 10, 11 |
| Recurrence Pattern: | |

**Meeting Status:** Meeting organizer  

**Organizer:** Scott, William (POL)
Fountain, Christine (POL)

Subject: HOLD - Meeting with Sandy Jo, Arif, and Mark

Start: 8.b., 10., 11.
End: 8.b., 10., 11.

Recurrence: (none)

Meeting Status: Meeting organizer

Organizer: Scott, William (POL)
Fountain, Christine (POL)

Subject: SFPD/Northwestern Research Project Meeting

Start: 9 a.m., 10. 11.
End: 5 p.m., 10. 11.
Show Time As: Tentative
Recurrence: (none)
Meeting Status: Not yet responded
Organizer:

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

You have been invited to the following event.

SFPD/Northwestern Research Project Meeting
When 9 a.m., 10. 11. Pacific Time - Los Angeles
Calendar william.scott@sfgov.org
Who
• [Redacted]
• [Redacted]
• [Redacted]
• [Redacted]
• rowena.carr@sfgov.org
• william.scott@sfgov.org
• [Redacted]
• kristine.demafeliz@sfgov.org
• rosland.butler@sfgov.org
• bob.moser@sfgov.org
• bernadette.t.thompson@sfgov.org
• catherine.mcguire@sfgov.org

Sat. 10. 11.

Sandy Jo,
Arif,
Mark,

It was great meeting with you today and great to see you all again. I am very interested in the SFPD engaging with Mark and his Northwestern University students for research opportunities proposed on emerging issues - to be identified.
I’d like to schedule a follow up meeting with you all and key members of our Executive leadership team.

I’ve copied my Executive Assistant, Ms. Rowena Carr, Assistant Chiefs Mike Redmond and Bob Moser, and Executive Director Catherine McGuire of our Strategic Management Bureau. Executive Director McGuire will be point on this.

Let’s shoot for two weeks or so from now. In the meanwhile I will brief my team on today’s discussion and brainstorm with them on research ideas that would benefit our Department.

Thank you again for reaching out and talk soon!

Bill

~==================================~

You have been invited to a Zoom meeting:

Meeting ID: 5.b., 10., 11.

Password: 5.b., 10., 11.

One tap mobile:

5.b., 10., 11.
Dial by your location:

5 b., 10., 11.

Find your local number:

5 b., 10., 11.

~==================================~

Going (william.scott@sfgov.org)?

Invitation from Google Calendar

You are receiving this courtesy email at the account william.scott@sfgov.org because you are an attendee of this event.

To stop receiving future updates for this event, decline this event. Alternatively you can sign up for a Google account at https://calendar.google.com/calendar/ and control your notification settings for your entire calendar.

Forwarding this invitation could allow any recipient to send a response to the organizer and be added to the guest list, or invite others regardless of their own invitation status, or to modify your RSVP Learn More.
Fountain, Christine (POL)

Subject: Phone Meeting Check-Ins with Dir. Paul Henderson (30 min only)
Location:
Start: 8:30 AM
End:
Recurrence: Weekly
Recurrence Pattern:
Meeting Status: Meeting organizer
Organizer: Scott, William (POL)
Required Attendees: Scott, William Chief (POL)

From: Thompson, Pamela (DPA)
Sent: Tuesday, July 17, 2018 1:10 PM
To: Demafeliz, Kristine (POL) <kristine.demafeliz@sfgov.org>
Cc: Fountain, Christine (POL) <christine.fountain@sfgov.org>
Subject: RE: Confirmation

Yes, he would like them to be phone check-ins for 30 mins.
Thanks for checking in. Let me know if I should remove the 2th’s meeting from the calendar.
Thanks,

Pamela Thompson
Management Assistant
Department of Police Accountability
25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 700
San Francisco, CA 94102
415-241-7721

From: Demafeliz, Kristine (POL)
Sent: Tuesday, July 17, 2018 10:49 AM
To: Thompson, Pamela (DPA) <pamela.thompson@sfgov.org>
Cc: Fountain, Christine (POL) <christine.fountain@sfgov.org>
Subject: Confirmation

Good morning Pam. I would like to confirm with you... Chief Scott has a meeting scheduled on his calendar to meet with Director Henderson on Thursday, July 26 at 4:00p with a location of TBD. We may have to cancel/reschedule that one since that’s Law Enforcement Night at the ballpark. But did we super confirm to change those meetings to “phone meetings” for 30 minutes only? Please advise so that I can update his calendar moving forward. Thank you Pam and happy Tuesday!
Kristine L. Demafeliz, Executive Assistant
Office of the Chief of Staff
(415) 837-7012
(415) 837-7370 (fax)

- for -

Rowena V. Carr, Executive Assistant
Office of the Chief of Police
(415) 837-7003
(415) 837-7370 (fax)

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This communication and its contents may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information. It is solely for the use of the intended recipient(s). Unauthorized interception, review, use or disclosure is prohibited and may violate applicable laws, including the Electronic Communications Privacy Act. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of the communication.
**Fountain, Christine (POL)**

**Subject:** Public Safety Meeting - Conditions in the Tenderloin Working Group

**Location:** Via Zoom

**Start:**

**End:**

**Recurrence:**

**Recurrence Pattern:**

**Meeting Status:** Accepted

**Organizer:** Elsbernd, Sean (MYR)

**Required Attendees:** Scott, William (POL); Elsbernd, Sean (MYR); Fabbri, Carl (POL); Katherine Feinstein; Kwon, Jenny; Faigman, David; jason.elliott@gov.ca.gov; Carr, Rowena (POL); david.l.anderson@usdoj.gov; jennifer.hiwa@usdoj.gov; helen.gilbert@usdoj.gov; Rubino, Kevin (USACAN)

**Optional Attendees:** Kwon, Jenny

**Attendees:**

- Sean Elsbernd
- Judge Katherine Feinstein
- Chief Bill Scott
- David Anderson
- Jenny Kwon
- David Faigman
- Jennifer Hiwa
- Helen Gilbert
- Jason Elliot
- Kevin Rubino

**Topic:** Public Safety Meeting - Conditions in the Tenderloin Working Group

**Time:** This is a recurring meeting Meet anytime

**Join Zoom Meeting**

**Meeting ID:**

**Passcode:**

**One tap mobile**

**Dial by your location**
### Fountain, Christine (POL)

**Subject:** Standing Meeting with Exec. Dir. McGuire  
**Location:** TBD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start:</th>
<th>End:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 b. 10, 11.</td>
<td>9 b. 10, 11.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recurrence:** 9 b. 10, 11.  
**Recurrence Pattern:** 9 b. 10, 11.

**Meeting Status:** Meeting organizer  
**Organizer:** Scott, William (POL)
Hi Ros,

The ED standing meetings with Chief are on S.b. 10. 11. but subject to change.

January 15 meeting is at 2:30 pm.

Thank you,
Row

Rowena V. Carr
Office of the Chief of Police
SF Police Headquarters
1245 3rd Street, Room 6171
San Francisco, CA 94158
415-837-7003

From: Butler, Rosland (POL) <roslan butler@sfgov.org>
Sent: Friday, January 8, 2021 10:06 AM
To: Carr, Rowena (POL) <Rowena.Carr@sfgov.org>
Cc: McGuire, Catherine (POL) <catherine.mcguire@sfgov.org>
Subject: 2021 Chief Check In Schedule
Good morning Rowena,

Please confirm the meeting with E/Dir. McGuire & Chief Scott moving forward for 2021 starting next week Friday, December 15th. The last two meetings were canceled due to the 12/25 Christmas & 01/01 New Years day holiday, and my calendar meeting was until 12/18/2020. I believe the meeting for today was switched to Wed. 1/6 to discuss the budget presentation to the PC.

Rosland Butler
Assistant to E/Dir. Catherine McGuire
San Francisco Police Department
Strategic Management Bureau: PSPP & Fiscal Division
1245 3rd St., 6th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94158

Direct Line: 415.837.7133
Work Cell: 415.964-6822
Fax SMB/PSPP: 415.575.6086
Fiscal Main: 415.837.7200
Fiscal Fax: 415.575.6085
Email: rosland.butler@sfgov.org

Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This communication and its contents may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information. It is solely for the use of the intended recipient(s). Unauthorized interception, review, use or disclosure is prohibited and may violate applicable laws, including the Electronic Communications Privacy Act. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of the communication.
| Subject: | Chief's Standing Meeting with Asja Steeves |
| Location: | Teams Meeting |
| Start: | 5.b., 10., 11. |
| End: | 5.b., 10., 11. |
| Recurrence: | 5.b., 10., 11. |
| Meeting Status: | Accepted |
| Organizer: | Carr, Rowena (POL) |
| Required Attendees: | Scott, William (POL); Steeves, Asja (POL) |

Date/time subject to change.
Fountain, Christine (POL)

Subject: Executive Covid Briefing
Location: 
Start: 5 p.m., 11
End: 5 p.m., 11
Recurrence: 5 p.m., 11
Recurrence Pattern: 
Meeting Status: Accepted

Organizer: Carroll, Maryellen (DEM)
Required Attendees: Cretan, Jeff (MYR); Howard, Kate (HRD); JoanneHayesWhite; Jue, Tyrone (MYR); Sharon Redmond; Hussey, Deirdre (PRT); Bobba, Naveena (DPH); Groffenberger, Ashley (MYR); Kelly, Naomi (ADM); SMITH, JESSE (CAT); Kelly, Jr, Harlan (PUC); Madland, Sarah (REC); Suhr, Wendy (DEM); Bechelli, Adrienne (DEM); Moore, Jamie (DPH); Scarpulla, John (PUC); Power, Andres (MYR); Redmond, Michael (POL); Degrafinried, Alaric (DPW); McSpadden, Shireen (HSA); Kittler, Sophia (MYR); Colfax, Grant (DPH); Su, Maria (CHF); Scanlon, Olivia (FIR); Young, Teresa (PUC); Miyamoto, Paul (SHF); Breed, London (MYR); Carlin, Michael (PUC); Wyrsch, Victor (FIR); Stewart-Kahn, Abigail (HOM); Engler, Joseph (SHF); Bruss, Andrea (MYR); Hayes-White, Joanne (DEM); Pojman, Natalie (DPH); Rhorer, Trent (HSA); Velo, Jose (FIR); Chu, Carmen (ASR); Sun, Selina (MYR); Stevenson, Peg (CON); Forbes, Elaine (PRT); Rosenfield, Ben (CON); Kagan, Rachael (DPH); Scott, William (POL); Tyra Fennell; Torres, Joaquin (ECN); Nicholson, Jeanine (FIR); Kirkpatrick, Kelly (MYR); Tumlin, Jeffrey (MTA); Zamora, Francis (DEM); Moser, Bob (POL); Ginsburg, Phil (REC); Elsbernd, Sean (MYR); Davis, Sheryl (HRC)

Optional Attendees: Buick, Jeanne (HRD); Isen, Carol (HRD); Bukowski, Kenneth (ADM); Rubenstein, Bryan (FIR); Kelly Jr, Harlan; Hogan, Kristin (DEM); Taupier, Anne (ECN)

Mary Ellen Carroll is inviting you to a scheduled Zoom meeting.

Topic: Executive Covid Briefing
Time: This is a recurring meeting Meet anytime

Join Zoom Meeting

Meeting ID: 5 p.m., 11
One tap mobile

Dial by your location
Fountain, Christine (POL)

Subject: Policy Group
Location: Microsoft Teams Meeting

Start: 9 a.m., 10/11
End: 9 a.m., 10/11
Show Time As: Tentative

Recurrence: 9 a.m., 10/11
Recurrence Pattern: 9 a.m., 10/11

Meeting Status: Tentatively accepted

Organizer: Stevenson, Peg (CON)
Required Attendees: Power, Andres (MYR); Carroll, Maryellen (DEM); Chu, Carmen (ADM); Colfax, Grant (DPH); Elsbernd, Sean (MYR); Forbes, Elaine (PRT); Rhorer, Trent (HSA); Rosenfield, Ben (CON); Scott, William (POL); SMITH, JESSE (CAT); Stewart-Kahn, Abigail (HOM); Bukowski, Kenneth (ADM); Su, Maria (CHF); Nicholson, Jeanine (FIR); Isen, Carol (HRD); Yant, Abbie (HSS)

Optional Attendees: Howard, Kate (HRD); Yeung, Linda (DEM); Bobba, Naveena (DPH); Bechelli, Adrienne (DEM); Kayhan, Dariush (HSA); Marks, Jim (UCSF); Woods, David (DPH); Yu, Albert (DPH); Tang, Katy (DPH); Patterson, Kate (LIB)

Updating this meeting through the 9 a.m., 10/11.

For the next phase of COVID response, this group will meet on 9 a.m., 10/11.

Please don’t forward the invite without checking in.

Peg Stevenson 415-898-5456

9 a.m., 10/11
United States, San Francisco (Toll)

Conference ID 9 a.m., 10/11
Fountain, Christine (POL)

Subject: Sean, Chief Scott & Dave/Lisa
Location: 8 b. 10. 11.
Start: 8 b. 10. 11.
End: 8 b. 10. 11.
Recurrence: 8 b. 10. 11.
Recurrence Pattern: 8 b. 10. 11.
Meeting Status: Accepted
Organizer: Elsbernd, Sean (MYR)
Required Attendees: Elsbernd, Sean (MYR); Scott, William (POL)
Fountain, Christine (POL)

Subject: Meeting with AC Moser and IAD
Location: 
Start: 9 a.m., 11
End: 9 a.m., 11
Recurrence: 9 a.m., 11
Recurrence Pattern: 
Meeting Status: Meeting organizer
Organizer: Scott, William (POL)
Required Attendees: Scott, William Chief (POL)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject:</th>
<th>Briefing with ACs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start:</td>
<td>5:00, 10.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End:</td>
<td>5:00, 10.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurrence:</td>
<td>5:00, 10.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurrence Pattern:</td>
<td>5:00, 10.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Status:</td>
<td>Meeting organizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizer:</td>
<td>Scott, William (POL)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fountain, Christine (POL)

Subject: Meeting with Chief Scott
Location: [Redacted]
Start: 5:00 PM
End: 5:00 PM
Recurrence: (none)
Meeting Status: Accepted
Organizer: Tracy Watson

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

Please join my meeting by computer, tablet, or smartphone.

Meeting [Redacted]

Join by Telephone

Join by One Touch Mobile
On your mobile device, you can connect with one tap mobile:

New to Zoom? Get the app now and be ready when your first meeting starts:

You can also test your phone, tablet or computer by joining a test meeting before your meeting starts:

You will be placed in a virtual waiting room until your meeting begins.
Fountain, Christine (POL)

Subject: 5 b. 10. 11.  Executive Covid Briefing
Location:

Start: 5 b. 10. 11.
End: 5 b. 10. 11.

Recurrence: 5 b. 10. 11.
Recurrence Pattern:

Meeting Status: Accepted

Organizer: Carroll, Maryellen (DEM)

Required Attendees: Cretan, Jeff (MYR); Howard, Kate (HRD); Joanne Hayes White; Joe, Tyrone (MYR); Sharon Redmond; Hussey, Deirdre (PRT); Bobba, Naveena (DPH); Groffenberger, Ashley (MYR); Kelly, Naomi (ADM); SMITH, JESSE (CAT); Kelly, Jr, Harlan (PUC); Madland, Sarah (REC); Suhr, Wendy (DEM); Bechelli, Adrienne (DEM); Moore, Jamie (DPH); Scarpulla, John (PUC); Power, Andres (MYR); Redmond, Michael (POL); Degrafinried, Alaric (DPW); McSpadden, Shireen (HSA); Kittler, Sophia (MYR); Colfax, Grant (DPH); Su, Maria (CHF); Scanlon, Olivia (FIR); Young, Teresa (PUC); Miyamoto, Paul (SHF); Breed, London (MYR); Carlin, Michael (PUC); Wyrsch, Victor (FIR); Stewart-Kahn, Abigail (HOM); Engler, Joseph (SHF); Bruss, Andrea (MYR); Hayes-White, Joanne (DEM); Pojman, Natalie (DPH); Rhorer, Trent (HSA); Velo, Jose (FIR); Chu, Carmen (ASR); Sun, Selina (MYR); Stevenson, Peg (CON); Forbes, Elaine (PRT); Rosenfeld, Ben (CON); Kagan, Rachael (DPH); Scott, William (POL); Tyra Fennell; Torres, Joaquin (ECN); Nicholson, Jeanine (FIR); Kirkpatrick, Kelly (MYR); Tumlin, Jeffrey (MTA); Zamora, Francis (DEM); Moser, Bob (POL); Ginsburg, Phil (REC); Elsbernd, Sean (MYR); Davis, Sheryl (HRC)

Optional Attendees: Buick, Jeanne (HRD); Isen, Carol (HRD); Bukowski, Kenneth (ADM); Rubenstein, Bryan (FIR); Kelly Jr, Harlan; Hogan, Kristin (DEM); Taupier, Anne (ECN)

Mary Ellen Carroll is inviting you to a scheduled Zoom meeting.

Topic: 5 b. 10. 11.  Executive Covid Briefing
Time: 5 b. 10. 11.

Join Zoom Meeting
5 b. 10. 11.

Meeting ID: 5 b. 10. 11.

One tap mobile
5 b. 10. 11.

Dial by your location
5 b. 10. 11.
Meeting 6.b., 10., 11.
Find your local number: 6.b., 10., 11.
# Fountain, Christine (POL)

**Subject:** Chris Fountain - Updates  
**Location:** Microsoft Teams Meeting  
**Start:**  
**End:**  
**Recurrence:** (none)  
**Meeting Status:** Meeting organizer  
**Organizer:** Scott, William (POL)  
**Required Attendees:** Fountain, Christine (POL)

---

## Microsoft Teams meeting

**Join on your computer or mobile app**

**Or call in (audio only)**

**Phone Conference ID:**

---

[Learn More] Meeting options
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject:</th>
<th>Meeting with APOA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start:</td>
<td>9:00, 10, 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End:</td>
<td>9:00, 10, 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurrence:</td>
<td>9:00, 10, 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurrence Pattern:</td>
<td>Occurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Status:</td>
<td>Meeting organizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizer:</td>
<td>Scott, William (POL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject:</td>
<td>Chief's API Forum (Capt. Yep)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start:</td>
<td>9 a.m., 10 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End:</td>
<td>10 a.m., 11 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurrence:</td>
<td>(none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Status:</td>
<td>Meeting organizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizer:</td>
<td>Scott, William (POL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject:</td>
<td>Meeting with Dir. Oliva-Aroche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start:</td>
<td>8 a.m., 10 a.m., 11 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End:</td>
<td>8 a.m., 10 a.m., 11 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurrence:</td>
<td>8 a.m., 10 a.m., 11 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurrence Pattern:</td>
<td>8 a.m., 10 a.m., 11 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Status:</td>
<td>Meeting organizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizer:</td>
<td>Scott, William (POL)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fountain, Christine (POL)

Subject: CRN: 5B.10.11. Meeting
Start: 5B.10.11.  
End: 5B.10.11.  
Show Time As: Tentative
Recurrence: 5B.10.11.  
Recurrence Pattern: 5B.10.11.  
Meeting Status: Tentatively accepted

Organizer: Hilder, Candy (POL)
Required Attendees: Scott, William (POL); McEachern, Greg (POL); Yee, Greg (POL); Ali, Mikail (POL); Flaherty, Denise (POL); Perea, Daniel (POL); Walsh, Peter; Altorfer, Eric (POL); Crockett, Ryan (POL); Smith, Amber (POL); Wong, Nora (POL); Thompson, Bernadette (POL)
Optional Attendees: Sanson-Mosier, William (POL); McGuire, Catherine (POL); Butler, Rosland (POL); O'Sullivan, Robert (POL); Preston, Darryelle (POL); Tran, Jimmy (POL); Sutton, Tiffany (POL); Demafeliz, Kristine (POL); Moser, Bob (POL); Medina, Chandra (POL); Ewins, Teresa (POL); Dorsey, Matt (POL); Cunningham, Jason (POL); Ford, Steve (POL); Sanchez, John (POL); Gribi, Hinde (POL); Fong, Daryl (POL); Barnes, Torrie (POL); Lazar, David (POL); Mannix, Ann (POL); Basco, Bernice (POL); Vaswani, Raj (POL); Fountain, Christine (POL); Rivera, Gabriel (POL); Endo, Kevin (POL); Cheng, Gary (POL); Nelson, Lauren (POL); Pereira, Frank (POL); Redmond, Michael (POL); Leung, Sally (POL); Oliva-Aroche, Diana (POL); Harrell, Joelle (POL)

You will be sent an email when attachments are ready to be viewed.

| B.B., 10.11. | United States, San Francisco (Toll) |
| Conference ID: B.B., 10.11. | Learn more about Teams |
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Fountain, Christine (POL)

Subject: meeting with Chief Scott
Location: 5 B, 10, 11.
Start: 5 B, 10, 11.
End: 5 B, 10, 11.
Recurrence: (none)
Meeting Status: Accepted
Organizer: Tracy Watson

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

Please join my meeting by computer, tablet, or smartphone.

Join by Telephone

Join by One Touch Mobile
On your mobile device, you can connect with one tap mobile:

New to Zoom? Get the app now and be ready when your first meeting starts:

You can also test your phone, tablet or computer by joining a test meeting before your meeting starts:

You will be placed in a virtual waiting room until your meeting begins.
Fountain, Christine (POL)

Subject: A.P.I. (Asian Pacific Islander) Forum Meeting with Chief Scott
Location: TEAMS Meeting

Start: 5.b., 10. 11.
End: 5.b., 10. 11.

Recurrence: (none)
Meeting Status: Accepted

Organizer: Wong, Gordon (POL)

Required Attendees: Scott, William (POL); Fong, Daryl (POL); Yep, Paul (POL); Lee, Kin Yau (POL);

Optional Attendees: Carr, Rowena (POL); Fountain, Christine (POL); Redmond, Michael (POL); Lazar, David (POL); Azim, Yossef (POL); Yick, Robert (POL); Basco, Bernice (POL); Lai, Wa Wu; Lee, Ivy (MYR); Lee, Judy (ECN); undefined; Oliva-Aroche, Diana (POL); McEachern, Greg (POL); Dennis Chew

Hello Everyone,

You have been invited to the A.P.I. (Asian Pacific Islander) Forum meeting with Chief Scott of the San Francisco Police Department. The purpose of this meeting will be to address the safety and well-being of our communities in San Francisco. This meeting will also address the recent crimes against the Asian / Pacific Islander community.

If there are any questions that you would like answered, please email me separately (gordon.wong@sfgov.org) and I will compile them for this meeting. Thank you and be safe.
Microsoft Teams meeting

Join on your computer or mobile app

Or call in (audio only)

Phone Conference ID:

United States, San Francisco

Learn More | Meeting options
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fountain, Christine</td>
<td>(POL)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subject:** Sean Elsbernd & Chief Scott

**Location:** Chief Scott to call Sean's

**Start:** 5:00, 10, 11
**End:** 6:00, 10, 11

**Recurrence:** 5:00, 10, 11
**Recurrence Pattern:** 5:00, 10, 11

**Meeting Status:** Accepted

**Organizer:** Elsbernd, Sean (MYR)

**Required Attendees:** Scott, William (POL)
Fountain, Christine (POL)

Subject: Crime Trends Briefing with Chief Scott
Location: Teams Meeting

Start: 5.b., 10., 11.
End: 5.b., 10., 11.

Recurrence: 5.b., 10., 11.
Recurrence Pattern: 5.b., 10., 11.

Meeting Status: Accepted

Organizer: Carr, Rowena (POL)
Required Attendees: Scott, William (POL); Redmond, Michael (POL); Lazar, David (POL); McEachern, Greg (POL); Vaswani, Raj (POL); Mannix, Ann (POL); Perea, Daniel (POL); Ewins, Teresa (POL); Walsh, Peter; Dorsey, Matt (POL); Oliva-Aroche, Diana (POL); Sutton, Tiffany (POL); Andraychak, Michael (POL)

Optional Attendees: Lobsinger, Adam (POL); Maxie, Allison (POL); Fountain, Christine (POL); Rueca, Robert (POL); Basco, Bernice (POL); Garcia, Maria (POL); Thompson, Bernadette (POL); Crowder, Erika (POL)

The Crime Trends Briefing will be Teams Meeting until staff can meet in person.
### Fountain, Christine (POL)

**Subject:** Meeting with Mayor Breed  
**Location:** ZOOM MEETING  
**Start:** 5.b., 10., 11.  
**End:** 5.b., 10., 11.  
**Recurrence:** Regular  
**Recurrence Pattern:** Regular  
**Meeting Status:** Meeting organizer  
**Organizer:** Scott, William (POL)  
**Required Attendees:** Scott, William Chief (POL)

Susanna Conine-Nakano is inviting you to a scheduled Zoom meeting.

**Topic:** Police Chief Scott + Mayor Breed  
**Time:** This is a recurring meeting Meet anytime

#### Join Zoom Meeting

- **Meeting ID:** 5.b., 10., 11.  
- **Passcode:** 5.b., 10., 11.  
- **One tap mobile:** 5.b., 10., 11.  
- **Dial by your location:** 5.b., 10., 11.

- **Meeting ID:** 5.b., 10., 11.  
- **Passcode:** 5.b., 10., 11.  
- **Find your local number:** 5.b., 10., 11.  
- **Join by SIP:** 5.b., 10., 11.  
- **Join by H.323:** 5.b., 10., 11.
Meeting ID: 5.b., 10., 11.
Passcode: 5.b., 10., 11.

Join by Skype for Business

Susanna Conine-Nakano
Scheduling Aide
Office of Mayor London N. Breed
City Hall Room 200
1 Dr Carlton B Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102
Fountain, Christine (POL)

Subject: Chief Staff/DA Staff Meeting (AC Redmond with CS from FOB, Investigations, Dir. Sutton, Dir. Oliva-Aroche)

Location:  

Start: 9 a.m., 10 a.m., 11 a.m.

End:  

Recurrence:  
Recurrence Pattern:  

Meeting Status: Meeting organizer

Organizer: Scott, William (POL)

AC Redmond
DC McEachern
DC Lazar
Cmdr. Walsh
Cmdr. Ewins
Cmdr. Vaswani
Dir. Sutton
Fountain, Christine (POL)

Subject: HOLD-UCSF Changemaker Series: Legislation to Disrupt Industry Practices that Disproportionately Impact Black Americans: San Francisco’s Comprehensive Flavored Tobacco Ban
Location: Zoom Webinar TBD

Start: 5:30, 10, 11.
End: 5:50, 10, 11.

Recurrence: (none)
Meeting Status: Accepted
Organizer: Akers, Melissa

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

*The webinar will begin at 5:30, but we ask that panelists log in between 5:00, 10, 11. to test audio/video

Session Title: Legislation to Disrupt Industry Practices that Disproportionately Impact Black Americans: San Francisco’s Comprehensive Flavored Tobacco Ban

Case Study: To illustrate these objectives, this panel will examine from multiple perspectives the first successful public health campaign to eliminate the sale of menthol and other flavored tobacco products using municipal legislation.

Learning Objectives:
- Uncover ways in which industry and the private sector use race to perpetuate existing practices
- Explore how multi-stakeholder collaborations including academic investigators and community leaders can neutralize strong industry counter-forces
- Discuss how municipal legislation can be used as a lever to address health inequities and public health priorities

Panelists:
Academic Investigator: Valerie Yerger, Professor of Health Policy, UCSF
Legislative Policy: Malia Cohen, State Board of Equalization, California
Community Leadership: William Scott, Chief of Police, San Francisco
Institutional Leadership: Robert Hiatt, Co-Leader, Cancer Control Program, UCSF Helen Diller Family Comprehensive Cancer Center

UCSF Changemaker Series
The Changemaker Series seeks to build the capacity of scientists and researchers to generate evidence that is responsive to the needs of real-world decision-makers. Sessions are organized around a specific story (or “case study”) that illustrates key learning points for how scientists can more meaningfully inform policies, systems, and structures in order to create social change or policy change.

Each session is filmed during a 60-minute Zoom call that includes multiple panelists. Audience members for the panel are a small number of UCSF post-doctoral students and early faculty members whose work focuses specifically on advancing equity in health and health care. The panel discussion will be recorded and professionally edited into a 6-10 minute video that elevates key points and is suitable for broader dissemination.
within and outside of UCSF. *Panelists will have the opportunity to review and provide feedback on the video before dissemination.*

You will receive a separate email from Zoom Webinar that contains your unique panelist log-in link. Once received, please follow the directions to save the information to your calendar.
Fountain, Christine (POL)

Subject: Police Commission Meeting
Location: City Hall - Room 400

Start: Wed 3/17/21 5:30 PM
End: Wed 3/17/21 8:00 PM

Recurrence: Weekly
Recurrence Pattern: Occurs every Wednesday from 5:30 PM to 8:00 PM effective 2/1/2017. (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada)

Meeting Status: Meeting organizer
Organizer: Scott, William (POL)
### Fountain, Christine (POL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Subject:</strong></th>
<th>AO Training - Force Op</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Start:</strong></td>
<td>5:00, 10.11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End:</strong></td>
<td>5:00, 10.11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recurrence:</strong></td>
<td>(none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meeting Status:</strong></td>
<td>Meeting organizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizer:</strong></td>
<td>Scott, William (POL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject:</td>
<td>Policy Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Microsoft Teams Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start:</td>
<td>5:00 AM, 11/15/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End:</td>
<td>5:00 AM, 11/15/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show Time As</td>
<td>Tentative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurrence:</td>
<td>5:00 AM, 11/15/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurrence Pattern:</td>
<td>5:00 AM, 11/15/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Status:</td>
<td>Tentatively accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizer:</td>
<td>Stevenson, Peg (CON)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Attendees:</td>
<td>Carroll, Maryellen (DEM); Chu, Carmen (ASR); Colfax, Grant (DPH); Elsbernd, Sean (MYR); Forbes, Elaine (PRT); Rhorer, Trent (HSA); Rosenfield, Ben (CON); Scott, William (POL); SMITH, JESSE (CAT); Stewart-Kahn, Abigail (HOM); Bukowski, Kenneth (ADM); Su, Maria (CHF); Isen, Carol (HRD); Nicholson, Jeanine (FIR); Yant, Abbie (HSS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optional Attendees:</td>
<td>Howard, Kate (HRD); Yeung, Linda (DEM); Power, Andres; Kayhan, Dariush (HSA); Bechelli, Adrienne (DEM); Bobba, Naveena (DPH); Marks, Jim (UCSF); Woods, David (DPH); Yu, Albert (DPH); Tang, Katy (DPH); Patterson, Kate (LIB)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Updating this meeting to extend through 5:00 AM, 11/15/21.

For the next phase of COVID response, this group will meet on 5:00 AM, 11/15/21.

Please don’t forward the invite without checking in.

Peg Stevenson 415-500-1011

5:00 AM, 11/15/21

United States, San Francisco (Toll)

Conference ID: 5:00 AM, 11/15/21

Learn more about Teams
### Fountain, Christine (POL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject:</th>
<th>Meeting with California Partnership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Teams Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start:</td>
<td>5.b., 10., 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End:</td>
<td>5.b., 10., 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurrence:</td>
<td>5.b., 10., 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurrence Patterns:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Status:</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizer:</td>
<td>Carr, Rowena (POL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Attendees:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:vaughn@thecapartnership.org">vaughn@thecapartnership.org</a>; <a href="mailto:reygan@thecapartnership.org">reygan@thecapartnership.org</a>; david; Gamero, Lili (POL); Sutton, Tiffany (POL); Redmond, Michael (POL); Lazar, David (POL); McEachern, Greg (POL); Canning, Chris (POL); Scott, William (POL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optional Attendees:</td>
<td>Basco, Bernice (POL); Thompson, Bernadette (POL); Crowder, Erika (POL); Azim, Yossef (POL)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A notification will be sent out prior to the date for any changes.

---

5.b., 10., 11.
5.b., 10., 11. United States, San Francisco (Toll)
Conference ID: 5.b., 10., 11.
5.b., 10., 11. Learn more about Teams 5.b., 10., 11.
Fountain, Christine (POL)

Subject: Police Academy Graduation
Start: s.b., 10, 11.
End: s.b., 10, 11.
Recurrence: (none)
Meeting Status: Meeting organizer
Organizer: Scott, William (POL)
Fountain, Christine (POL)

Subject: HSOC Principals Call
Location: Microsoft Teams Meeting

Start: 9:30, 10. 11.
End: 5:30, 10. 11.
Show Time As: Tentative

Recurrence: Every 30 days, 10. 11.
Recurrence Pattern: None

Meeting Status: Tentatively accepted

Organizer: Kositsky, Jeff (DEM)
Required Attendees: Carroll, Maryellen (DEM); Colfax, Grant (DPH); Abigail Stewart-Kahn (Abigail.Stewart-Kahn@sfgov.org); Degrafinried, Alaric (DPW); Scott, William (POL); Nicholson, Jeanine (FIR); Rosenfield, Ben (CON); Alfaro, Nancy (ADM); Tumlin, Jeffrey (MTA); Ginsburg, Phil (REC); Elsbernd, Sean (MYR); Fletcher, Karen (ADP); Forbes, Elaine (PRT); Miyamoto, Paul (SHF); Short, Carla (DPW); Redmond, Michael (POL); Stevenson, Peg (CON); Maimoni, Andy (ADM); Bobba, Naveena (DPH); Freeman, Matthew (SHF); Follin, Maja (REC); Johnston, Jennifer (ADM); Sawyer, Amy (MYR); Marshall, Laura (CON); Engler, Joseph (SHF); McCormick, Shawn (MTA); Lippi, Joseph (HOM)

Optional Attendees: Hogan, Kristin (DEM); Scanlon, Olivia (FIR)

United States, San Francisco (Toll)

Conference ID: 9:30, 10. 11.
Fountain, Christine (POL)

Subject: All Hands On Meeting
Location: Teams Meeting

Start: 9 a.m., 10, 11.
End: 5 p.m., 10, 11.

Recurrence: 9 a.m., 10, 11.
Recurrence Pattern: 9 a.m., 10, 11.

Meeting Status: Accepted

Organizer: Carr, Rowena (POL)
Required Attendees: Yin, Dominic (POL); Ford, Steve (POL); Ali, Mikhail (POL); Redmond, Michael (POL); Moser, Bob (POL); Mannix, Ann (POL); O'Sullivan, Robert (POL); McEachern, Greg (POL); Walsh, Peter; Pereia, Daniel (POL); Ewins, Teresa (POL); Lazar, David (POL); Yee, Greg (POL); Fong, Daryl (POL); McGuire, Catherine (POL); Hart, Jack (POL); Rainsford, Nicholas (POL); Jaimerena, John (POL); Caltagirone, Gaetano (POL); Fabbri, Carl (POL); Yick, Robert (POL); Vaswani, Raj (POL); Pedrini, Christopher (POL); Vintero, Eric (POL); Mar, Gregory (POL); Pagano, Renee; Flaherty, Denise (POL); O'Brien, Alexa (POL); Yep, Paul (POL); Williams, Yulanda (POL); Kota, Mark (POL); Dangerfield, Troy (POL); Cherniss, Jason (POL); Sanchez, John (POL); Sutton, Tiffany (POL); Falvey, Timothy (POL); Chin, Sergio (POL); Mannina, Steven (POL); Schiff, Frederick (POL); Wearing, Trenia (POL); Woon, Chris (POL); Yee, Henry (POL); Escobar, William (POL); Sanson-Mosier, William (POL); Dorantes, Jennifer (POL); Dorsey, Matt (POL); Falzon, Dave (POL); Preston, Darryelle (POL); Oliva-Aroche, Diana (POL); Altorfer, Eric (POL); Lozada, Aaron (POL); Conley, William (POL); Leung, Patrick (POL); Lemos, Dan; Lee, Kin Yau (POL); Lam, Henry (POL); Marquez, Marcial (POL); Buckley, Nicholas (POL); tony@sfpoa.org; Scott, William (POL); Jones, Nicole (POL); Ahern, James (POL); Daniels, Juan (POL)

Optional Attendees: Williams, Wilfred (POL); Knoble, Kevin (POL); Fountain, Christine (POL)

This will be a Teams Meeting until staff can meet in person; time start subject to change.
# Fountain, Christine (POL)

**Subject:** MLB Street Conditions Meeting (Staff: Sean Elsbernd)

**Location:** Via Zoom

**Start:** 8 a.m., 10 a.m.

**End:** 8 a.m., 10 a.m.

**Recurrence:** Every Tuesday at 10 a.m.

**Recurrence Pattern:**

**Meeting Status:** Accepted

**Organizer:** Elsbernd, Sean (MYR)

**Required Attendees:** Sawyer, Amy (MYR); Kositsky, Jeff (DEM); Sun, Selina (MYR); Carroll, Maryellen (DEM); Scott, William (POL); Nicholson, Jeanine (FIR); Degrafainried, Alaric (DPW); Stewart-Kahn, Abigail (HOM); Colfax, Grant (DPH); Lippi, Joseph (HOM)

**Optional Attendees:** Murray, Ashley (MYR); Ludwig, Theresa (FIR); Hervey, Myisha (DPW); Bowyer, Julie (HOM); Varisto, Michaela (DPH); Tyson, Pamela (DEM); Conine-Nakano, Susanna (MYR)

**Topic:** Street Conditions Meeting

**Meeting ID:** 8 a.m., 10 a.m.

**Passcode:** 8 a.m., 10 a.m.

**Attendees:**
- Sean Elsbernd
- Jeff Kositsky
- MaryEllen Carroll
- Chief Bill Scott
- Chief Jeanine Nicholson
- Alaric Degrafainried
- Abigail Stewart Kahn
- Joe Lippi
- Grant Colfax
- Amy Sawyer
Fountain, Christine (POL)

Subject: Standing Meeting with Dir. Sutton
Location: 9 b., 10., 11.
Start: 9 b., 10., 11.
End: 9 b., 10., 11.
Recurrence: 9 b., 10., 11.
Recurrence Pattern: Occurs
Meeting Status: Meeting organizer
Organizer: Scott, William (POL)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject:</th>
<th>Lunch Meeting with DA Boudin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start:</td>
<td>S.b., 10., 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End:</td>
<td>S.b., 10., 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurrence:</td>
<td>S.b. 10.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurrence Pattern:</td>
<td>S.b., 10., 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Status:</td>
<td>Meeting organizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizer:</td>
<td>Scott, William (POL)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fountain, Christine (POL)

Subject:  DGO Concurrence Meetings
Location:  Microsoft Teams Meeting
Start:  5 p.m., 10.11.
End:  5 p.m., 10.11.
Recurrence:  5 p.m., 10.11.
Recurrence Pattern:  5 p.m., 10.11.
Meeting Status:  Accepted

Organizer:  Butler, Rosland (POL)
Required Attendees:  Scott, William (POL); Carr, Rowena (POL) (rowena.carr@sfgov.org); JASON CUNNINGHAM; Mannix, Ann (POL); Garcia, Maria (POL); Redmond, Michael (POL); Thompson, Bernadette (POL); McEachern, Greg (POL); Crowder, Erika (POL); Yee, Greg (POL); Wong, Nora (POL); Lazar, David (POL); Basco, Bernice (POL); Ali, Mikail (POL); Padilla, Sylvia (POL); Rosalejos, Gloria (POL); Bardsley, William (POL); Harrell, Joelle (POL); Fountain, Christine (POL); Moser, Bob (POL); Demafeliz, Kristine (POL); McGuire, Catherine (POL); Preston, Darryle (POL)

Optional Attendees:  Oliva-Aroche, Diana (POL)

Reoccurring meeting invite being sent on behalf of Jason Cunningham*

This meeting will take place on the 5 p.m., 10.11.

United States, San Francisco (Toll)
### Fountain, Christine (POL)

| Subject: | Standing Meeting with Exec. Dir. McGuire |
| Location: | TBD |
| Start: | 5-6 p.m.|
| End: | 8-9 p.m. |
| Recurrence: | 3rd, 10th, 17th, 24th of each month |
| Recurrence Pattern: | TBD |
| Meeting Status: | Meeting organizer |
| Organizer: | Scott, William (POL) |
Fountain, Christine (POL)

Subject: Standing Meeting w/Chief Scott & E/Dir. McGuire
Location: TBD

Start: 5 b. 10. 11.
End: 5 b. 10. 11.
Show Time As: Tentative

Recurrence: 5 b. 10. 11.
Recurrence Pattern: Tentative accepted

Meeting Status: Tentatively accepted

Organizer: McGuire, Catherine (POL)
Required Attendees: Scott, William (POL); McGuire, Catherine (POL)
Optional Attendees: Rowena Carr; Butler, Rosland (POL)

From: Carr, Rowena (POL) <Rowena.Carr@sfgov.org>
Sent: Monday, January 11, 2021 8:56 AM
To: Butler, Rosland (POL) <rosland.butler@sfgov.org>
Cc: McGuire, Catherine (POL) <catherine.mcguire@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: 2021 Chief Check In Schedule

Hi Ros,

The ED standing meetings with Chief are on 5 b. 10. 11. but subject to change.

January 15 meeting is at 2:30 pm.

Thank you,
Row

Rowena V. Carr
Office of the Chief of Police
SF Police Headquarters
1245 3rd Street, Room 6171
San Francisco, CA 94158
415-837-7003

From: Butler, Rosland (POL) <rosland.butler@sfgov.org>
Sent: Friday, January 8, 2021 10:06 AM
To: Carr, Rowena (POL) <Rowena.Carr@sfgov.org>
Cc: McGuire, Catherine (POL) <catherine.mcguire@sfgov.org>
Subject: 2021 Chief Check In Schedule

1
Good morning Rowena,

Please confirm the meeting with E/Dir. McGuire & Chief Scott moving forward for 2021 starting next week Friday, December 15th. The last two meetings were canceled due to the 12/25 Christmas & 01/01 New Years day holiday, and my calendar meeting was until 12/18/2020. I believe the meeting for today was switched to Wed. 1/6 to discuss the budget presentation to the PC.

Rosland Butler
Assistant to E/Dir. Catherine McGuire
San Francisco Police Department
Strategic Management Bureau: PSPP & Fiscal Division
1245 3rd St., 6th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94158

Direct Line: 415.837.7133
Work Cell: 415.964-6822
Fax SMB/PSPP: 415.575.6086
Fiscal Main:415.837.7200
Fiscal Fax: 415.575. 6085
Email: rosland.butler@sfgov.org

Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This communication and its contents may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information. It is solely for the use of the intended recipient(s). Unauthorized interception, review, use or disclosure is prohibited and may violate applicable laws, including the Electronic Communications Privacy Act. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of the communication.
Fountain, Christine (POL)

Subject: Chief's Standing Meeting with Asja Steeves
Location: Teams Meeting

Start: 5.b., 10., 11.
End: 5.b., 10., 11.

Recurrence: 5.b., 10.
Recurrence Pattern: 5.b., 10., 11.

Meeting Status: Accepted

Organizer: Carr, Rowena (POL)
Required Attendees: Scott, William (POL); Steeves, Asja (POL)

Date/time subject to change.
Fountain, Christine (POL)

Subject: [Redacted] Executive Covid Briefing
Location: [Redacted]
Start: 5 b. 10. 11.
End: 5 b. 10. 11.
Recurrence: 5 b. 10. 11.
Recurrence Pattern: [Redacted]
Meeting Status: Accepted

Organizer: Carroll, Maryellen (DEM)
Required Attendees: Cretan, Jeff (MYR); Howard, Kate (HRD); JoanneHayesWhite; Jue, Tyrone (MYR); Sharon Redmond; Hussey, Deirdre (PRT); Bobba, Naveena (DPH); Groffenberger, Ashley (MYR); Kelly, Naomi (ADM); SMITH, JESSE (CAT); Kelly, Jr, Harlan (PUC); Madland, Sarah (REC); Suhr, Wendy (DEM); Bechelli, Adrienne (DEM); Moore, Jamie (DPH); Scarpulla, John (PUC); Power, Andres (MYR); Redmond, Michael (POL); Degrafinried, Alaric (DPW); McSpadden, Shireen (HSA); Kittler, Sophia (MYR); Colfax, Grant (DPH); Su, Maria (CHF); Scanlon, Olivia (FIR); Young, Teresa (PUC); Miyamoto, Paul (SHF); Breed, London (MYR); Carlin, Michael (PUC); Wyrsch, Victor (FIR); Stewart-Kahn, Abigail (HOM); Engler, Joseph (SHF); Bruss, Andrea (MYR); Hayes-White, Joanne (DEM); Pojman, Natalie (DPH); Rhorer, Trent (HSA); Velo, Jose (FIR); Chu, Carmen (ASR); Sun, Selina (MYR); Stevenson, Peg (CON); Forbes, Elaine (PRT); Rosenfield, Ben (CON); Kagan, Rachael (DPH); Scott, William (POL); Tyra Fennell; Torres, Joaquin (ECN); Nicholson, Jeanine (FIR); Kirkpatrick, Kelly (MYR); Tumlin, Jeffrey (MTA); Zamora, Francis (DEM); Moser, Bob (POL); Ginsburg, Phil (REC); Elsbernd, Sean (MYR); Davis, Sheryl (HRC)

Optional Attendees: Buick, Jeanne (HRD); Isen, Carol (HRD); Bukowski, Kenneth (ADM); Rubenstein, Bryan (FIR); Kelly Jr, Harlan; Hogan, Kristin (DEM); Taupier, Anne (ECN)

Mary Ellen Carroll is inviting you to a scheduled Zoom meeting.

Topic: [Redacted] Executive Covid Briefing
Time: This is a recurring meeting Meet anytime

Join Zoom Meeting [Redacted]
Meeting ID: [Redacted]
One tap mobile [Redacted]

Dial by your location [Redacted]
Fountain, Christine (POL)

Subject: Policy Group
Location: Microsoft Teams Meeting
Start: 5:00 PM, 10/11
End: 5:00 PM, 10/11
Show Time As: Tentative
Recurrence: 5:00 PM, 10/11
Recurrence Pattern: 5:00 PM, 10/11
Meeting Status: Tentatively accepted

Organizer: Stevenson, Peg (CON)
Required Attendees: Power, Andres (MYR); Carroll, Maryellen (DEM); Chu, Carmen (ADM); Colfax, Grant (DPH); Elsbernd, Sean (MYR); Forbes, Elaine (PRT); Rhorer, Trent (HSA); Rosenfield, Ben (CON); Scott, William (POL); SMITH, JESSE (CAT); Stewart-Kahn, Abigail (HOM); Bukowski, Kenneth (ADM); Su, Maria (CHF); Nicholson, Jeanine (FIR); Isen, Carol (HRD); Yant, Abbie (HSS)
Optional Attendees: Howard, Kate (HRD); Yeung, Linda (DEM); Bobba, Naveena (DPH); Bechelli, Adrienne (DEM); Kayhan, Dariush (HSA); Marks, Jim (UCSF); Woods, David (DPH); Yu, Albert (DPH); Tang, Katy (DPH); Patterson, Kate (LIB)

Updating this meeting through the 5:00 PM, 10/11.

For the next phase of COVID response, this group will meet on 5:00 PM, 10/11.

Please don't forward the invite without checking in.

Peg Stevenson 415-552-1010
<p>| Subject: | Sean, Chief Scott &amp; Dave/Lisa |
| Location: | 5b., 10., 11. |
| Start: | 5b., 10., 11. |
| End: | 5b., 10., 11. |
| Recurrence: | 5b., 10., 11. |
| Recurrence Pattern: | 5b., 10., 11. |
| Meeting Status: | Accepted |
| Organizer: | Elsbernd, Sean (MYR) |
| Required Attendees: | Elsbernd, Sean (MYR); Scott, William (POL) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Fountain, Christine (POL)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with AC Moser and IAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th, 10th Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Start:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recurrence:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every 1st Monday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meeting Status:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting organizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizer:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott, William (POL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Required Attendees:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott, William Chief (POL)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fountain, Christine (POL)

Subject: Briefing with ACs
Location: 
Start: 5:30 p.m., 11/11
End: 6:00 p.m., 11/11
Recurrence: Every 10, 11
Recurrence Pattern: 
Meeting Status: Meeting organizer
Organizer: Scott, William (POL)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject:</th>
<th>ACs, DCs, and E/Director Meeting with Chief</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start:</td>
<td>5:00, 10.11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End:</td>
<td>5:00, 10.11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurrence:</td>
<td>5:00, 10.11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurrence Pattern:</td>
<td>5:00, 10.11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Status:</td>
<td>Meeting organizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizer:</td>
<td>Scott, William (POL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fountain, Christine (POL)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject:</strong> HOLD - Wealth and Disparity in the Black Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Start:</strong> 5.b., 10., 11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End:</strong> 5.b., 10., 11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recurrence:</strong> (none)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meeting Status:</strong> Meeting organizer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizer:</strong> Scott, William (POL)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Fountain, Christine (POL)**

**Subject:** Chris Fountain - Updates  
**Location:** Microsoft Teams Meeting  
**Start:** 5:30pm, 10/11  
**End:** 5:30pm, 10/11  
**Recurrence:** (none)  
**Meeting Status:** Meeting organizer  
**Organizer:** Scott, William (POL)  
**Required Attendees:** Fountain, Christine (POL)

---

**Join on your computer or mobile app**  
**Or call in (audio only)**  
**United States, San Francisco**  
**Phone Conference ID:**  

[Learn More](#) | [Meeting options](#)
### Fountain, Christine (POL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject:</th>
<th>HOLD - Meeting with Sandy Jo, Arif, and Mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start:</td>
<td>9 a.m., 10 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End:</td>
<td>9 a.m., 10 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurrence:</td>
<td>(none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Status:</td>
<td>Meeting organizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizer:</td>
<td>Scott, William (POL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fountain, Christine (POL)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject:</strong> Meeting with Dir. Oliva-Aroche</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Start:</strong> 8 a.m., 10, 11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End:</strong> 8 a.m., 10, 11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recurrence:</strong> 8 a.m., 10, 11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meeting Status:</strong> Meeting organizer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizer:</strong> Scott, William (POL)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Fountain, Christine (POL)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject:</th>
<th>CRP.B. 10., 11. Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start:</td>
<td>5.B., 10., 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End:</td>
<td>5.B., 10., 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show Time As:</td>
<td>Tentative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Recurrence:    | 5.B., 10., 11.          |
| Recurrence Pattern: |                |

| Meeting Status: | Tentatively accepted |

**Organizer:**  Hilder, Candy (POL)

**Required Attendees:**  Scott, William (POL); McEachern, Greg (POL); Yee, Greg (POL); Ali, Mikail (POL); Flaherty, Denise (POL); Perea, Daniel (POL); Walsh, Peter; Altorfer, Eric (POL); Crockett, Ryan (POL); Smith, Amber (POL); Wong, Nora (POL); Thompson, Bernadette (POL)

**Optional Attendees:**  Sansom-Mosier, William (POL); McGuire, Catherine (POL); Butler, Rosland (POL); O'Sullivan, Robert (POL); Preston, Darryelle (POL); Tran, Jimmy (POL); Sutton, Tiffany (POL); Demafeliz, Kristine (POL); Moser, Bob (POL); Medina, Chandra (POL); Ewins, Teresa (POL); Dorsey, Matt (POL); Cunningham, Jason (POL); Ford, Steve (POL); Sanchez, John (POL); Gribi, Hinde (POL); Fong, Daryl (POL); Barnes, Torrie (POL); Lazar, David (POL); Mannix, Ann (POL); Basco, Bernice (POL); Vaswani, Raj (POL); Fountain, Christine (POL); Rivera, Gabriel (POL); Endo, Kevin (POL); Cheng, Gary (POL); Nelson, Lauren (POL); Pereira, Frank (POL); Redmond, Michael (POL); Leung, Sally (POL); Oliva-Aroche, Diana (POL); Harrell, Joelle (POL)

You will be sent an email when attachments are ready to be viewed.

---

**5.B., 10., 11.**

**5.B., 10., 11.** United States, San Francisco (Toll)

**Conference ID:**  5.B., 10., 11.  

Learn more about Teams  5.B., 10., 11.
Rowena V. Carr  
Office of the Chief of Police  
SF Police Headquarters  
1245 3rd Street, Room 6171  
San Francisco, CA 94158  
415-837-7003  

From: Mark Culkins <mculkins@sftc.org>  
Sent: Wednesday, January 13, 2021 6:18 PM  
To: Lazar, David (POL) <David.Lazar@sfgov.org>; Carr, Rowena (POL) <Rowena.Carr@sfgov.org>; Loretta Giorgi <LGiorgi@sftc.org>  
Subject: Judge Giorgi/Chief Scott Meeting  

Hi Rowena,  

Here is the recurring meeting invite.  

Thanks,  

Mark Culkins  
Chief Operations Officer, Criminal | Traffic  
Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco  
850 Bryant St. 3rd Floor Room 3C  
San Francisco, CA 94103  
(415) 551-0350  email: mculkins@sftc.org
"To assure equal access, fair treatment, and the just and efficient resolution of disputes for all people asserting their rights under the law."

Topic: Judge Giorgi/Chief Scott Meeting
Time: This is a recurring meeting Meet anytime

Join Zoom Meeting
Meeting ID: sb., 10., 11.
Passcode: sb., 10., 11.
Find your local number: sb., 10., 11.

Meeting ID: sb., 10., 11.
Passcode: sb., 10., 11.
Find your local number: sb., 10., 11.

Meeting ID: sb., 10., 11.
Passcode: sb., 10., 11.
Find your local number: sb., 10., 11.
## Fountain, Christine (POL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Subject:</strong></th>
<th>Chief Scott &amp; Grant Colfax - new call time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
<td>Microsoft Teams Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Start:</strong></td>
<td>S.b., 10., 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End:</strong></td>
<td>S.b., 10., 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recurrence:</strong></td>
<td>S.b., 10., 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recurrence Pattern:</strong></td>
<td>S.b., 10., 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meeting Status:</strong></td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizer:</strong></td>
<td>Varisto, Michaela (DPH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Required Attendees:</strong></td>
<td>Colfax, Grant (DPH); Scott, William (POL); Carr, Rowena (POL)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**New check in time starting in:** S.b., 10., 11.

Rowena and I will figure out a call time for September, S.b., 10., 11. doesn’t work for the Chief. Thank you.

**Conference ID:** S.b., 10., 11.
Fountain, Christine (POL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject:</th>
<th>Crime Trends Briefing with Chief Scott</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Teams Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start:</td>
<td>5.b., 10., 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End:</td>
<td>5.b., 10., 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurrence:</td>
<td>5.b., 10., 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurrence Pattern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Status:</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizer:</td>
<td>Carr, Rowena (POL)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Crime Trends Briefing will be Teams Meeting until staff can meet in person.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Fountain, Christine (POL)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Start:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recurrence:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recurrence Pattern:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meeting Status:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizer:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Required Attendees:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fountain, Christine (POL)

Subject: Meeting with Mayor Breed
Location: ZOOM MEETING
Start: 5 p.m., 10. 11.
End: 5 p.m., 10. 11.
Recurrence: 5 p.m., 10. 11.
Recurrence Pattern:
Meeting Status: Meeting organizer
Organizer: Scott, William (POL)
Required Attendees: Scott, William Chief (POL)

Susanna Conine-Nakano is inviting you to a scheduled Zoom meeting.

Topic: Police Chief Scott + Mayor Breed
Time: This is a recurring meeting Meet anytime

Join Zoom Meeting
5 p.m., 10. 11.

Meeting ID: 5 p.m., 10. 11.
Passcode: 5 p.m., 10. 11.
One tap mobile
5 p.m., 10. 11.

Dial by your location
5 p.m., 10. 11.

Meeting ID: 5 p.m., 10. 11.
Passcode: 5 p.m., 10. 11.
Find your local number: 5 p.m., 10. 11.

Join by SIP
5 p.m., 10. 11.

Join by H.323
5 p.m., 10. 11.
Meeting ID: 10., 11.
Passcode: 10., 11.

Join by Skype for Business
10., 11.

Susanna Conine-Nakano
Scheduling Aide
Office of Mayor London N. Breed
City Hall Room 200
1 Dr Carlton B Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102
Fountain, Christine (POL)

Subject: Police Commission Meeting - Dark
Location: City Hall - Room 400

Start: Wed 3/24/21 5:30 PM
End: Wed 3/24/21 8:00 PM

Recurrence: Weekly
Recurrence Pattern: Occurs every Wednesday from 5:30 PM to 8:00 PM effective 2/1/2017. (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada)

Meeting Status: Meeting organizer
Organizer: Scott, William (POL)
Fountain, Christine (POL)

Subject: Policy Group
Location: Microsoft Teams Meeting

Start: S.b., 10., 11.
End: S.b., 10., 11.
Show Time As: Tentative

Recurrence: S.b., 10., 11.
Recurrence Pattern: Tentatively accepted

Meeting Status: Tentatively accepted

Organizer: Stevenson, Peg (CON)
Required Attendees: Carroll, Maryellen (DEM); Chu, Carmen (ASR); Colfax, Grant (DPH); Elsbernd, Sean (MYR); Forbes, Elaine (PRT); Rhorer, Trent (HSA); Rosenfield, Ben (CON); Scott, William (POL); SMITH, JESSE (CAT); Stewart-Kahn, Abigail (HOM); Bukowski, Kenneth (ADM); Su, Maria (CHF); Isen, Carol (HRD); Nicholson, Jeanine (FIR); Yant, Abbie (HSS)

Optional Attendees: Howard, Kate (HRD); Yeung, Linda (DEM); Power, Andres; Kayhan, Dariush (HSA); Bechelli, Adrienne (DEM); Bobba, Naveena (DPH); Marks, Jim (UCSF); Woods, David (DPH); Yu, Albert (DPH); Tang, Katy (DPH); Patterson, Kate (LIB)

Updating this meeting to extend through the S.b., 10., 11.

For the next phase of COVID response, this group will meet on S.b., 10., 11.

Please don’t forward the invite without checking in.

Peg Stevenson 415 S.b., 10.
Fountain, Christine (POL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject:</th>
<th>Meeting with OFJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Virtual (Zoom)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start:</td>
<td>5:00, 10., 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End:</td>
<td>5:00, 10., 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurrence:</td>
<td>5:00, 10., 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurrence Pattern:</td>
<td>5:00, 10., 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Status:</td>
<td>Meeting organizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizer:</td>
<td>Scott, William (POL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Attendees</td>
<td>Scott, William Chief (POL)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Subject: HSOC Principals Call
Location: Microsoft Teams Meeting

Start: 5:00 p.m., 10. 11.
End: 5:00 p.m., 10. 11.
Show Time As: Tentative

Recurrence: 5:00 p.m., 10. 11.
Recurrence Pattern:

Meeting Status: Tentatively accepted

Organizer: Kositsky, Jeff (DEM)

Required Attendees: Carroll, Maryellen (DEM); Colfax, Grant (DPH); Abigail Stewart-Kahn (Abigail.Stewart-Kahn@sfgov.org); Degrainfried, Alaric (DPW); Scott, William (POL); Nicholson, Jeanine (FIR); Rosenfield, Ben (CON); Alfaro, Nancy (ADM); Tumlin, Jeffrey (MTA); Ginsburg, Phil (REC); Elsbernd, Sean (MYR); Fletcher, Karen (ADP); Forbes, Elaine (PRT); Miyamoto, Paul (SHF); Short, Carla (DPW); Redmond, Michael (POL); Stevenson, Peg (CON); Maimoni, Andy (ADM); Bobba, Naveena (DPH); Freeman, Matthew (SHF); Follin, Maja (REC); Johnston, Jennifer (ADM); Sawyer, Amy (MYR); Marshall, Laura (CON); Engler, Joseph (SHF); McCormick, Shawn (MTA); Lippi, Joseph (HOM)

Optional Attendees: Hogan, Kristin (DEM); Scanlon, Olivia (FIR)

Location: United States, San Francisco (Toll)
Conference ID:
Fountain, Christine (POL)

Subject: Chief's Meeting re Equity and Inclusion (ACs, ED and Dir. Sutton)
Location: Teams Meeting
Start: 8 b., 10., 11.
End: 8 b., 10., 11.
Recurrence: 8 b., 10., 11.
Recurrence Pattern: 8 b., 10., 11.
Meeting Status: Accepted
Organizer: Carr, Rowena (POL)
Required Attendees: Moser, Bob (POL); Redmond, Michael (POL); McGuire, Catherine (POL); Scott, William (POL); Sutton, Tiffany (POL)
Optional Attendees: Demafeliz, Kristine (POL); Butler, Rosland (POL); Thompson, Bernadette (POL)

Dates are subject to change and will send notification prior to scheduled date until December 2020.

5 b., 10., 11.
5 b., 10., 11. United States, San Francisco (Toll)
Conference ID: 5 b., 10., 11.

22nd Annual SOR Report
APPENDIX - Page 1098
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject:</th>
<th>DO NOT SCHEDULE ANYTHING - ETHICS TRAINING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start:</td>
<td>s.b., 10., 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End:</td>
<td>s.b., 10., 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurrence:</td>
<td>(none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Status:</td>
<td>Meeting organizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizer:</td>
<td>Scott, William (POL)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fountain, Christine (POL)

Subject: Public Safety Meeting- Conditions in the Tenderloin Working Group
Location: Via Zoom
Start: 5:30 p.m., 11.
End: 5:00 p.m., 11.
Recurrence: 5:30 p.m., 11.
Meeting Status: Accepted
Organizer: Elsbernd, Sean (MYR)
Required Attendees: Scott, William (POL); Elsbernd, Sean (MYR); Fabbri, Carl (POL); Katherine Feinstein; Kwon, Jenny; Faigman, David; jason.elliott@gov.ca.gov; Carr, Rowena (POL); david.i.anderson@usdoj.gov; jennifer.hiwa@usdoj.gov; helen.gilbert@usdoj.gov; Rubino, Kevin (USACAN)
Optional Attendees: Kwon, Jenny

Attendees:
- Sean Elsbernd
- Judge Katherine Feinstein
- Chief Bill Scott
- David Anderson
- Jenny Kwon
- David Faigman
- Jennifer Hiwa
- Helen Gilbert
- Jason Elliot
- Kevin Rubino

Topic: 5:30 p.m., 11. Public Safety Meeting- Conditions in the Tenderloin Working Group
Time: This is a recurring meeting. Meet anytime

Join Zoom Meeting
5:30 p.m., 11.
Meeting ID: 5:30 p.m., 11.
Passcode: 5:30 p.m., 11.
One tap mobile
5:30 p.m., 11.
Dial by your location
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>2021 UC Hastings Symposium (more to follow)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start</td>
<td>5:30, 10, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End</td>
<td>5:30, 10, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurrence</td>
<td>(none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Status</td>
<td>Meeting organizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizer</td>
<td>Scott, William (POL)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fountain, Christine (POL)

Subject: Invitation: BGCSF Board Retreat @ [Redacted] (william.scott@sfgov.org)

Start: [Redacted]
End: [Redacted]
Show Time As: Tentative
Recurrence: (none)
Meeting Status: Not yet responded
Organizer: BGCSF Board

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

You have been invited to the following event.

BGCSF Board Retreat

When [Redacted]

Joining info
- Join with Google Meet [Redacted]
- Join by phone [Redacted]

Calendar william.scott@sfgov.org

Who [Redacted] creator

- Doug Tom
- [Redacted]
- [Redacted]
- [Redacted]
- Eric Prosnitz
- [Redacted]
Invitation from Google Calendar

You are receiving this courtesy email at the account william.scott@sfgov.org because you are an attendee of this event.

To stop receiving future updates for this event, decline this event. Alternatively you can sign up for a Google account at https://www.google.com/calendar/ and control your notification settings for your entire calendar.

Forwarding this invitation could allow any recipient to send a response to the organizer and be added to the guest list, or invite others regardless of their own invitation status, or to modify your RSVP. Learn More.
Fountain, Christine (POL)

Subject: Standing Meeting w/Chief Scott & E/Dir. McGuire
Location: TBD
Start: TBD
End: TBD
Show Time As: Tentative
Recurrence: TBD
Recurrence Pattern: TBD
Meeting Status: Tentatively accepted

Organizer: McGuire, Catherine (POL)
Required Attendees: Scott, William (POL); McGuire, Catherine (POL)
Optional Attendees: Rowena Carr; Butler, Rosland (POL)

From: Carr, Rowena (POL) <Rowena.Carr@sfgov.org>
Sent: Monday, January 11, 2021 8:56 AM
To: Butler, Rosland (POL) <rosland.butler@sfgov.org>
Cc: McGuire, Catherine (POL) <catherine.mcguire@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: 2021 Chief Check In Schedule

Hi Ros,

The ED standing meetings with Chief are on TBD but subject to change.

January 15 meeting is at 2:30 pm.

Thank you,
Row

Rowena V. Carr
Office of the Chief of Police
SF Police Headquarters
1245 3rd Street, Room 6171
San Francisco, CA 94158
415-837-7003

From: Butler, Rosland (POL) <rosland.butler@sfgov.org>
Sent: Friday, January 8, 2021 10:06 AM
To: Carr, Rowena (POL) <Rowena.Carr@sfgov.org>
Cc: McGuire, Catherine (POL) <catherine.mcguire@sfgov.org>
Subject: 2021 Chief Check In Schedule
Good morning Rowena,

Please confirm the meeting with E/Dir. McGuire & Chief Scott moving forward for 2021 starting next week Friday, December 15th. The last two meetings were canceled due to the 12/25 Christmas & 01/01 New Years day holiday, and my calendar meeting was until 12/18/2020. I believe the meeting for today was switched to Wed. 1/6 to discuss the budget presentation to the PC.

Rosland Butler
Assistant to E/Dir. Catherine McGuire
San Francisco Police Department
Strategic Management Bureau: PSPP & Fiscal Division
1245 3rd St., 6th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94158

Direct Line: 415.837.7133
Work Cell:  415.964-6822
Fax SMB/PSSP: 415.575.6086
Fiscal Main:415.837.7200
Fiscal Fax: 415.575. 6085
Email: rosland.butler@sfgov.org

Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This communication and its contents may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information. It is solely for the use of the intended recipient(s). Unauthorized interception, review, use or disclosure is prohibited and may violate applicable laws, including the Electronic Communications Privacy Act. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of the communication.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Fountain, Christine (POL)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Start:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recurrence:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recurrence Pattern:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meeting Status:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizer:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Required Attendees:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date/time subject to change.

---

**Conference ID:** 9.b., 10., 11.

9 United States, San Francisco (Toll)

Learn more about Teams
Fountain, Christine (POL)

Subject: Policy Group
Location: Microsoft Teams Meeting

Start: S.B., 10., 11.
End: S.B., 10., 11.
Show Time As: Tentative

Recurrence: S.B., 10., 11.
Recurrence Pattern: Tentatively accepted

Meeting Status: Tentatively accepted

Organizer: Stevenson, Peg (CON)
Required Attendees: Power, Andres (MYR); Carroll, Maryellen (DEM); Chu, Carmen (ADM); Colfax, Grant (DPH); Elsbernd, Sean (MYR); Forbes, Elaine (PRT); Rhorer, Trent (HSA); Rosenfield, Ben (CON); Scott, William (POL); SMITH, JESSE (CAT); Stewart-Kahn, Abigail (HOM); Bukowski, Kenneth (ADM); Su, Maria (CHF); Nicholson, Jeanine (FIR); Isen, Carol (HRD); Yant, Abbie (HSS)

Optional Attendees: Howard, Kate (HRD); Yeung, Linda (DEM); Bobba, Naveena (DPH); Bechelli, Adrienne (DEM); Kayhan, Dariush (HSA); Marks, Jim (UCSF); Woods, David (DPH); Yu, Albert (DPH); Tang, Katy (DPH); Patterson, Kate (LIB)

Updating this meeting through the S.B., 10., 11.

For the next phase of COVID response, this group will meet on S.B., 10., 11.

Please don’t forward the invite without checking in.

Peg Stevenson 415 S.B., 10.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject:</th>
<th>Sean, Chief Scott &amp; Dave/Lisa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start:</td>
<td>5 b., 10., 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurrence:</td>
<td>5 b., 10., 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurrence Pattern:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Status:</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizer:</td>
<td>Elsbernd, Sean (MYR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Attendees:</td>
<td>Elsbernd, Sean (MYR); Scott, William (POL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fountain, Christine (POL)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject:</strong></td>
<td>Meeting with AC Moser and IAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
<td>A.B., 10., 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Start:</strong></td>
<td>A.B., 10., 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End:</strong></td>
<td>A.B., 10., 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recurrence:</strong></td>
<td>A.B., 10., 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recurrence Pattern:</strong></td>
<td>A.B., 10., 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meeting Status:</strong></td>
<td>Meeting organizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizer:</strong></td>
<td>Scott, William (POL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Required Attendees:</strong></td>
<td>Scott, William Chief (POL)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Fountain, Christine (POL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject:</th>
<th>Briefing with ACs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>5th, 10th, 15th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start:</td>
<td>5th, 10th, 15th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End:</td>
<td>5th, 10th, 15th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurrence:</td>
<td>5th, 10th, 15th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurrence Pattern:</td>
<td>5th, 10th, 15th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Status:</td>
<td>Meeting organizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizer:</td>
<td>Scott, William (POL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject:</td>
<td>HOLD - Wealth and Disparity in the Black Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start:</td>
<td>8.b., 10., 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End:</td>
<td>8.b., 10., 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurrence:</td>
<td>(none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Status:</td>
<td>Meeting organizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizer:</td>
<td>Scott, William (POL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fountain, Christine (POL)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 b., 10., 11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with Dir. Oliva-Aroche</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Start:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 b., 10., 11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 b., 10., 11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recurrence:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 b., 10., 11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recurrence Pattern:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 b., 10., 11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meeting Status:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting organizer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizer:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott, William (POL)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fountain, Christine (POL)

Subject: CR Meeting

Start: 8:00 AM
End: 10:00 AM
Show Time As: Tentative

Recurrence:
Recurrence Pattern:

Meeting Status: Tentatively accepted

Organizer: Hilder, Candy (POL)

Required Attendees: Scott, William (POL); McEachern, Greg (POL); Yee, Greg (POL); Ali, Mikail (POL); Flaherty, Denise (POL); Perea, Daniel (POL); Walsh, Peter; Altorfer, Eric (POL); Crockett, Ryan (POL); Smith, Amber (POL); Wong, Nora (POL); Thompson, Bernadette (POL)

Optional Attendees: Sanson-Mosier, William (POL); McGuire, Catherine (POL); Butler, Rosland (POL); O'Sullivan, Robert (POL); Preston, Darryelle (POL); Tran, Jimmy (POL); Sutton, Tiffany (POL); Demafeliz, Kristine (POL); Moser, Bob (POL); Medina, Chandra (POL); Ewins, Teresa (POL); Dorsey, Matt (POL); Cunningham, Jason (POL); Ford, Steve (POL); Sanchez, John (POL); Gribi, Hinde (POL); Fong, Daryl (POL); Barnes, Torrie (POL); Lazar, David (POL); Mannix, Ann (POL); Basco, Bernice (POL); Vaswani, Raj (POL); Fountain, Christine (POL); Rivera, Gabriel (POL); Endo, Kevin (POL); Cheng, Gary (POL); Nelson, Lauren (POL); Pereira, Frank (POL); Redmond, Michael (POL); Leung, Sally (POL); Oliva-Aroche, Diana (POL); Harrell, Joelle (POL)

You will be sent an email when attachments are ready to be viewed.

8:00 AM

United States, San Francisco (Toll)

Conference ID: 8:00 AM

Learn more about Teams
Fountain, Christine (POL)

| Subject:  | Crime Trends Briefing with Chief Scott |
| Location: | Teams Meeting |
| Start:    | 5.b., 10., 11. |
| End:      | 5.b., 10., 11. |
| Recurrence: | 5.b., 10., 11. |
| Recurrence Pattern: | 5.b., 10., 11. |
| Meeting Status: | Accepted |
| Organizer: | Carr, Rowena (POL) |

The Crime Trends Briefing will be Teams Meeting until staff can meet in person.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject:</th>
<th>DO NOT SCHEDULE ANYTHING - ETHICS TRAINING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start:</td>
<td>9 a.m., 10 a.m., 11 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End:</td>
<td>9 a.m., 10 a.m., 11 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurrence:</td>
<td>(none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Status</td>
<td>Meeting organizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizer:</td>
<td>Scott, William (POL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fountain, Christine (POL)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject:</strong> Sean Elsbernd &amp; Chief Scott</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong> Chief Scott to call Sean's</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Start:</strong> 9.b., 10.. 11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End:</strong> 9.b., 10.. 11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recurrence:</strong> 9.b., 10.. 11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recurrence Pattern:</strong> 9.b., 10.. 11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meeting Status:</strong> Accepted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizer:</strong> Elsbernd, Sean (MYR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Required Attendees:</strong> Scott, William (POL)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fountain, Christine (POL)

Subject: Meeting with Mayor Breed  
Location: ZOOM MEETING

Start: 10.11.22  
End: 10.11.22

Recurrence: 10.11.22  
Recurrence Pattern:

Meeting Status: Meeting organizer

Organizer: Scott, William (POL)  
Required Attendees: Scott, William Chief (POL)

Susanna Conine-Nakano is inviting you to a scheduled Zoom meeting.

Topic: Police Chief Scott + Mayor Breed  
Time: This is a recurring meeting Meet anytime

Join Zoom Meeting

Meeting ID: 10.11.22  
Passcode: 10.11

One tap mobile

Dial by your location

Meeting ID: 10.11.22  
Passcode: 10.11

Find your local number:

Join by SIP

Join by H.323
Meeting ID: 5.b., 10., 11.
Passcode: 5.b., 10., 11.

Join by Skype for Business
5.b., 10., 11.

Susanna Conine-Nakano
Scheduling Aide
Office of Mayor London N. Breed
City Hall Room 200
1 Dr Carlton B Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102
Fountain, Christine (POL)

Subject: Police Commission Meeting - Dark  
Location: City Hall - Room 400

Start: Wed 3/31/21 5:30 PM  
End: Wed 3/31/21 8:00 PM

Recurrence: Weekly  
Recurrence Pattern: Occurs every Wednesday from 5:30 PM to 8:00 PM effective 2/1/2017. (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada)

Meeting Status: Meeting organizer  
Organizer: Scott, William (POL)
February 27, 2021

This is a follow up to a previous request:

This request from October 21 2019 was not completely responded to and apparently they forgot about it.
This is a petition under 67.21(d) for a written determination that the records are public and an order for their disclosure.

Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 81953
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.

---

On Dec. 22, 2019:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Monthly Calendars - Immediate Disclosure Request
You claim that you have some sort of procedure to make sure you completely respond to requests that require rolling responses, but this request has been sitting for 2 months without a response.

NOTE: Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. The email address sending this request is a publicly-viewable mailbox. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request and various services that mirror those documents for analysis and research by journalists and the general public (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication
of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the government all be disclosable public records.

---

On Oct. 25, 2019:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Monthly Calendars - Immediate Disclosure Request
Thank you Mr. Heckel, and I look forward to the remaining records!

--Anonymous
---

---

On Oct. 24, 2019:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Monthly Calendars - Immediate Disclosure Request
Dear Anonymous,

Please see attached the requested Prop G calendar for the Mayor for the month of October 2019 in the requested monthly summary view. As noted, Admin Code 67.29-5 requires that this calendar be updated every three days and accordingly, this calendar is up to date through October 21.

Please note that entries for future meetings after today have been redacted for the security reasons noted previously pursuant to Cal. Gov. Code 6254(f).

Further, a cell phone number has been redacted for the October 23rd entry to protect privacy. See Cal. Govt. Code Secs. 6254(c), 6254(k); California Constitution, Art. I, Sec. 1.

We are continuing to process the rest of your request pertaining to non-Prop G calendars as noted.

Please let us know if you have any questions.

Regards,

Hank Heckel
Compliance Officer
Office of the Mayor
City and County of San Francisco
---

On Oct. 23, 2019:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Monthly Calendars - Immediate Disclosure Request
** Note that all of your responses (including disclosed records) may be automatically and instantly available to the public on the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though I am not a MuckRock representative). Please redact your responses correctly - once you send them to us there is no going back. **

While I do not agree with any of your arguments for exemptions, they appear to be consistent with your past arguments, EXCEPT: you have withheld the October PropG calendar. How could that possibly need to be redacted? It is a PropG calendar and completely public. As you said nothing is even added to the PropG calendar until after the event has happened.

Thanks,
Anonymous
---
On Oct. 22, 2019:
Subject: California Public Records Act Request: Monthly Calendars - Immediate Disclosure Request
Dear Anonymous,

This is in response to your request below sent Sunday, October 20 and received by the Office of the Mayor on Monday, October 21. Please see the attached responsive records. These include the "Prop G" calendar in monthly summaries from January to September as requested.

Please note that for the October Prop G entries and for "non Prop G" calendar information, we need to consult with other departments and make applicable redactions, which renders the request not routine, simple or readily answerable. Admin Code 67.25. We will provide responsive records as they become available according to the regular permitted timeline.

Regarding entries for future dates, as we have previously noted, such entries are exempt from disclosure, at least pursuant to Cal. Gov. Code 6254(f). Pursuant to that section and contrary to your arguments, future events and meetings of the Mayor that are not public, necessarily provide "security procedures" information of a "local police agency" given the security assigned to the Mayor for such events and meetings.

Under that provision and a rule of reason analysis, it jeopardizes the safety and security of such meetings to reveal their details in advance.

Also, by definition there are no "Prop G" entries available for future dates. The Prop G calendar is backward looking and is prepared to provide complete information for past meetings, updated every 3 days. See Admin Code 67.29-5.

Regards,

Hank Heckel
Compliance Officer
Office of the Mayor
City and County of San Francisco

October 21, 2019

Office of the Mayor,

** Note that all of your responses (including disclosed records) may be automatically and instantly available to the public on the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though I am not a MuckRock representative). Please redact your responses correctly - once you send them to us there is no going back. **

This is a new Immediate Disclosure Request under the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance and the CPRA, made on October 20, 2019.

I would like to understand the Mayor's retention of her non-Prop G calendar. To that end, we will test the extent of records retained using monthly summary views.

I am requesting approximately 24 pages of PDF records. It should be a simple print to PDF from Outlook, and is 'readily answerable.'

All records must be provided in rolling fashion.

Please provide:
1. IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE: an electronic copy of the Mayor's monthly January 2019 Outlook calendar view of "Calendar, Mayor (MYR)" (or whatever you may have renamed that account to) AND of "PropG, Mayor (MYR)", with all
events/items. You are welcome to print the monthly summary view directly to .PDF form in Outlook and redact them. Do not print and scan. This is a 67.21(l) format request that is easily generated.

2. IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE: an electronic copy of the Mayor's monthly February 2019 Outlook calendar view of "Calendar, Mayor (MYR)" (or whatever you may have renamed that account to) AND of "PropG, Mayor (MYR)", with all events/items. You are welcome to print the monthly summary view directly to .PDF form in Outlook and redact them. Do not print and scan. This is a 67.21(l) format request that is easily generated.

3. IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE: an electronic copy of the Mayor's monthly March 2019 Outlook calendar view of "Calendar, Mayor (MYR)" (or whatever you may have renamed that account to) AND of "PropG, Mayor (MYR)", with all events/items. You are welcome to print the monthly summary view directly to .PDF form in Outlook and redact them. Do not print and scan. This is a 67.21(l) format request that is easily generated.

4. IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE: an electronic copy of the Mayor's monthly April 2019 Outlook calendar view of "Calendar, Mayor (MYR)" (or whatever you may have renamed that account to) AND of "PropG, Mayor (MYR)", with all events/items. You are welcome to print the monthly summary view directly to .PDF form in Outlook and redact them. Do not print and scan. This is a 67.21(l) format request that is easily generated.

5. IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE: an electronic copy of the Mayor's monthly May 2019 Outlook calendar view of "Calendar, Mayor (MYR)" (or whatever you may have renamed that account to) AND of "PropG, Mayor (MYR)", with all events/items. You are welcome to print the monthly summary view directly to .PDF form in Outlook and redact them. Do not print and scan. This is a 67.21(l) format request that is easily generated.

6. IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE: an electronic copy of the Mayor's monthly June 2019 Outlook calendar view of "Calendar, Mayor (MYR)" (or whatever you may have renamed that account to) AND of "PropG, Mayor (MYR)", with all events/items. You are welcome to print the monthly summary view directly to .PDF form in Outlook and redact them. Do not print and scan. This is a 67.21(l) format request that is easily generated.

7. IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE: an electronic copy of the Mayor's monthly July 2019 Outlook calendar view of "Calendar, Mayor (MYR)" (or whatever you may have renamed that account to) AND of "PropG, Mayor (MYR)", with all events/items. You are welcome to print the monthly summary view directly to .PDF form in Outlook and redact them. Do not print and scan. This is a 67.21(l) format request that is easily generated.

8. IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE: an electronic copy of the Mayor's monthly August 2019 Outlook calendar view of "Calendar, Mayor (MYR)" (or whatever you may have renamed that account to) AND of "PropG, Mayor (MYR)", with all events/items. You are welcome to print the monthly summary view directly to .PDF form in Outlook and redact them. Do not print and scan. This is a 67.21(l) format request that is easily generated.

9. IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE: an electronic copy of the Mayor's monthly Sept 2019 Outlook calendar view of "Calendar, Mayor (MYR)" (or whatever you may have renamed that account to) AND of "PropG, Mayor (MYR)", with all events/items. You are welcome to print the monthly summary view directly to .PDF form in Outlook and redact them. Do not print and scan. This is a 67.21(l) format request that is easily generated.

10. IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE: an electronic copy of the Mayor's monthly Oct 2019 Outlook calendar view of "Calendar, Mayor (MYR)" (or whatever you may have renamed that account to) AND of "PropG, Mayor (MYR)", with all events/items. You are welcome to print the monthly summary view directly to .PDF form in Outlook and redact them. Do not print and scan. This is a 67.21(l) format request that is easily generated.

11. IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE: an electronic copy of the Mayor's monthly Nov 2019 Outlook calendar view of "Calendar, Mayor (MYR)" (or whatever you may have renamed that account to) AND of "PropG, Mayor (MYR)", with all events/items. You are welcome to print the monthly summary view directly to .PDF form in Outlook and redact them. Do not print and scan. This is a 67.21(l) format request that is easily generated.
12. IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE: an electronic copy of the Mayor's monthly Dec 2019 Outlook calendar view of "Calendar, Mayor (MYR)" (or whatever you may have renamed that account to) AND of "PropG, Mayor (MYR)", with all events/items. You are welcome to print the monthly summary view directly to .PDF form in Outlook and redact them. Do not print and scan. This is a 67.21(I) format request that is easily generated.

Please provide only those copies of records available without any fees. If you determine certain records would require fees, please instead provide the required notice of which of those records are available and non-exempt for inspection in-person if we so choose.

I look forward to your immediate disclosure.

Sincerely,
Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 81953-03405492@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:
https://accounts.muckrock.com/accounts/login/?url_auth_token=AAAxJKbo2Vje5U7JiiIkNXflXyg%3A1iMQoT%3AiijnxGXEVyIKASs1wnoWi9AfOvcA&next=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.muckrock.com%2Faccounts%2Flogin%2F%3Fnext%3D%252F2Fagency_login%252Foffice-of-the-mayor-3891%252Fmonthly-calendars-immediate-disclosure-request-81953%252F81953email%252Dmayorsunshinerequests%252D4osgov.org
Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 81953
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.

---

On Oct. 21, 2019:
Subject: California Public Records Act Request: Monthly Calendars - Immediate Disclosure Request
Office of the Mayor,

** Note that all of your responses (including disclosed records) may be automatically and instantly available to the public on the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though I am not a MuckRock representative). Please redact your responses correctly - once you send them to us there is no going back. **

This is a new Immediate Disclosure Request under the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance and the CPRA, made on October 20, 2019.

I would like to understand the Mayor's retention of her non-Prop G calendar. To that end, we will test the extent of records retained using monthly summary views.
I am requesting approximately 24 pages of PDF records. It should be a simple print to PDF from Outlook, and is 'readily answerable.'

All records must be provided in rolling fashion.

Please provide:

1. IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE: an electronic copy of the Mayor's monthly January 2019 Outlook calendar view of "Calendar, Mayor (MYR)" (or whatever you may have renamed that account to) AND of "PropG, Mayor (MYR)", with all events/items. You are welcome to print the monthly summary view directly to .PDF form in Outlook and redact them. Do not print and scan. This is a 67.21(l) format request that is easily generated.

2. IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE: an electronic copy of the Mayor's monthly February 2019 Outlook calendar view of "Calendar, Mayor (MYR)" (or whatever you may have renamed that account to) AND of "PropG, Mayor (MYR)", with all events/items. You are welcome to print the monthly summary view directly to .PDF form in Outlook and redact them. Do not print and scan. This is a 67.21(l) format request that is easily generated.

3. IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE: an electronic copy of the Mayor's monthly March 2019 Outlook calendar view of "Calendar, Mayor (MYR)" (or whatever you may have renamed that account to) AND of "PropG, Mayor (MYR)", with all events/items. You are welcome to print the monthly summary view directly to .PDF form in Outlook and redact them. Do not print and scan. This is a 67.21(l) format request that is easily generated.

4. IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE: an electronic copy of the Mayor's monthly April 2019 Outlook calendar view of "Calendar, Mayor (MYR)" (or whatever you may have renamed that account to) AND of "PropG, Mayor (MYR)", with all events/items. You are welcome to print the monthly summary view directly to .PDF form in Outlook and redact them. Do not print and scan. This is a 67.21(l) format request that is easily generated.

5. IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE: an electronic copy of the Mayor's monthly May 2019 Outlook calendar view of "Calendar, Mayor (MYR)" (or whatever you may have renamed that account to) AND of "PropG, Mayor (MYR)", with all events/items. You are welcome to print the monthly summary view directly to .PDF form in Outlook and redact them. Do not print and scan. This is a 67.21(l) format request that is easily generated.

6. IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE: an electronic copy of the Mayor's monthly June 2019 Outlook calendar view of "Calendar, Mayor (MYR)" (or whatever you may have renamed that account to) AND of "PropG, Mayor (MYR)", with all events/items. You are welcome to print the monthly summary view directly to .PDF form in Outlook and redact them. Do not print and scan. This is a 67.21(l) format request that is easily generated.

7. IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE: an electronic copy of the Mayor's monthly July 2019 Outlook calendar view of "Calendar, Mayor (MYR)" (or whatever you may have renamed that account to) AND of "PropG, Mayor (MYR)", with all events/items. You are welcome to print the monthly summary view directly to .PDF form in Outlook and redact them. Do not print and scan. This is a 67.21(l) format request that is easily generated.

8. IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE: an electronic copy of the Mayor's monthly August 2019 Outlook calendar view of "Calendar, Mayor (MYR)" (or whatever you may have renamed that account to) AND of "PropG, Mayor (MYR)", with all events/items. You are welcome to print the monthly summary view directly to .PDF form in Outlook and redact them. Do not print and scan. This is a 67.21(l) format request that is easily generated.

9. IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE: an electronic copy of the Mayor's monthly Sept 2019 Outlook calendar view of "Calendar, Mayor (MYR)" (or whatever you may have renamed that account to) AND of "PropG, Mayor (MYR)", with all events/items. You are welcome to print the monthly summary view directly to .PDF form in Outlook and redact them. Do not print and scan. This is a 67.21(l) format request that is easily generated.

10. IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE: an electronic copy of the Mayor's monthly Oct 2019 Outlook calendar view of "Calendar, Mayor (MYR)" (or whatever you may have renamed that account to) AND of "PropG, Mayor (MYR)", with all events/items. You are welcome to print the monthly summary view directly to .PDF form in Outlook and redact them. Do not print and scan. This is a 67.21(l) format request that is easily generated.
events/items. You are welcome to print the monthly summary view directly to .PDF form in Outlook and redact them. Do not print and scan. This is a 67.21(l) format request that is easily generated.

11. IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE: an electronic copy of the Mayor's monthly Nov 2019 Outlook calendar view of "Calendar, Mayor (MYR)" (or whatever you may have renamed that account to) AND of "PropG, Mayor (MYR)", with all events/items. You are welcome to print the monthly summary view directly to .PDF form in Outlook and redact them. Do not print and scan. This is a 67.21(l) format request that is easily generated.

12. IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE: an electronic copy of the Mayor's monthly Dec 2019 Outlook calendar view of "Calendar, Mayor (MYR)" (or whatever you may have renamed that account to) AND of "PropG, Mayor (MYR)", with all events/items. You are welcome to print the monthly summary view directly to .PDF form in Outlook and redact them. Do not print and scan. This is a 67.21(l) format request that is easily generated.

Please provide only those copies of records available without any fees. If you determine certain records would require fees, please instead provide the required notice of which of those records are available and non-exempt for inspection in-person if we so choose.

I look forward to your immediate disclosure.

Sincerely,
Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 81953-03405492@requests.muckrock.com
Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 81953
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.
Buta, Odaya (CAT)

From: 84174-46370490@requests.muckrock.com
Sent: Saturday, February 27, 2021 2:44 PM
To: Supervisor Records (CAT)
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Calendars and Emails - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF Economic Dev)

Office of Economic and Workforce Development
PRA Office
City Hall, Room 448
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

February 27, 2021

This is a follow up to a previous request:

This is a 67.21(d) petition for a determination in writing that the following records are public and an order for their disclosure against OEWD.

Records: the Feb 8, 2020 request from this email address asking as follows which has never been responded to.

RE: BCC Emails - Immediate Disclosure Request

Department Head:

Below are new Immediate Disclosure Requests (SF Admin Code 67.25(a)) directed to your agency and the department head. Your response is required by Feb 11, 2020. Rolling records responses are requested (SFAC 67.25(d)) if you are unable to immediately produce records. Exact copies of every responsive record are requested (Gov Code 6253(b)) - do not: provide mere URLs, print and scan electronic records, convert native files to PDFs, or provide black and white versions of any color record. Provide only copies of records not requiring fees and in-person inspection of all other records (GC 6253). Emails are requested in the easily-generated EML or MSG formats (SFAC 67.21(l)).

I am now auditing how the City appears to unlawfully withhold the BCC recipients of emails when they print out emails in certain formats. The identity of BCC recipients is not exempt. BCC is not an information security record that reveals vulnerabilities or increases chance of an attack. The BCC names was typed in by a human being and are not metadata. You must provide BCC just like you provide To or CC recipients. There is no legal authority to keep secret the identities of persons communicating with government officials, unless they are specifically confidential informants and such. If you withhold the BCC names, I will file complaints, separate and apart from email metadata complaints (which I have now already won, see ruling in SOTF 19044).

Your non-exhaustive obligations: All withholding of any information must be justified in writing (SFAC 67.27). All withholdings by masking or deletion (aka redactions) must be keyed by footnote or other clear reference to the specific justification for that redaction, and only the minimal exempt portion of any record may be withheld (SFAC 67.26). You must respond to emailed requests (SFAC 67.21(b)). You must notify us of whether or not responsive records exist and/or were withheld for each below request (Gov Code 6253(c), 6255(b)). You must state the name and title of each person responsible for withholding any information (Gov Code 6253(d)). Do not impose any end-user restrictions upon me (Santa Clara Co vs Superior Ct, 170 Cal.App 4th 1301); so if you use a third-party website to publish records, please make them completely public without any login or sign-in.
Your agency must do all of the above things in your response, and you cannot wait until we file complaints.

****** We have no duty to, and we will not again, remind the City of its obligations. Instead, we will file complaints for every Sunshine Ordinance or CPRA violation. We will continue to file complaints until the City's procedures are modified to fully comply with the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA, without caveat or exception. ******

1. An exact copy with all email headers (incl. but not limited to the BCC identities), attachments, color, formatting, hyperlinks, images, and all other parts of the record of the most recent 5 emails which have any BCC recipients which were sent by your Dept Head on any government account. Note that you will have to search directly from the person’s computer or account in their Sent folder specifically (In many email systems, no other method will allow you to see the BCC recipients). In modern Outlook systems, the search query is as follows: (bcc:*)

Do not destroy or discard any responsive records - we will appeal all withholdings or Sunshine violations.

NOTE: Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. The email address sending this request is a publicly-viewable mailbox. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 84174-46370490@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:
Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 84174
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.

---
On Feb. 8, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Calendars and Emails - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF Economic Dev)
RE: BCC Emails - Immediate Disclosure Request

Department Head:

Below are new Immediate Disclosure Requests (SF Admin Code 67.25(a)) directed to your agency and the department head. Your response is required by Feb 11, 2020. Rolling records responses are requested (SFAC 67.25(d)) if you are unable to immediately produce records. Exact copies of every responsive record are requested (Gov Code 6253(b)) - do not: provide mere URLs, print and scan electronic records, convert native files to PDFs, or provide black and white versions of any color record. Provide only copies of records not requiring fees and in-person inspection of all other records (GC 6253). Emails are requested in the easily-generated EML or MSG formats (SFAC 67.21(l)).

I am now auditing how the City appears to unlawfully withhold the BCC recipients of emails when they print out emails in certain formats. The identity of BCC recipients is not exempt. BCC is not an information security record that reveals vulnerabilities or increases chance of an attack. The BCC names was typed in by a human being and are not metadata. You must provide BCC just like you provide To or CC recipients. There is no legal authority to keep secret the identities of persons communicating with government officials, unless they are specifically confidential informants and such. If you withhold the BCC names, I will file complaints, separate and apart from email metadata complaints (which I have now already won, see ruling in SOTF 19044).

Your non-exhaustive obligations: All withholding of any information must be justified in writing (SFAC 67.27). All withholdings by masking or deletion (aka redactions) must be keyed by footnote or other clear reference to the specific justification for that redaction, and only the minimal exempt portion of any record may be withheld (SFAC 67.26). You must respond to emailed requests (SFAC 67.21(b)). You must notify us of whether or not responsive records exist and/or were withheld for each below request (Gov Code 6253(c), 6255(b)). You must state the name and title of each person responsible for withholding any information (Gov Code 6253(d)). Do not impose any end-user restrictions upon me (Santa Clara Co. vs Superior Ct, 170 Cal.App 4th 1301); so if you use a third-party website to publish records, please make them completely public without any login or sign-in.

Your agency must do all of the above things in your response, and you cannot wait until we file complaints.

****** We have no duty to, and we will not again, remind the City of its obligations. Instead, we will file complaints for every Sunshine Ordinance or CPRA violation. We will continue to file complaints until the City's procedures are modified to fully comply with the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA, without caveat or exception. ******

1. An exact copy with all email headers (incl. but not limited to the BCC identities), attachments, color, formatting, hyperlinks, images, and all other parts of the record of the most recent 5 emails which have any BCC recipients which were sent by your Dept Head on any government account. Note that you will have to search directly from the person’s computer or account in their Sent folder specifically (In many email systems, no other method will allow you to see the BCC recipients). In modern Outlook systems, the search query is as follows: (bcc:*)

Do not destroy or discard any responsive records - we will appeal all withholdings or Sunshine violations.

NOTE: Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. The email address sending this request is a publicly-viewable mailbox. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an
indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

---

On Dec. 11, 2019:
Subject: California Public Records Act Request: Calendars and Emails - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF Economic Dev)
Good afternoon,

Attached, please find the following responsive documents to your California Public Records Request, dated, 12/9/2019.

The following documents are responsive and thus closes out your current request.

M.

Marianne Mazzucco Thompson
Office of Economic and Workforce Development
City Hall, Room 448
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102
P: 415-554-6297
E: Marianne.Thompson@sfgov.org

---

On Dec. 9, 2019:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Calendars and Emails - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF Economic Dev)
Ms. Thompson,

There was an earlier Dec 7 email with an attachment. I am resending them both below to avoid confusion. Response is still due Dec 10.

To the Department Head,

Attached is an Immediate Disclosure Request (SF Admin Code 67.25(a)).
Your response is required by Dec. 10, 2019. Rolling records responses are requested (67.25(d)).

NOTE: Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. The email address sending this request is a publicly-viewable mailbox. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be public records.
Sincerely,

Anonymous

-----

RE: the DEC 7 IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE REQUEST from this email address

Please note: "Exact copies" are requested for all records pursuant to CPRA Gov Code 6253(c).
Please email all records, or publish them to your own website/portal (as long as the URL is accessible without any login), or upload them and publish them to MuckRock.com directly using the auto-generated link in the footer below. Do not physically mail any records. Provide only those copies available without fees - if you believe certain copies require fees, instead provide the required notice of which records are available for in-person inspection.

Your response is still required by Dec. 10, 2019. Rolling records responses were requested (67.25(d)).

NOTE: Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. The email address sending this request is a publicly-viewable mailbox. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

---

On Dec. 9, 2019:
Subject: FW: California Public Records Act Request: Calendars and Emails - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF Economic Dev)
Please not that there is not content in the e-mail. I do not know what you are requesting, as I am unable to open the links.

M.

Marianne Mazzucco Thompson
Office of Economic and Workforce Development
City Hall, Room 448
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102
P: 415-554-6297
E: Marianne.Thompson@sfgov.org
On Dec. 7, 2019:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Calendars and Emails - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF Economic Dev)
RE: the DEC 7 IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE REQUEST from this email address

Please note: "Exact copies" are requested for all records pursuant to CPRA Gov Code 6253(c).
Please email all records, or publish them to your own website/portal (as long as the URL is accessible without any login),
or upload them and publish them to MuckRock.com directly using the auto-generated link in the footer below. Do not
physically mail any records.
Provide only those copies available without fees - if you believe certain copies require fees, instead provide the required
notice of which records are available for in-person inspection.

Your response is still required by Dec. 10, 2019. Rolling records responses were requested (67.25(d)).

NOTE: Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going
back. The email address sending this request is a publicly-viewable mailbox. All of your responses (including all
responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service
used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing
herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including
but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special,
direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an
indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential
information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

---

On Dec. 7, 2019:
Subject: California Public Records Act Request: Calendars and Emails - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF Economic Dev)
To the Department Head,

Attached is an Immediate Disclosure Request (SF Admin Code 67.25(a)).
Your response is required by Dec. 10, 2019. Rolling records responses are requested (67.25(d)).

NOTE: Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going
back. The email address sending this request is a publicly-viewable mailbox. All of your responses (including all
responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service
used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing
herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including
but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special,
direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an
indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential
information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 84174-46370490@requests.muckrock.com
Buta, Odaya (CAT)

From: 84164-62563184@requests.muckrock.com
Sent: Saturday, February 27, 2021 2:46 PM
To: Supervisor Records (CAT)
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Calendars and Emails - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF MTA)

San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
PRA Office
7th Floor
1 South Van Ness Avenue
SF, CA 94103

February 27, 2021

This is a follow up to a previous request:

This is a 67.21(d) petition to determine in writing that the records responsive to the below Feb 8, 2020 request to MTA are public and to order them disclosed.

From nobody Sat Feb 8 13:08:06 2020
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="===============5005663475704444880=="
MIME-Version: 1.0
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Calendars and Emails - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF MTA)
From: "84164-62563184@requests.muckrock.com"
<84164-62563184@requests.muckrock.com>
To: Tom.Maguire@sfmta.com
Date: Sat, 08 Feb 2020 18:08:06 -0000
Message-ID: <20200208180806.4009.86944@d48fa7da-6a47-4b40-b83b-f39e9cfa38f0.prvt.dyno.rt.heroku.com>

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="utf-8"
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
PRA Office
7th Floor
1 South Van Ness Avenue
SF, CA 94103

February 8, 2020

This is a follow up to a previous request:

RE: BCC Emails - Immediate Disclosure Request
Department Head:

Below are new Immediate Disclosure Requests (SF Admin Code 67.25(a)) directed to your agency and the department head. Your response is required by Feb 11, 2020. Rolling records responses are requested (SFAC 67.25(d)) if you are unable to immediately produce records. Exact copies of every responsive record are requested (Gov Code 6253(b)) - do not: provide mere URLs, print and scan electronic records, convert native files to PDFs, or provide black and white versions of any color record. Provide only copies of records not requiring fees and in-person inspection of all other records (GC 6253). Emails are requested in the easily-generated EML or MSG formats (SFAC 67.21(l)).

I am now auditing how the City appears to unlawfully withhold the BCC recipients of emails when they print out emails in certain formats. The identity of BCC recipients is not exempt. BCC is not an information security record that reveals vulnerabilities or increases chance of an attack. The BCC names was typed in by a human being and are not metadata. You must provide BCC just like you provide To or CC recipients. There is no legal authority to keep secret the identities of persons communicating with government officials, unless they are specifically confidential informants and such. If you withhold the BCC names, I will file complaints, separate and apart from email metadata complaints (which I have now already won, see ruling in STF 19044).

Your non-exhaustive obligations: All withholding of any information must be justified in writing (SFAC 67.27). All withholdings by masking or deletion (aka redactions) must be keyed by footnote or other clear reference to the specific justification for that redaction, and only the minimal exempt portion of any record may be withheld (SFAC 67.26). You must respond to email requests (SFAC 67.21(b)). You must notify us of whether or not responsive records exist and/or were withheld for each below request (Gov Code 6253(c), 6255(b)). You must state the name and title of each person responsible for withholding any information (Gov Code 6253(d)). Do not impose any end-user restrictions upon me (Santa Clara Co. vs Superior Ct, 170 Cal.App 4th 1301); so if you use a third-party website to publish records, please make them completely public without any login or sign-in.

Your agency must do all of the above things in your response, and you cannot wait until we file complaints. =

****** We have no duty to, and we will not again, remind the City of its obligations. Instead, we will file complaints for every Sunshine Ordinance or CPRA violation. We will continue to file complaints until the City's procedures are modified to fully comply with the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA, without caveat or exception. ******

1. An exact copy with all email headers (incl. but not limited to the BCC identities), attachments, color, formatting and all other parts of the record of the most recent 5 emails which have any BCC recipients which were sent by your Dept Head on any government account. Note that you will have to search directly from the person's computer or account in their Sent folder.
specifically (In many email systems, no other method will allow you to see the BCC recipients). In modern Outlook systems, the search query is as follows: (bcc:*)

Do not destroy or discard any responsive records - we will appeal all withholdings or Sunshine violations.

NOTE: Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. The email address sending this request is a publicly-viewable mailbox. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 84164-62563184@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:
https://accounts.muckrock.com/accounts/login/?next=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.muckrock.com%2Faccounts%2Flogin%2F3Fnext%3D%2Faccounts%2FAgency_login%2Fsan-francisco-municipal-transportation-agency-3914%2Fcalendars-and-emails-immediate-disclosure-request-sf-mta-84164%2F%3FSFEmail%3Dsupervisor.records%3Femail%3Dsupervisor.records%40sfcityatty.org&url_auth_token=AAATu0IQO4kGTnTj4PxmY8mU-2o%3A1168LO%3AfZ8JTamGeMQ6eaVfu8CwZ5rsStE
Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 84164
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.

---

On Feb. 8, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Calendars and Emails - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF MTA)
RE: BCC Emails - Immediate Disclosure Request
Department Head:

Below are new Immediate Disclosure Requests (SF Admin Code 67.25(a)) directed to your agency and the department head. Your response is required by Feb 11, 2020. Rolling records responses are requested (SFAC 67.25(d)) if you are unable to immediately produce records. Exact copies of every responsive record are requested (Gov Code 6253(b)) - do not: provide mere URLs, print and scan electronic records, convert native files to PDFs, or provide black and white versions of any color record. Provide only copies of records not requiring fees and in-person inspection of all other records (GC 6253). Emails are requested in the easily-generated EML or MSG formats (SFAC 67.21(l)).

I am now auditing how the City appears to unlawfully withhold the BCC recipients of emails when they print out emails in certain formats. The identity of BCC recipients is not exempt. BCC is not an information security record that reveals vulnerabilities or increases chance of an attack. The BCC names was typed in by a human being and are not metadata. You must provide BCC just like you provide To or CC recipients. There is no legal authority to keep secret the identities of persons communicating with government officials, unless they are specifically confidential informants and such. If you withhold the BCC names, I will file complaints, separate and apart from email metadata complaints (which I have now already won, see ruling in SOTF 19044).

Your non-exhaustive obligations: All withholding of any information must be justified in writing (SFAC 67.27). All withholdings by masking or deletion (aka redactions) must be keyed by footnote or other clear reference to the specific justification for that redaction, and only the minimal exempt portion of any record may be withheld (SFAC 67.26). You must respond to emailed requests (SFAC 67.21(b)). You must notify us of whether or not responsive records exist and/or were withheld for each below request (Gov Code 6253(c), 6255(b)). You must state the name and title of each person responsible for withholding any information (Gov Code 6253(d)). Do not impose any end-user restrictions upon me (Santa Clara Co. vs Superior Ct, 170 Cal.App 4th 1301); so if you use a third-party website to publish records, please make them completely public without any login or sign-in.

Your agency must do all of the above things in your response, and you cannot wait until we file complaints.

***** We have no duty to, and we will not again, remind the City of its obligations. Instead, we will file complaints for every Sunshine Ordinance or CPRA violation. We will continue to file complaints until the City's procedures are modified to fully comply with the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA, without caveat or exception. *****

1. An exact copy with all email headers (incl. but not limited to the BCC identities), attachments, color, formatting and all other parts of the record of the most recent 5 emails which have any BCC recipients which were sent by your Dept Head on any government account. Note that you will have to search directly from the person's computer or account in their Sent folder specifically (In many email systems, no other method will allow you to see the BCC recipients). In modern Outlook systems, the search query is as follows: (bcc:*)

Do not destroy or discard any responsive records - we will appeal all withholdings or Sunshine violations.

NOTE: Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. The email address sending this request is a publicly-viewable mailbox. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,
Anonymous
---

On Feb. 4, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Calendars and Emails - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF MTA)
Of course you do not have to create any records. But you also cannot violate any Sunshine Ordinance requirements, which you did. Departments have two options: they can wait to be ordered into compliance by the SOTF or they can do so voluntarily.

You have made your choice.
---

On Feb. 4, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Calendars and Emails - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF MTA)
We are not required to create a record in response to a request.
---

On Jan. 28, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Calendars and Emails - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF MTA)
It appears that you do not wish to issue such letter. Therefore, we shall proceed to hearing to ask SOTF to find all violations and issue all orders.
---

On Jan. 13, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Calendars and Emails - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF MTA)
(To avoid doubt, we cannot dismiss SOTF 19133 until the letter above is signed by Tom Maguire and that letter is published to us.)
---

On Dec. 7, 2019:
Subject: California Public Records Act Request: Calendars and Emails - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF MTA)
To Whom It May Concern:

Attached is an Immediate Disclosure Request (SF Admin Code 67.25(a)).
Your response is required by Dec. 10, 2019. Rolling records responses are requested (67.25(d)).

NOTE: Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. The email address sending this request is a publicly-viewable mailbox. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous
Department of Emergency Management
PRA Office
1011 Turk Street
SF, CA 94102

February 27, 2021

This is a follow up to a previous request:

The Feb 8 2020 email from this address to DEM never had a response. This is a 67.21(d) petition to determine in writing the records public and order them disclosed.

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 84181-53996453@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:
%3Fnext%3D%253D%2Faccounts%2Fagency_login%2Fdepartment-of-emergency-management-8080%2Fcalendars-
and-emails-immediate-disclosure-request-sf-dem-84181%252F%253Femail%253Dsupervisor.records%252540sfcityatty.org&url_auth_token=AAAdJ4xrU-r5p-
QnHIR00J0R5i8%3A1IG8WM%3AOf2AaQpf5uVuMCZF8UfJ7H1kn1c
Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 84181
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.

---

On March 13, 2020:
Subject: Automatic reply: California Public Records Act Request: Calendars and Emails - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF DEM)
San Francisco’s Emergency Operations Center is active to support preparation and response to COVID-19 (Novel Coronavirus). Inquiries unrelated to COVID-19 may experience a delay in response. We apologize for the inconvenience and appreciate your understanding.
---

On Feb. 11, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Calendars and Emails - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF DEM)
VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Requestor: Anonymous
Email: 84181-53996453@requests.muckrock.com<mailto:84181-53996453@requests.muckrock.com>

February 11, 2020

Re: California Public Records Act Request: SF DEM BCC emails - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF DEM)

Dear Anonymous:

This letter responds to your Immediate Disclosure Request sent on February 8, 2020 and received by the Department of Emergency Management via email on February 10, 2020.

---

On Feb. 8, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Calendars and Emails - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF DEM)
RE: BCC Emails - Immediate Disclosure Request

Department Head:

Below are new Immediate Disclosure Requests (SF Admin Code 67.25(a)) directed to your agency and the department head. Your response is required by Feb 11, 2020. Rolling records responses are requested (SFAC 67.25(d)) if you are unable to immediately produce records. Exact copies of every responsive record are requested (Gov Code 6253(b)) - do not: provide mere URLs, print and scan electronic records, convert native files to PDFs, or provide black and white versions of any color record. Provide only copies of records not requiring fees and in-person inspection of all other records (GC 6253). Emails are requested in the easily-generated EML or MSG formats (SFAC 67.21(l)).

I am now auditing how the City appears to unlawfully withhold the BCC recipients of emails when they print out emails in certain formats. The identity of BCC recipients is not exempt. BCC is not an information security record that reveals vulnerabilities or increases chance of an attack. The BCC names was typed in by a human being and are not metadata. You must provide BCC just like you provide To or CC recipients. There is no legal authority to keep secret the identities of persons communicating with government officials, unless they are specifically confidential informants and such. If you withhold the BCC names, I will file complaints, separate and apart from email metadata complaints (which I have now already won, see ruling in SOTF 19044).

Your non-exhaustive obligations: All withholding of any information must be justified in writing (SFAC 67.27). All withholdings by masking or deletion (aka redactions) must be keyed by footnote or other clear reference to the specific justification for that redaction, and only the minimal exempt portion of any record may be withheld (SFAC 67.26). You must respond to emailed requests (SFAC 67.21(b)). You must notify us of whether or not responsive records exist and/or were withheld for each below request (Gov Code 6253(c), 6255(b)). You must state the name and title of each person responsible for withholding any information (Gov Code 6253(d)). Do not impose any end-user restrictions upon me (Santa Clara Co. vs Superior Ct, 170 Cal.App 4th 1301); so if you use a third-party website to publish records, please make them completely public without any login or sign-in.

Your agency must do all of the above things in your response, and you cannot wait until we file complaints.
****** We have no duty to, and we will not again, remind the City of its obligations. Instead, we will file complaints for every Sunshine Ordinance or CPRA violation. We will continue to file complaints until the City’s procedures are modified to fully comply with the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA, without caveat or exception. ******

1. An exact copy with all email headers (incl. but not limited to the BCC identities), attachments, color, formatting, hyperlinks, images, and all other parts of the record of the most recent 5 emails which have any BCC recipients which were sent by your Dept Head on any government account. Note that you will have to search directly from the person's computer or account in their Sent folder specifically (In many email systems, no other method will allow you to see the BCC recipients). In modern Outlook systems, the search query is as follows: (bcc:*)

Do not destroy or discard any responsive records - we will appeal all withholdings or Sunshine violations.

NOTE: Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. The email address sending this request is a publicly-viewable mailbox. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

---

On Jan. 13, 2020:
Subject: SOTF - Notice of Appearance to Determine Jurisdiction - Compliance and Amendments Committee; January 28, 2020
Good Afternoon:

Notice is hereby given that the Compliance and Amendments Committee of the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force shall hold hearings on complaints listed below to determine if the Task Force has jurisdiction pursuant to Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Section 67.21(e). A hearing to review the merits of the complaint will be scheduled on a future date.

The Complainant and Respondent are NOT REQUIRED to attend the January 28, 2020, Committee meeting but may attend to provide testimony related to the above listed determinations only.

Date: January 28, 2020

Location: City Hall, Room 408

Time: 4:30 p.m.

Complaints:

File No. 19091: Complaint filed by Anonymous against Mayor London Breed, the Office of the Mayor, Hank Heckel, Sean Elsbernd, Andres Power, Andrea Bruss, Marjon Philhour, Jeff Cretan, Sophia Kittler for allegedly violating Administrative Code, (Sunshine Ordinance) Sections 67.21, 67.26, 67.27 and 67.29-7, by failing to respond to a request for public records in a timely and/or complete manner.
File No. 19094: Complaint filed by Anonymous against Linda Gerull and the Department of Technology for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.21, 67.25, 67.26 and 67.27 by failing to respond to a public records request in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19097: Complaint filed by Anonymous against Public Works for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.21, 67.26 and 67.27, by failing to respond to a public records request in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19109: Complaint filed by Stephen Malloy against Dept. of Public Health for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.24, 67.25, 67.26 and 67.27 by failing to respond to a public records request in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19110: Complaint filed by Stephen Malloy against the Fire Department for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.24, 67.25, 67.26 and 67.27 by failing to respond to a public records request in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19117: Complaint filed by Conrad Wu against the Public Utilities Commission for allegedly violating Administrative Code, (Sunshine Ordinance) Sections 67.25 by failing to respond to a public records request in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19118: Complaint filed by Paul Ondik against the Police Department for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.21(b), by failing to respond to a records request in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19119: Complaint filed by Anonymous against the Department of Technology for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.21(b), 67.26 and 67.27 by failing to respond to a public records request in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19120: Complaint filed by Anonymous against the Office of the City Attorney for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.21(b)(c), 67.26, 67.27, by failing to respond to a request for public records in a timely and/or complete manner; failing to justify withholding of records and failing to provide assistance.

File No. 19121: Complaint filed by Anonymous against the Police Commission for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.21(b)(k), 67.26 and 67.27, by failing to respond to a public records request in a timely and/or complete manner; withholding more than the minimum and failing to justify withholding.

File No. 19122: Complaint filed by Anonymous against City Librarian Michael Lambert and the Public Library for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Section 67.25, by failing to respond to an Immediate Disclosure Request in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19123: Complaint filed by Paul Kniha against the San Francisco Municipal Executive Association for allegedly violating Administrative Code, (Sunshine Ordinance), Section 67.21, by failing to respond to a public records request in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19125: Complaint filed by Anonymous against the Controller's Office for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.21(b)(c)(k), 67.26, 67.27, by failing to respond to a request for records in a timely and/or complete manner, failing to assist, withheld more than the minimally exempt portion of a public record, failing to justify withholdings with clear reference to exemption statute or case law and failing to provide an exact copy of records.
File No. 19126: Complaint filed by Ann Treboux against the San Francisco Arts Commission for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Section 67.25, by failing to respond to an Immediate Disclosure Request in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19128: Complaint filed by Anonymous against Chief William Scott, Sgt. Brian Rodriguez, Michael Andraychak and the Police Department for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.21, 67.25, 67.26, 67.27 and 67.29-7(a), by failing to respond to an Immediate Disclosure Request in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19130: Complaint filed by Stephen Malloy against Chesa Boudin and the District Attorney's Office for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Section 67.21, by failing to respond to a public records request in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19131: Complaint filed by Anonymous against Jose Cisneros, Theresa Buckley and the Treasurer’s Office for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.21, 67.24, 67.26, 67.27, by failing to respond to a request for records in a timely and/or complete manner, failing to assist, withheld more than the minimally exempt portion of a public record.

File No. 19132: Complaint filed by Anonymous against Mary Ellen Carroll and the Department of Emergency Management for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.21 and 67.25, by failing to respond to an Immediate Disclosure Request in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19133: Complaint filed by Anonymous against Tom Maguire and the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.21 and 67.25, by failing to respond to an Immediate Disclosure Request in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19134: Complaint filed by Anonymous against Rob Reiter and City Hall Building Management for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.21 and 67.25 by failing to respond to an Immediate Disclosure Request in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19135: Complaint filed by Anonymous against Vicki Hennessy and the Sheriff's Department for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.21 and 67.25 by failing to respond to an Immediate Disclosure Request in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19136: Complaint filed by Anonymous against Naomi Kelly and the Office of the City Administrator for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.21 and 67.25 by failing to respond to an Immediate Disclosure Request in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19137: Complaint filed by Anonymous against Thomas P. Campbell and the Fine Arts Museum for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.21, 67.25 and 67.34 by failing to respond to an Immediate Disclosure Request in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19138: Complaint filed by Stephen Malloy against the University of California, Regents of the University of California, for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.21, by failing to respond to a public records request in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19139: Complaint filed by Anonymous against Jeanne Buick, Henry Voong and the Department of Human Resources for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.24, 67.26 and 67.27(a), by withholding public records.

File No. 19140: Complaint filed by Stephen Malloy against the Department of Human Resources 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. 19141: Complaint filed by Anonymous against Chief William Scott and the Police Department for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.21 and 67.25, by failing to respond to an Immediate Disclosure Request in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19143: Complaint filed by Anonymous against Sheriff Vicki Hennessy, James Wilson and the Sheriff’s Department for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.24, 67.25 and 67.27, by failing to respond to an Immediate Disclosure Request in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19144: Complaint filed by Anonymous against the Department of Police Accountability for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections, 67.21, 67.24, 67.26 and 67.27, by failing to respond to a public records request in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19145: Complaint filed by Anonymous against the Police Commission for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.5 and 67.21, by failing to respond to a public records request in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19146: Complaint filed by Anonymous against City Librarian Michael Lambert and the Public Library for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Section 67.21, by failing to request for public records in a timely and/or complete manner.

The agenda and packet material for the meeting is available online at the following link:

Cheryl Leger
Assistant Clerk, Board of Supervisors

Tel: 415-554-7724

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.

---

On Jan. 13, 2020:
Subject: SOTF - Notice of Appearance to Determine Jurisdiction - Compliance and Amendments Committee; January 28, 2020
Good Afternoon:
Notice is hereby given that the Compliance and Amendments Committee of the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force shall hold hearings on complaints listed below to determine if the Task Force has jurisdiction pursuant to Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Section 67.21(e). A hearing to review the merits of the complaint will be scheduled on a future date.

The Complainant and Respondent are NOT REQUIRED to attend the January 28, 2020, Committee meeting but may attend to provide testimony related to the above listed determinations only.

Date: January 28, 2020

Location: City Hall, Room 408

Time: 4:30 p.m.

Complaints:

File No. 19091: Complaint filed by Anonymous against Mayor London Breed, the Office of the Mayor, Hank Heckel, Sean Elsbernd, Andres Power, Andrea Bruss, Marjon Philhour, Jeff Cretan, Sophia Kittler for allegedly violating Administrative Code, (Sunshine Ordinance) Sections 67.21, 67.26, 67.27 and 67.29-7, by failing to respond to a request for public records in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19094: Complaint filed by Anonymous against Linda Gerull and the Department of Technology for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.21, 67.25, 67.26 and 67.27 by failing to respond to a public records request in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19097: Complaint filed by Anonymous against Public Works for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.21, 67.26 and 67.27, by failing to respond to a public records request in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19109: Complaint filed by Stephen Malloy against Dept. of Public Health for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.24, 67.25, 67.26 and 67.27 by failing to respond to a public records request in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19110: Complaint filed by Stephen Malloy against the Fire Department for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.24, 67.25, 67.26 and 67.27 by failing to respond to a public records request in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19117: Complaint filed by Conrad Wu against the Public Utilities Commission for allegedly violating Administrative Code, (Sunshine Ordinance) Sections 67.25 by failing to respond to a public records request in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19118: Complaint filed by Paul Ondik against the Police Department for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.21(b), by failing to respond to a records request in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19119: Complaint filed by Anonymous against the Department of Technology for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.21(b)(c), 67.26 and 67.27 by failing to respond to a public records request in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19120: Complaint filed by Anonymous against the Office of the City Attorney for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.21(b)(c), 67.26, 67.27, by failing to respond to a request for public records in a timely and/or complete manner; failing to justify withholding of records and failing to provide assistance.
File No. 19121: Complaint filed by Anonymous against the Police Commission for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.21(b)(k), 67.26 and 67.27, by failing to respond to a public records request in a timely and/or complete manner; withholding more than the minimum and failing to justify withholding.

File No. 19122: Complaint filed by Anonymous against City Librarian Michael Lambert and the Public Library for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Section 67.25, by failing to respond to an Immediate Disclosure Request in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19123: Complaint filed by Paul Kniha against the San Francisco Municipal Executive Association for allegedly violating Administrative Code, (Sunshine Ordinance), Section 67.21, by failing to respond to a public records request in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19125: Complaint filed by Anonymous against the Controller's Office for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.21(b)(c)(k), 67.26, 67.27, by failing to respond to a request for records in a timely and/or complete manner, failing to assist, withheld more than the minimally exempt portion of a public record, failing to justify withholdings with clear reference to exemption statute or case law and failing to provide an exact copy of records.

File No. 19126: Complaint filed by Ann Treboux against the San Francisco Arts Commission for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Section 67.25, by failing to respond to an Immediate Disclosure Request in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19128: Complaint filed by Anonymous against Chief William Scott, Sgt. Brian Rodriguez, Michael Andraychak and the Police Department for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.21, 67.25, 67.26, 67.27 and 67.29-7(a), by failing to respond to an Immediate Disclosure Request in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19130: Complaint filed by Stephen Malloy against Chesa Boudin and the District Attorney's Office for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Section 67.21, by failing to respond to a public records request in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19131: Complaint filed by Anonymous against Jose Cisneros, Theresa Buckley and the Treasurer's Office for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.21, 67.24, 67.26, 67.27, by failing to respond to a request for records in a timely and/or complete manner, failing to assist, withheld more than the minimally exempt portion of a public record.

File No. 19132: Complaint filed by Anonymous against Mary Ellen Carroll and the Department of Emergency Management for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.21 and 67.25, by failing to respond to an Immediate Disclosure Request in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19133: Complaint filed by Anonymous against Tom Maguire and the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.21 and 67.25, by failing to respond to an Immediate Disclosure Request in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19134: Complaint filed by Anonymous against Rob Reiter and City Hall Building Management for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.21 and 67.25 by failing to respond to an Immediate Disclosure Request in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19135: Complaint filed by Anonymous against Vicki Hennessy and the Sheriff's Department for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.21 and 67.25 by failing to respond to an Immediate Disclosure Request in a timely and/or complete manner.
File No. 19136: Complaint filed by Anonymous against Naomi Kelly and the Office of the City Administrator for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.21 and 67.25 by failing to respond to an Immediate Disclosure Request in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19137: Complaint filed by Anonymous against Thomas P. Campbell and the Fine Arts Museum for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.21, 67.25 and 67.34 by failing to respond to an Immediate Disclosure Request in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19138: Complaint filed by Stephen Malloy against the University of California, Regents of the University of California, for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.21, by failing to respond to a public records request in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19139: Complaint filed by Anonymous against Jeanne Buick, Henry Voong and the Department of Human Resources for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.24, 67.26 and 67.27(a), by withholding public records.

File No. 19140: Complaint filed by Stephen Malloy against the Department of Human Resources 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. 19141: Complaint filed by Anonymous against Chief William Scott and the Police Department for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.21 and 67.25, by failing to respond to an Immediate Disclosure Request in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19143: Complaint filed by Anonymous against Sheriff Vicki Hennessy, James Wilson and the Sheriff’s Department for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.24, 67.25 and 67.27, by failing to respond to an Immediate Disclosure Request in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19144: Complaint filed by Anonymous against the Department of Police Accountability for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections, 67.21, 67.24, 67.26 and 67.27, by failing to respond to a public records request in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19145: Complaint filed by Anonymous against the Police Commission for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.5 and 67.21, by failing to respond to a public records request in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19146: Complaint filed by Anonymous against City Librarian Michael Lambert and the Public Library for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Section 67.21, by failing to request for public records in a timely and/or complete manner.

The agenda and packet material for the meeting is available online at the following link:

Cheryl Leger
Assistant Clerk, Board of Supervisors
Tel: 415-554-7724


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.

---

On Dec. 7, 2019:

Subject: California Public Records Act Request: Calendars and Emails – Immediate Disclosure Request (SF DEM)
To the Department Head (Mary Ellen Carroll),

Attached is an Immediate Disclosure Request (SF Admin Code 67.25(a)).
Your response is required by Dec. 10, 2019. Rolling records responses are requested (67.25(d)).

NOTE: Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. The email address sending this request is a publicly-viewable mailbox. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be public records.

Sincerely,
Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 84181-53996453@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:
https://accounts.muckrock.com/accounts/login/?next=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.muckrock.com%2Faccounts%2Flogin%2F%3Fnext%3D%253D%252Faccounts%252Fagency_login%252Fdepartment-of-emergency-management-8080%252Fcalendars-and-emails-immediate-disclosure-request-sf-dem-84181%252F%253Demail%252Dfrom%252Dsupervisor.records%252Dfrom%252Dsfcityatty.org&url_auth_token=AAAdJ4xrU-r5p-QnHlRO0J0RSi%3A1lG8WM%3A0f2AaQp5uVuMCZF8UfJ7H1kn1c
Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 84181
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516
Buta, Odaya (CAT)

From: 98251-27428784@requests.muckrock.com
Sent: Saturday, February 27, 2021 7:44 PM
To: Supervisor Records (CAT)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Office Of Contract Administration
PRA Office
City Hall, Room 430
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

February 27, 2021

This is a follow up to a previous request:

Supervisor of Records:

Since there has been no response to this request from July 15, 2020, this is a petition for a written determination that the records are public and an order for their disclosure.

--Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 98251-27428784@requests.muckrock.com
Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 98251
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516
PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.

---

On July 17, 2020:
Hello,

This email is to inform you that the Office of City Administrator will provide a response to your Public Records Request dated July 16, 2020.
Regards,

Shawnee Tang
Office of Contract Administration
City and County of San Francisco
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Rm 430
San Francisco, CA 94102-4685

---

On July 16, 2020:
The attached IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE REQUESTS replace any earlier ones you received from this email address.

NOTE: Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. The email address sending this request is a publicly-viewable mailbox. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,
Anonymous

---

On July 15, 2020:
Office Of Contract Administration,

Attached are new Immediate Disclosure Requests under the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA.

NOTE: Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. The email address sending this request is a publicly-viewable mailbox. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service
used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,
Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 98251-27428784@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:
%3Fnext%3D%252Faccounts%252Fagency_login%252Foffice-of-contract-administration-19341%252Fwalter-wong-mlok-
consulting-alternate-choice-llc-green-source-trading-llc-jaidin-consulting-and-other-records-immediate-disclosure-
request-sf-oca-98251%252F%253Femail%253Dsupervisor.records%252540sfcityatty.org&url_auth_token=AABqWujdSRG8-
Ki9xO3KiQ3WC0%3A11DG0I%3A-K0Lgc_1YKjHA7rCbkPVXnTRXv8

Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 98251
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.
Buta, Odaya (CAT)

From: 98255-36312589@requests.muckrock.com on behalf of ‘98255-36312589@requests.muckrock.com’
<98255-36312589@requests.muckrock.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 27, 2021 8:39 PM
To: Supervisor Records (CAT)
Admin Naomi Kelly

Office of the City Administrator
PRA Office
Room 362
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Fransisco, CA 94102

February 27, 2021

This is a follow up to a previous request:

Supervisor of Records:
This is a 67.21(d) petition for the July 15 2020 request from this email address to Naomi Kelly, for Kelly's own records. They responded only after Kelly resigned, although her records were in the constructive possession of the City as of the date I made the request.
Please determine Kelly's records public in writing and order them disclosed.

Sincerely,
Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 98255-36312589@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:
Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 98255
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the
requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.

---

On Feb. 23, 2021:
Again: Did your Office and Naomi Kelly actually conduct a search *at the time of my request* of her personal accounts? She was an employee when I made the request. Not a former employee.

This is an immediate disclosure request for all written documentation in any form (text, chat, email, letter, anything) that Naomi Kelly was asked to perform a search for the original request on this email, and all of her responses.

---

On Feb. 23, 2021:

Dear Requestor,

Please see the last batch for this request.

Sincerely,

Office of the City Administrator
City Hall, Room 362
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-4148

---

On Feb. 23, 2021:

Dear Requestor,

Please see batch #3 attached.

Sincerely,

Office of the City Administrator
City Hall, Room 362
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-4148

---

On Feb. 23, 2021:

Dear Requestor,
Please see batch #2 attached.

Sincerely,

Office of the City Administrator
City Hall, Room 362
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-4148

---

On Feb. 23, 2021:
Dear Requestor,

Please see batch #2 attached.

Sincerely,

Office of the City Administrator
City Hall, Room 362
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-4148

---

On July 15, 2020:
Office of the City Administrator and Naomi Kelly,

Attached are new Immediate Disclosure Requests under the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA.

NOTE: Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. The email address sending this request is a publicly-viewable mailbox. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,
Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 98255-36312589@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:
%3Fnext%3D%252Faccounts%252Fagency_login%252Fsan-fransisco-311-18636%252Fwalter-wong-mlok-consulting-
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Buta, Odaya (CAT)

From: 88878-67394299@requests.muckrock.com  
Sent: Sunday, February 28, 2021 12:40 AM  
To: Supervisor Records (CAT)  
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request #20-1076

Department of Public Health  
PRA Office  
Room 302  
101 Grove Street  
San Francisco, CA 94102

February 28, 2021

This is a follow up to request number 20-1076:

This is a 67.21(d) petition for written determination that records requested in DPH requests 20-1076 and 20-1078 are public and an order for their disclosure.

Filed via MuckRock.com  
E-mail (Preferred): 88878-67394299@requests.muckrock.com  
Upload documents directly:  
%3Fnext%3D%252Faccounts%2Fagency_login%252Fdepartment-of-public-health-4836%252Fcoronaviruscovid-19sars-cov-2-response-san-francisco-immediate-disclosure-request-88878%252F%253Femail%253Dsupervisor.records%2540sfcityatty.org&url_auth_token=AAAe_VQf-k0KzR9XR24yQKwiCpi%3A1lGHcO%3A4KgR_uP7GotKMYmdislNZ8RzH6Y

Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):  
MuckRock News  
DEPT MR 88878  
411A Highland Ave  
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.

---

On Oct. 2, 2020:  
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request #20-1076  
You cannot close my outstanding requests. Violation complaints will be filed with SOTF.

--Anonymous

---
On Oct. 2, 2020:
Subject: Your City and County of San Francisco public records request #20-1076 has been closed.
City and County of San Francisco

************************************************************************
Hi there

Record request #20-1076 has been closed. The closure reason supplied was:

We did not hear back from you when we asked for more clarification about your request. Since we are unable to conduct a diligent search for responsive records without your guidance, we consider your request closed. If you are still interested in your request, you are welcome to submit a new request with more details at any time here: https://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/requests/new.

************************************************************************

Questions about your request? Reply to this email or sign in to contact staff at City and County of San Francisco.

Technical support: See our help page

---

On Aug. 1, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request #20-1076
DCA Simpson,

DPH requested I contact you re: DPH records requests 20-1076 and 20-1078.

DPH has not made requests 20-1076 and 20-1078 available openly on NextRequest. The City cannot require me to agree to end-user conditions to access public records, for example by requiring registration and acceptance of NextRequest's terms of service (see for example Santa Clara Co. vs Superior Ct, 170 Cal.App 4th 1301). Please make those requests publicly viewable on NextRequest, without sign-in.

NOTE: THE EMAIL ADDRESS SENDING THIS REQUEST IS A PUBLICLY-VIEWABLE MAILBOX. Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,
Anonymous
---

On April 16, 2020:
Subject: [ACTION REQUIRED] Your City and County of San Francisco public records portal account
Use this to confirm your account. The link is only valid for 24 hours.

City and County of San Francisco
Hello MuckRock.com!
************************************************************************
You can confirm your City and County of San Francisco public records portal account by copying and pasting the URL below into your web browser. This link is only valid for the next 24 hours.

Magic link: http://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/users/confirmation?confirmation_token=zUwamtfbCgfAt83GTdsy

Questions? Check out our help page (https://www.nextrequest.com/support) or email us at support@nextrequest.com.
************************************************************************

---

On April 15, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request #20-1076
Please make requests 20-1076 and 20-1078 publicly viewable. I will not sign in to any third party service.
---

On Feb. 28, 2020:
Subject: California Public Records Act Request: Coronavirus/COVID-19/SARS-CoV-2 Response (San Francisco) Immediate Disclosure Request
SFDPH:

NOTE: THE EMAIL ADDRESS SENDING THIS REQUEST IS A PUBLICLY-VIEWABLE MAILBOX. Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Below are new Immediate Disclosure Requests (SF Admin Code 67.25(a)) directed to your agency and its department head. Your initial response is required by March 2, 2020. Rolling records responses are requested (SFAC 67.25(d)) if you are unable to immediately produce records. Exact copies of every responsive record are requested (Gov Code 6253(b)). Provide only copies of records not requiring fees and in-person inspection of all other records (GC 6253).

Your non-exhaustive obligations:
- All withholding of any information must be justified in writing by specific statutory authority (SFAC 67.27).
- All withholdings by masking or deletion (aka redactions) must be keyed by footnote or other clear reference to the specific justification for that redaction, and only the minimal exempt portion of any record may be withheld (SFAC 67.26).
- You must respond to emailed requests (SFAC 67.21(b)).
- You must notify us of whether or not responsive records exist and/or were withheld for each below request (Gov Code 6253(c), 6255(b)).
- You must state the name and title of each person responsible for withholding any information (Gov Code 6253(d)).
- Do not impose any end-user restrictions upon me (Santa Clara Co. vs Superior Ct, 170 Cal.App 4th 1301); so if you use a third-party website to publish records, please make them completely public without any login or sign-in.

Your agency must do all of the above things in your response, and you cannot wait until we file complaints.

****** We have no duty to, and we will not again, remind the City of its obligations. Instead, we will file complaints for every Sunshine Ordinance or CPRA violation. We will continue to file complaints until the City's procedures are modified to fully comply with the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA, without caveat or exception. ******

1. All communications with CDC or its employees (email, text, or chat) with any of the following insensitive keywords: "coronavirus" "wuhan" "SARS" "COVID" "COVID19" "COVID-19" "SARS-CoV-2" "2019-nCOV" "nCOV" "severe acute respiratory syndrome" "viral pneumonia" "pneumonia of unknown origin" "novel pneumonia" from Nov 14, 2019 to present. For solely this request, any format showing all participants (TO, FROM, CC; and BCC for items sent by City employees) and preserving the body, attachments and images is sufficient.

2. All communications to or from the California DPH or its employees (email, text, or chat) with any of the following insensitive keywords: "coronavirus" "wuhan" "SARS" "COVID" "COVID19" "COVID-19" "SARS-CoV-2" "2019-nCOV" "nCOV" "severe acute respiratory syndrome" "viral pneumonia" "pneumonia of unknown origin" "novel pneumonia" from Nov 14, 2019 to present. For solely this request, any format showing all participants (TO, FROM, CC; and BCC for items sent by City employees) and preserving the body, attachments and images is sufficient.

This information is of the highest public interest. You may prioritize this request over any other outstanding Sunshine requests from me, if it would speed up your response to this one. You may exclude press releases or similar material already published to the general public. If you believe this query would take more than say a week to produce, please provide suggestions to narrow the query to match my purpose, which is: to determine the scope and quality of Federal, state, and local government response to COVID-19/SARS-CoV-2, most importantly including decisions to test or not to test PUIs or other suspect cases.

Do not destroy or discard any responsive records - we will appeal all withholdings or Sunshine violations.

Thank you for your anticipated cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,
Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 88878-67394299@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:
Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 88878
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516
PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.
Buta, Odaya (CAT)

From: 94374-74128043@requests.muckrock.com
Sent: Sunday, February 28, 2021 12:43 AM
To: Supervisor Records (CAT)
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request #20-2942

Department of Public Health
PRA Office
Room 302
101 Grove Street
San Francisco, CA 94102

February 28, 2021

This is a follow up to request number 20-2942:

This is a 67.21(d) petition for determination in writing that all records in DPH request 20-2942 - from June 4, 2020 - are public and an order for their disclosure. They only bothered searching after Tomas Aragon had left the City and now cannot produce all of the records that were in the constructive possession of the City at the time of my request.

--Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 94374-74128043@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:

Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 94374
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requestor's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.

---

On Feb. 8, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request #20-2942
You are required by law to produce all of the records. I will not agree that my request is satisfied by giving me these
fewer records on Colfax’s phone. My lack of agreement in no way allows you not to produce whatever you have.

---

On Feb. 8, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request #20-2942
Hi,

Please clarify if you would like for DPH to move forward with conducting the proposed alternate search for responsive records through Dr. Colfax’s mobile phone. If so, please narrow the timeframe to help facilitate the review.

We appreciate your help.

Thank you,
Veronica
---

On Feb. 5, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request #20-2942
Shortly, there will also be a records request to all City employees demanding all communications with Aragon and that they preserve all records.
Whatever it is you tried to hide here will be found out.

When will the City realize that it can never get away with illegal actions like this...
---

On Feb. 5, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request #20-2942
Shortly, there will also be a records request to all City employees demanding all communications with Aragon and that they preserve all records.
Whatever it is you tried to hide here will be found out.

When will the City realize that it can never get away with illegal actions like this...
---

On Feb. 5, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request #20-2942
You and Colfax willfully violated the law by closing this request in Sept and then only reopening it in January after Aragon left the City’s employment to make sure I could never get the records. We’ll never know what Aragon and the Mayor discussed now...
Suit will be filed in this case - you will get my filing shortly.
---

On June 4, 2020:
Subject: California Public Records Act Request: Inter-Agency Text Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF Health Officer Tomas Aragon)
Health Officer Tomas Aragon:

Below are new Immediate Disclosure Requests (SF Admin Code 67.25(a)) directed to you. Your response is required by June 5, 2020. Rolling records responses are requested (SFAC 67.25(d)) if you are unable to immediately produce records. Exact copies of every responsive record are requested (Gov Code 6253(b)) - do not: provide mere URLs, print and scan electronic records, convert native files to PDFs, or provide black and white versions of any color images. Provide only copies of records not requiring fees and in-person inspection of all other records (GC 6253).
Your non-exhaustive obligations:
- All withholding of any information must be justified in writing (SFAC 67.27).
- All withholdings by masking or deletion (aka redactions) must be keyed by footnote or other clear reference to the specific justification for that redaction, and only the minimal exempt portion of any record may be withheld (SFAC 67.26).
- You must respond to emailed requests (SFAC 67.21(b)).
- You must notify us of whether or not responsive records exist and/or were withheld for each below request (Gov Code 6253(c), 6255(b)).
- You must state the name and title of each person responsible for withholding any information (Gov Code 6253(d)).
- Do not impose any end-user restrictions upon me (Santa Clara Co. vs Superior Ct, 170 Cal.App 4th 1301); so if you use a third-party website like NextRequest to publish records, please make them completely public without any login or sign-in.

Your agency must do all of the above things in your response, and you cannot wait until we file complaints.

****** We have no duty to, and we will not again, remind the City of its obligations. Instead, we will file complaints for every Sunshine Ordinance or CPRA violation. We will continue to file complaints until the City's procedures are modified to fully comply with the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA, without caveat or exception. ******

1. All text or chat messages (including group messages) in any form or application (including but not limited to SMS, MMS, WhatsApp, WeChat, Signal, Instagram, Twitter, Facebook, Hangouts, Skype, Teams):
   - a) sent by you to/cc/bcc any of Mayor London Breed, Sean Elsbernd, SFPD Chief William Scott, Dennis Herrera, Grant Colfax, Jeff Kositsky, Mohammed Nuru, Alaric Degrafenried, Andy Lynch, Hank Heckel, Mary Ellen Carroll, or Abigail Stewart-Kahn (the "Named Public Officials") OR
   - b) sent by any of the Named Public Officials and received by you (and possibly others, such as in a group message) OR
   - c) sent by a third party and received by both you and any of the Named Public Officials (such as in a group message), with timestamps between Jan 1, 2019 and June 3, 2020 (inclusive), including a personal property search under City of San Jose vs Superior Court (2017). While the phone numbers are not needed, the following must be preserved: the timestamps, the textual content, attachments, and images, and also ALL sender and recipient names (including groups). Pursuant to SF Admin Code 67.21(l), which requires you to use any electronic format that we request, please provide the records in spreadsheet format. For an example of the format of the response, see SFPD Chief Scott's prior response here: https://cdn.muckrock.com/foia_files/2020/04/14/Text_Messages_Breed_Scott_Redacted.pdf and clearly referenced redaction justifications here: https://cdn.muckrock.com/foia_files/2020/04/14/ChiefOfficeResponse201.pdf (though I do not concede all of them are appropriate redactions). Please provide rolling responses, starting with the most recent records going backwards. Messages to/from before your current department head became the department must still be provided.

Do not destroy or discard any responsive records - we will appeal all withholdings or Sunshine violations. Remember your department head has an obligation to maintain in a professional and businesslike manner correspondence and release them as public records (SF Admin Code 67.27-9(a)); and we will cross-check your responses with all other parties to ensure you have not destroyed or withheld records improperly.

Thank you for your anticipated cooperation in this matter.

NOTE: Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. The email address sending this request is a publicly-viewable mailbox. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an
indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,
Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 94374-74128043@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:
%3Fnext%3D%252Fagency_login%252Fdepartment-of-public-health%252Finter-agency-text-messages-immediate-disclosure-request-sf-health-officer-tomas-aragon-94374%252F
Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 94374
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.
Buta, Odaya (CAT)

From: 94425-31123144@requests.muckrock.com
Sent: Sunday, February 28, 2021 12:45 AM
To: Supervisor Records (CAT)

Department of Emergency Management
PRA Office
1011 Turk Street
SF, CA 94102

February 28, 2021

This is a follow up to a previous request:

Supervisor of Records,

This is a 67.21(d) petition for written determination that the records responsive to the DEM request from June 4 2020 from this email address are public an order for their disclosure.

--Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 94425-31123144@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:
%3Fnext%3D%252Faccounts%252Fagency_login%252Fdepartment-of-emergency-management-8080%252Finter-
agency-text-messages-immediate-disclosure-request-sf-dem-
94425%252F%253Femail%253Dsupervisor.records%2540sfcityatty.org&url_auth_token=AAAdj4xrU-r5p-
QnHlR00j0Rs9%3A1G7h8%3AOeF5DfFeSo078vj7S7Iw2UM
Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 94425
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.

---

On July 3, 2020:
On June 5th you stated you would respond in 10 days to the June 4 requests from this email address. No response or records having been provided in 24 days since our request, we will now file complaints.

NOTE: Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. The email address sending this request is a publicly-viewable mailbox. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,
Anonymous

---

On June 5, 2020:
Mary Ellen Carroll:

(Note this request was also previously sent to the DEM generic Sunshine email, however you have an individual legal responsibility as custodian of your own communications to provide the following records.)

Below are new Immediate Disclosure Requests (SF Admin Code 67.25(a)) directed to your agency and its department head. Your response is required by June 5, 2020. Rolling records responses are requested (SFAC 67.25(d)) if you are unable to immediately produce records. Exact copies of every responsive record are requested (Gov Code 6253(b)) - do not: provide mere URLs, print and scan electronic records, convert native files to PDFs, or provide black and white versions of any color images. Provide only copies of records not requiring fees and in-person inspection of all other records (GC 6253).

Your non-exhaustive obligations:
- All withholding of any information must be justified in writing (SFAC 67.27).
- All withholdings by masking or deletion (aka redactions) must be keyed by footnote or other clear reference to the specific justification for that redaction, and only the minimal exempt portion of any record may be withheld (SFAC 67.26).
- You must respond to emailed requests (SFAC 67.21(b)).
- You must notify us of whether or not responsive records exist and/or were withheld for each below request (Gov Code 6253(c), 6255(b)).
- You must state the name and title of each person responsible for withholding any information (Gov Code 6253(d)).
- Do not impose any end-user restrictions upon me (Santa Clara Co. vs Superior Ct, 170 Cal.App 4th 1301); so if you use a third-party website like NextRequest to publish records, please make them completely public without any login or sign-in.

Your agency must do all of the above things in your response, and you cannot wait until we file complaints.
****** We have no duty to, and we will not again, remind the City of its obligations. Instead, we will file complaints for every Sunshine Ordinance or CPRA violation. We will continue to file complaints until the City’s procedures are modified to fully comply with the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA, without caveat or exception. ******

1. All text or chat messages (including group messages) in any form or application (including but not limited to SMS, MMS, WhatsApp, WeChat, Signal, Instagram, Twitter, Facebook, Hangouts, Skype, Teams):
   - a) sent by your current department head to/cc/bcc any of Mayor London Breed, Sean Elsbernd, SFPD Chief William Scott, Tomás Aragón, Dennis Herrera, Jeff Kositsky, Mohammed Nuru, Alaric Degrafineid, Andy Lynch, Hank Heckel, or Abigail Stewart-Kahn (the “Named Public Officials”) OR
   - b) sent by any of the Named Public Officials and received by your current department head (and possibly others, such as in a group message) OR
   - c) sent by a third party and received by both your current department head and any of the Named Public Officials (such as in a group message),

   with timestamps between Jan 1, 2019 and June 3, 2020 (inclusive), including a personal property search under City of San Jose vs Superior Court (2017). While the phone numbers are not needed, the following must be preserved: the timestamps, the textual content, attachments, and images, and also ALL sender and recipient names (including groups). Pursuant to SF Admin Code 67.21(l), which requires you to use any electronic format that we request, please provide the records in spreadsheet format. For an example of the format of the response, see SFPD Chief Scott’s prior response here: https://cdn.muckrock.com/foia_files/2020/04/14/Text_Messages_Breed_Scott_Redacted.pdf and clearly referenced redaction justifications here: https://cdn.muckrock.com/foia_files/2020/04/14/ChiefOfficeResponse201.pdf (though I do not concede all of them are appropriate redactions). Please provide rolling responses, starting with the most recent records going backwards. Messages to/from before your current department head became the department head must still be provided.

Do not destroy or discard any responsive records - we will appeal all withholdings or Sunshine violations. Remember your department head has an obligation to maintain in a professional and businesslike manner their correspondence and release them as public records (SF Admin Code 67.27-9(a)); and we will cross-check your responses with all other parties to ensure you have not destroyed or withheld records improperly.

Thank you for your anticipated cooperation in this matter.

NOTE: Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. The email address sending this request is a publicly-viewable mailbox. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Stay safe and compliant,

Anonymous

---

On June 5, 2020:
San Francisco’s Emergency Operations Center is active to support preparation and response to COVID-19 (Novel Coronavirus). Inquiries unrelated to COVID-19 may experience a delay in response.
I am working offsite at the City’s Emergency Operations Center as a Disaster Service Worker and this will delay my response.

The City of San Francisco takes the health and well-being of our community extremely seriously. We are taking extensive and proactive actions to prevent the spread of COVID-19 to our most vulnerable populations.

Know the facts: Risk for COVID-19 is based on travel, contacts and exposure to the virus. No racial, ethnic or cultural group is more at risk. The most common symptoms of COVID-19 are fever, cough and shortness of breath. If you are feeling sick, please first call your doctor, a nurse hotline, or an urgent care center. Do not go to the emergency room of a hospital unless you are having an actual emergency.

Stay at home: The City has issued a Public Health Order requiring people to stay home except for essential needs. Vulnerable populations, including adults over the age of 60 and people with health conditions, must stay home. Everyone else is required to stay home except to get food, care for a relative or friend, get necessary health care, or go to an essential job. Stay at least 6 feet apart if leaving your home for essential activities.

Access resources and services:

Find free meals for children<https://na01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.sfusd.edu%2Fservices%2Fhealth-wellness%2Fnutrition-school-meals&data=02%7C01%7Cvictor.lim%40sfgov.org%7Ce3e34451ee9c4656e5aa08d7ce958e24%7C22d5c2fceed3e443d9a7fdfcc0231f73f%7C0%7C0%7C637205014047709501&data=Y%2B3Ry2ruNdfWsN1Mq4UOiDh9vMiK%2B23LgRdI%7CkPOqM%3D&reserved=0>

Find out about emergency childcare centers<https://na01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fsf.gov%2Finformation%2Fsan-francisco-converts-rec-facilities-emergency-child-care-centers&data=02%7C01%7Cvictor.lim%40sfgov.org%7Ce3e34451ee9c4656e5aa08d7ce958e24%7C22d5c2fceed3e443d9a7fdfcc0231f73f%7C0%7C0%7C637205014047709501&data=Y%2B3Ry2ruNdfWsN1Mq4UOiDh9vMiK%2B23LgRdI%7CkPOqM%3D&reserved=0>

Get City help if your business or employment is impacted by COVID-19<https://na01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Foewd.org%2Fassistance-guidance-businesses-and-workers-impacted-covid-19%23Biz%2520and%2520Employers&data=02%7C01%7Cvictor.lim%40sfgov.org%7Ce3e34451ee9c4656e5aa08d7ce958e24%7C22d5c2fceed3e443d9a7fdfcc0231f73f%7C0%7C0%7C637205014047719490&data=wzCOPxJvDdfMdp0kruaTYHuQby5JgDkum0cX1W2oE%3D&reserved=0>

Find City services that are open during the coronavirus outbreak<https://na01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fsf.gov%2Finformation%2Fcity-services-whats-open&data=02%7C01%7Cvictor.lim%40sfgov.org%7Ce3e34451ee9c4656e5aa08d7ce958e24%7C22d5c2fceed3e443d9a7fdfcc0231f73f%7C0%7C0%7C637205014047719490&data=3BUb2D%2BWU0uGqm%2FL0UtNj1kVH5xIcRM7KAzicBED%3D&reserved=0>

Download fact sheets, social media graphics, or flyers<https://na01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fsf.gov%2Foutreach-toolkit-coronavirus-covid-19&data=02%7C01%7Cvictor.lim%40sfgov.org%7Ce3e34451ee9c4656e5aa08d7ce958e24%7C22d5c2fceed3e443d9a7fdfcc0231f73f%7C0%7C0%7C637205014047729485&data=j5p9kCq8eiAfRL%2F3MWjtQQz76xMHUIdVuUAf%2Fo91U%3D&reserved=0>
Stay informed: Text COVID19SF to 888-777 for text message alerts. Call 311 or visit www.SF.gov/coronavirus for more information.

---

On June 5, 2020:
I understand COVID places extra difficulties on accessing records, and I have to-date provided the City numerous voluntary waivers of timeliness for that reason.

I also understand that the Mayor has attempted to suspend, under the guise of this pandemic, transparency laws having no relationship to timeliness or social distance, such as her purported suspension of SFAC 67.24(g,i), and the City has specifically attempted to use the catch-all exemption against my requests because there is no lawful reason to withhold the information I seek. All claims by the City to employ the Mayor's suspensions of parts of the Sunshine Ordinance to withhold or redact or refuse to justify withholding or redactions in ways not permitted by the full Sunshine Ordinance will continue to be litigated.

Remember that Ms. Caroll, because she has custody of her own cell-phone, has an individual legal responsibility to provide these records, even if you or others in the department are unable to physically access her phone. I will be sure to directly make the request of her as well.

Stay safe and compliant,
Anonymous

NOTE: Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. The email address sending this request is a publicly-viewable mailbox. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

---

On June 5, 2020:
Dear Anonymous,

We have received your request and we are processing our response. Please note that due to the continuing public health emergency, City workers are naturally working under unusual and difficult conditions with many called in for service as disaster service workers or otherwise prioritizing work on the public health emergency and with many others working remotely while also providing care for children or other family members. This impacts the ability to respond to records requests, particularly in gathering documents when working from a remote location. The City’s emergency
orders have suspended certain provisions of the Sunshine Ordinance in response, including immediate disclosure requests and the 10 day period in which to provide or withhold documents.

Please understand that compliance with the California Public Records Act and the Sunshine Ordinance, subject to the scope of these orders, otherwise remains in effect and city departments are fulfilling those obligations while navigating the challenges of the health emergency. Further, your request is neither simple nor routine and does not seek easily accessible documents. It also requires consultation with another city department. Thus, it would not ordinarily be answered as an immediate disclosure request and would be treated as a regular records request, irrespective of the emergency orders. See Cal. Gov. Code 6253 and Admin. Code 67.25(b).

Thus, we will further respond within 10 days of your request, barring the need for a further extension, and inform you of whether responsive documents exist and, if so, the estimated date for their production.

Victor Wai Ho Lim | 林偉浩
External Affairs Officer | 外務特派專員
Department of Emergency Management | 三藩市應急管理局
415-558-2768 direct | 直線
415-558-2712 media line | 傳媒

---

On June 4, 2020:
Subject: California Public Records Act Request: Inter-Agency Text Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF DEM)
Department of Emergency Management and its Department Head:

Below are new Immediate Disclosure Requests (SF Admin Code 67.25(a)) directed to your agency and its department head. Your response is required by June 5, 2020. Rolling records responses are requested (SFAC 67.25(d)) if you are unable to immediately produce records. Exact copies of every responsive record are requested (Gov Code 6253(b)) - do not: provide mere URLs, print and scan electronic records, convert native files to PDFs, or provide black and white versions of any color images. Provide only copies of records not requiring fees and in-person inspection of all other records (GC 6253).

Your non-exhaustive obligations:
- All withholding of any information must be justified in writing (SFAC 67.27).
- All withholdings by masking or deletion (aka redactions) must be keyed by footnote or other clear reference to the specific justification for that redaction, and only the minimal exempt portion of any record may be withheld (SFAC 67.26).
- You must respond to emailed requests (SFAC 67.21(b)).
- You must notify us of whether or not responsive records exist and/or were withheld for each below request (Gov Code 6253(c), 6255(b)).
- You must state the name and title of each person responsible for withholding any information (Gov Code 6253(d)).
- Do not impose any end-user restrictions upon me (Santa Clara Co. vs Superior Ct, 170 Cal.App 4th 1301); so if you use a third-party website like NextRequest to publish records, please make them completely public without any login or sign-in.

Your agency must do all of the above things in your response, and you cannot wait until we file complaints.

****** We have no duty to, and we will not again, remind the City of its obligations. Instead, we will file complaints for every Sunshine Ordinance or CPRA violation. We will continue to file complaints until the City's procedures are modified to fully comply with the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA, without caveat or exception. ******
1. All text or chat messages (including group messages) in any form or application (including but not limited to SMS, MMS, WhatsApp, WeChat, Signal, Instagram, Twitter, Facebook, Hangouts, Skype, Teams):
   - a) sent by your current department head to/cc/bcc any of Mayor London Breed, Sean Elsbernd, SFPD Chief William Scott, Tomás Aragón, Dennis Herrera, Jeff Kositsky, Mohammed Nuru, Alaric Degrafinried, Andy Lynch, Hank Heckel, or Abigail Stewart-Kahn (the "Named Public Officials") OR
   - b) sent by any of the Named Public Officials and received by your current department head (and possibly others, such as in a group message) OR
   - c) sent by a third party and received by both your current department head and any of the Named Public Officials (such as in a group message),

   with timestamps between Jan 1, 2019 and June 3, 2020 (inclusive), including a personal property search under City of San Jose vs Superior Court (2017). While the phone numbers are not needed, the following must be preserved: the timestamps, the textual content, attachments, and images, and also ALL sender and recipient names (including groups).

   Pursuant to SF Admin Code 67.21(l), which requires you to use any electronic format that we request, please provide the records in spreadsheet format. For an example of the format of the response, see SFPD Chief Scott’s prior response here: https://cdn.muckrock.com/foia_files/2020/04/14/Text_Messages_Breed_Scott_Redacted.pdf and clearly referenced redaction justifications here: https://cdn.muckrock.com/foia_files/2020/04/14/ChiefOfficeResponse201.pdf (though I do not concede all of them are appropriate redactions). Please provide rolling responses, starting with the most recent records going backwards. Messages to/from before your current department head became the department head must still be provided.

   Do not destroy or discard any responsive records - we will appeal all withholdings or Sunshine violations. Remember your department head has an obligation to maintain in a professional and businesslike manner their correspondence and release them as public records (SF Admin Code 67.27-9(a)); and we will cross-check your responses with all other parties to ensure you have not destroyed or withheld records improperly.

   Thank you for your anticipated cooperation in this matter.

   NOTE: Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. The email address sending this request is a publicly-viewable mailbox. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

   Sincerely,
   Anonymous

   Filed via MuckRock.com
   E-mail (Preferred): 94425-31123144@requests.muckrock.com
%3Fnext%3D%252Faccounts%252Fagency%252Fdepartment-of-emergency-management-8080%252Finter-
agency-text-messages-immediate-disclosure-request-sf-dem-
94425%252F253Femail%253Dsupervisor.records%252540sfcityatty.org&url_auth_token=AAAd4xrU-r5p-
NnPqNh00j0s%253A11GhHb%253AOEF15DfeSo078v7JS7IE1w2UM
   Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

   For mailed responses, please address (see note):
   MuckRock News
DEPT MR 94425
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.
February 28, 2021

This is a follow up to request number P000054-092420:

On Nov 7 2020 I requested from the Sheriffs Office: "This is a further immediate disclosure request for the calendar and meeting records for the Sheriff for the dates Feb 14, 2021 thru Feb 28, 2021 as they exist at the time of this request with minimal redactions pursuant to SOTF Order 19112. Rolling responses and exact copies must be provided."

No response was ever provided. Under SFAC 67.21(d) please determine these records public in writing and order them disclosed.

--Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 84168-39742724@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:
RE: Public Records Request of September 23, 2020, Reference # P000054-092420
Dear Anonymous,
We are writing in response to your public records request dated September 23, 2020. We are providing a rolling response to your records request with the calendar entry for the date of November 14, 2020 of Sheriff Miyamoto. This record is available in the Records Request System. Please log in to your online account and retrieve the records. Your original request was received on September 23, 2020 and read as follows:

---

On Nov. 18, 2020:
Subject: [Records Center] Public Records Request :: P000054-092420
--- Please respond above this line ---

RE: Public Records Request of September 23, 2020, Reference # P000054-092420
Dear Anonymous,
We are writing in response to your public records request dated September 23, 2020. We are providing a rolling response to your records request with the calendar entry for the date of November 14, 2020 of Sheriff Miyamoto. This record is available in the Records Request System. Please log in to your online account and retrieve the records. Your original request was received on September 23, 2020 and read as follows: From: 84168-39742724@requests.muckrock.com <84168-39742724@requests.muckrock.com>

---

On Nov. 17, 2020:
Subject: RE: New Complaint against the Sheriff
Anonymous: I don’t see the email and your form states there are exhibits. Thank you.

Cheryl Leger
Assistant Clerk, Board of Supervisors
Cheryl.Leger@sfgov.org<mailto:Cheryl.Leger@sfgov.org>
Tel: 415-554-7724
Fax: 415-554-5163
www.sfbos.org


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.
On Nov. 17, 2020:
Subject: RE: New Response Complaint Form
Anonymous: I need your original emails sent to the Sheriff’s Department requesting records. Thank you.

Cheryl Leger
Assistant Clerk, Board of Supervisors
Cheryl.Leger@sfgov.org
Tel: 415-554-7724
Fax: 415-554-5163
www.sfbos.org

[CustomerSatisfactionIcon] 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.

---

On Nov. 17, 2020:
Subject: RE: Public Records Request of September 23, 2020, Reference # P000054-092420
The following is a copy of a message sent to you on November 16, 2020 via GovQA:

RE: Public Records Request of September 23, 2020, Reference # P000054-092420

Dear Anonymous,
We are writing in response to your public records request dated September 23, 2020. We are providing a rolling response to your records request with the calendar entries for the dates of November 12 and 13, 2020 of Sheriff Miyamoto. This record is available in the Records Request System. Please log in to your online account and retrieve the records.
Your original request was received on September 23, 2020 and read as follows:

---

On Dec. 7, 2019:
Subject: California Public Records Act Request: Calendars and Emails - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF Sheriff)
To Whom It May Concern:
Attached is an Immediate Disclosure Request (SF Admin Code 67.25(a)).
Your response is required by Dec. 10, 2019. Rolling records responses are requested (67.25(d)).

NOTE: Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. The email address sending this request is a publicly-viewable mailbox. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 84168-39742724@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:
%3Fnext%3D%252Faccounts%252Fagency_login%252Fsan-francisco-sheriffs-department-5169%252Fcalendars-and-
emails-immediate-disclosure-request-sf-sheriff-
84168%252F%253Femail%25253Dsupervisor.records%252540sfcityatty.org&url_auth_token=AAAeXMQfjpA7_DT8ARfN
VpXQ%3A1lGOaz%3A1BCQauZVOwpHlcQ28IXHfGwsTy0
Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 84168
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.
This is a follow up to a previous request:

See attached petition.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 84182
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.

---

On Feb. 26, 2021:
Subject: SOTF - Agenda Packet for March 3, 2021 Sunshine Task Force hearing; 4:00 pm
Good Afternoon:
The agenda and packet for the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force March 3, 2021 4:00 p.m. meeting is online at the following link:

https://sfgov.org/sunshine/sites/default/files/sotf_030321_agenda.pdf

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

Cheryl Leger
Assistant Clerk, Board of Supervisors
Cheryl.Leger@sfgov.org
Tel: 415-554-7724
Fax: 415-554-5163
www.sfbos.org


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.

---

On Feb. 19, 2021:
Subject: SOTF - Notice of Appearance, March 3, 2021 - Sunshine Ordinance Task Force; 4:00 PM; Remote Meeting
Good Afternoon:

You are receiving this notice because you are named as a Complainant or Respondent in the following complaints scheduled before the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force to: 1) hear the merits of the complaint; 2) issue a determination; and/or 3) consider referrals from a Task Force Committee.

Date: March 3, 2021

Location: Remote Meeting

Time: 4:00 p.m.

Complainants: Your attendance is required for this meeting/ hearing. Remote meeting information can be found on the cover page of the Agenda.
Respondents/Departments: Pursuant to Section 67.21 (e) of the Ordinance, the custodian of records or a representative of your department, who can speak to the matter, is required at the meeting/hearing.

Complaints:

File No. 19076: Reconsideration of SOTF findings and Order of Determination - Complaint filed by Maria Schulman against Animal Care and Control, for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Section 67.21, by failing to respond to a request for public records in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19131: Complaint filed by Anonymous against Jose Cisneros, Theresa Buckley and the Treasurer’s Office for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.21, 67.24, 67.26, 67.27, by failing to respond to a request for records in a timely and/or complete manner, failing to assist, withheld more than the minimally exempt portion of a public record.

File No. 19134: Complaint filed by Anonymous against Rob Reiter and City Hall Building Management for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.21 and 67.25 by failing to respond to an Immediate Disclosure Request in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19136: Complaint filed by Anonymous against Naomi Kelly and the Office of the City Administrator for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.21 and 67.25 by failing to respond to an Immediate Disclosure Request in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19140: Complaint filed by Stephen Malloy against the Department of Human Resources for violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.21, 67.24(h), 67.26, 67.27 and 67.25, by failing to respond to a request for public records in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19139: Complaint filed by Anonymous against Jeanne Buick, Henry Voong and the Department of Human Resources for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.24(h), by failing to cite a prohibited deliberative process exemption, 67.26 for failing to keep withholding to a minimum and (67.27), for failing to provide justification of withholding a document.

Documentation (evidence supporting/disputing complaint)

For a document to be considered, it must be received at least three (4) working days before the hearing (see attached Public Complaint Procedure).

For inclusion in the agenda packet, supplemental/supporting documents must be received by 5:00 pm, February 25, 2021.

Cheryl Leger

Assistant Clerk, Board of Supervisors

Tel: 415-554-7724


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.

Cheryl Leger
Assistant Clerk, Board of Supervisors
Tel: 415-554-7724


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.

---

On Nov. 19, 2020:
Subject: Re: California Public Records Act Request: Calendars and Emails - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF ADM)
Dear Requestor,

We are in receipt of your Immediate Disclosure Request email dated November 19, 2020.

In your message you asked, "Please send your response to SOTF Complaint 19136 and the associated records directly to this correct email address so that I may review them." Please find attached the responsive records previously disclosed.

The IDR requests:

"(a) all emails sent by either cheryl.leger@sfgov.org<mailto:cheryl.leger@sfgov.org> OR sotf@sfgov.org<mailto:sotf@sfgov.org> received by the address naomi.kelly@sfgov.org<mailto:naomi.kelly@sfgov.org> and (b) every reply or forward to every email in (a) (including all subsequent forwards or replies, under transitive closure, i.e. provide all complete email threads), from Nov 1, 2019 to present. You must provide the emails in their original electronic format and with all email headers/metadata preserved, and all attachments and formatting. See SOTF Orders 19044 and 19098. Your employee testified at SOTF yesterday that certain staffing constraints prevented you..."
from acknowledging my records request for almost a year. However, SOTF asked why you personally refused to reply to the Complaint Notice sent by SOTF to you, personally, in case 19136. I will be finding out the actual reason."

This serves to notify you that we are in receipt of your request and are processing our response. Please note that city workers are naturally working under unusual and difficult conditions with many called in for emergency service as disaster relief workers, or otherwise prioritizing work on the public health emergency, and with many working remotely, sometimes while also providing care for children or other family members. This impacts the City’s ability to respond to records requests, particularly in gathering documents when working from a remote location. These issues are noted in the Mayor’s emergency orders (also attached) which, among other things, have suspended certain provisions of the Sunshine Ordinance, including immediate disclosure requests and the 10-day period in which to provide or withhold documents.

Pursuant to these orders, we will respond further within 10 days of your request, barring a further extension, to notify you of the existence of any disclosable records and our timetable for production pursuant to the California Public Records Act.

Sincerely,

Tal Quetone
Office of the City Administrator
(415) 554-4148
Pronouns: He, Him, His

---

On Nov. 19, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Calendars and Emails - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF ADM)
Naomi Kelly:

1) Please send your response to SOTF Complaint 19136 and the associated records directly to this correct email address so that I may review them.

2) This is an immediate disclosure request for (a) all emails sent by either cheryl.leger@sfgov.org OR sotf@sfgov.org received by the address naomi.kelly@sfgov.org and (b) every reply or forward to every email in (a) (including all subsequent forwards or replies, under transitive closure, i.e. provide all complete email threads), from Nov 1, 2019 to present. You must provide the emails in their original electronic format and with all email headers/metadata preserved, and all attachments and formatting. See SOTF Orders 19044 and 19098. Your employee testified at SOTF yesterday that certain staffing constraints prevented you from acknowledging my records request for almost a year. However, SOTF asked why you personally refused to reply to the Complaint Notice sent by SOTF to you, personally, in case 19136. I will be finding out the actual reason.

NOTE: Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. The email address sending this request is a publicly-viewable mailbox. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be public records.

Sincerely,
On Nov. 13, 2020:
Subject: SOTF - Sunshine Ordinance Task Force Complaint Committee November 17, 2020 Remote Meeting - Agenda and Packet Online
Good Afternoon:

The agenda and packet for the Complaint Committee of the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force November 17, 2020 5:30 p.m. meeting is online at the following link:

https://sfgov.org/sunshine/sites/default/files/complaint_111720_agenda.pdf

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

Cheryl Leger
Assistant Clerk, Board of Supervisors
Cheryl.Leger@sfgov.org
Tel: 415-554-7724
Fax: 415-554-5163
www.sfbos.org

<http://www.sfbos.org/index.aspx?page=104> Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.


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.

---

On Dec. 7, 2019:
Subject: California Public Records Act Request: Calendars and Emails - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF ADM)
To the Department Head (Naomi M. Kelly),

Attached is an Immediate Disclosure Request (SF Admin Code 67.25(a)).
Your response is required by Dec. 10, 2019. Rolling records responses are requested (67.25(d)).
NOTE: Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. The email address sending this request is a publicly-viewable mailbox. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 84182-48147675@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:
%3Dnext%3D%252Faccounts%252Fagency_login%252Fsan-fransisco-311-18636%252Fcalendars-and-emails-immediate-disclosure-request-sf-adm-
84182%252F%253Demail%253Dsupervisor.records%252540sfcityatty.org&url_auth_token=AABkDcrkc2hpnhG1e4bE80_Zx1c%3A1GiOH%3A_GOyPlyNjIH6C7fnZR7ajnuLw6c

Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 84182
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.
March 1, 2021

Petition under SF Administrative Code § 67.21(d)

Supervisor of Records Dennis Herrera,

Please determine in writing that the following records or parts thereof requested November 19, 2020 via 84182-48147675@requests.muckrock.com are public and order City Administrator to disclose them:

This is an immediate disclosure request for (a) all emails sent by either cheryl.leger@sfgov.org OR sotf@sfgov.org received by the address naomi.kelly@sfgov.org and (b) every reply or forward to every email in (a) (including all subsequent forwards or replies, under transitive closure, i.e. provide all complete email threads), from Nov 1, 2019 to present. You must provide the emails in their original electronic format and with all email headers/metadata preserved, and all attachments and formatting. See SOTF Orders 19044 and 19098. Your employee testified at SOTF yesterday that certain staffing constraints prevented you from acknowledging my records request for almost a year. However, SOTF asked why you personally refused to reply to the Complaint Notice sent by SOTF to you, personally, in case 19136. I will be finding out the actual reason.
Anonymous

Petition under SF Administrative Code § 67.21(d)

The City has failed to respond within the CPRA deadlines.

Sincerely,

Anonymous
Buta, Odaya (CAT)

From: 84162-44435865@requests.muckrock.com
Sent: Monday, March 1, 2021 5:26 AM
To: Supervisor Records (CAT)
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Calendars and Emails - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF TTX)
Attachments: petition_20210301_TTX.pdf; IDR-20191207-TTX.pdf

San Francisco Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector
PRA Office
Room 140
1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Place
SF, CA 94102

March 1, 2021

This is a follow up to a previous request:

See attached petition.

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 84162-44435865@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:
Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 84162
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.

---

On Feb. 26, 2021:
Subject: SOTF - Agenda Packet for March 3, 2021 Sunshine Task Force hearing; 4:00 pm
Good Afternoon:
The agenda and packet for the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force March 3, 2021 4:00 p.m. meeting is online at the following link:

https://sfgov.org/sunshine/sites/default/files/sotf_030321_agenda.pdf

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

Cheryl Leger
Assistant Clerk, Board of Supervisors
Cheryl.Leger@sfgov.org
Tel: 415-554-7724
Fax: 415-554-5163
www.sfbos.org

[CustomerSatisfactionIcon] 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.

---

On Feb. 19, 2021:
Subject: SOTF - Notice of Appearance, March 3, 2021 - Sunshine Ordinance Task Force; 4:00 PM; Remote Meeting

Good Afternoon:

You are receiving this notice because you are named as a Complainant or Respondent in the following complaints scheduled before the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force to: 1) hear the merits of the complaint; 2) issue a determination; and/or 3) consider referrals from a Task Force Committee.

Date: March 3, 2021

Location: Remote Meeting

Time: 4:00 p.m.

Complainants: Your attendance is required for this meeting/hearing. Remote meeting information can be found on the cover page of the Agenda.
Respondents/Departments: Pursuant to Section 67.21 (e) of the Ordinance, the custodian of records or a representative of your department, who can speak to the matter, is required at the meeting/hearing.

Complaints:

File No. 19076: Reconsideration of SOTF findings and Order of Determination - Complaint filed by Maria Schulman against Animal Care and Control, for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Section 67.21, by failing to respond to a request for public records in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19131: Complaint filed by Anonymous against Jose Cisneros, Theresa Buckley and the Treasurer’s Office for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.21, 67.24, 67.26, 67.27, by failing to respond to a request for records in a timely and/or complete manner, failing to assist, withheld more than the minimally exempt portion of a public record.

File No. 19134: Complaint filed by Anonymous against Rob Reiter and City Hall Building Management for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.21 and 67.25 by failing to respond to an Immediate Disclosure Request in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19136: Complaint filed by Anonymous against Naomi Kelly and the Office of the City Administrator for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.21 and 67.25 by failing to respond to an Immediate Disclosure Request in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19140: Complaint filed by Stephen Malloy against the Department of Human Resources for violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.21, 67.24(h), 67.26, 67.27 and 67.25, by failing to respond to a request for public records in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19139: Complaint filed by Anonymous against Jeanne Buick, Henry Voong and the Department of Human Resources for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Section 67.24(h), by failing to cite a prohibited deliberative process exemption, 67.26 for failing to keep withholding to a minimum and (67.27), for failing to provide justification of withholding a document.

Documentation (evidence supporting/disputing complaint)

For a document to be considered, it must be received at least three (4) working days before the hearing (see attached Public Complaint Procedure).

For inclusion in the agenda packet, supplemental/supporting documents must be received by 5:00 pm, February 25, 2021.

Cheryl Leger

Assistant Clerk, Board of Supervisors

Tel: 415-554-7724


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.

Cheryl Leger
Assistant Clerk, Board of Supervisors
Tel: 415-554-7724


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.

---

On Nov. 20, 2020:
Subject: SOTF - Compliance and Amendments Committee November 24, 2020 Agenda
Good Afternoon:

The agenda and packet for the Compliance and Amendments Committee of the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force November 24, 2020, 4:30 p.m. meeting is online at the following link:

https://sfgov.org/sunshine/sites/default/files/cac112420_agenda.pdf

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

Cheryl Leger
Assistant Clerk, Board of Supervisors
Cheryl.Leger@sfgov.org<mailto:Cheryl.Leger@sfgov.org>
Tel: 415-554-7724
Fax: 415-554-5163
www.sfbos.org
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.

---

On Nov. 16, 2020:
Subject: SOTF - Notice of Appearance - Compliance and Amendments Committee; November 24, 2020 4:30 p.m.
Good Afternoon:

You are receiving this notice because you are named as a Complainant or Respondent in one of the following complaints scheduled before the Compliance and Amendments Committee to: 1) hear the merits of the complaint; 2) issue a determination; and/or 3) consider referrals from a Task Force Committee.

Date: November 24, 2020
Location: Remote meeting; participant information to be included on the Agenda
Time: 4:30 p.m.

Complainants: Your attendance is required for this meeting/hearing.

Respondents/Departments: Pursuant to Section 67.21 (e) of the Ordinance, the custodian of records or a representative of your department, who can speak to the matter, is required at the meeting/hearing.

Complaints:

1. File No. 19145: Complaint filed by Chris Khors against the Police Commission for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.5 and 67.21, by failing to respond to a public records request in a timely and/or complete manner.

2. File No. 20010: Complaint filed by Patrick Monette-Shaw against the Office of the City Attorney for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.21(b) and 67.25(d), by failing to respond to an Immediate Disclosure Request in a timely and/or complete manner.

3. File No. 20011: Complaint filed by Ahimsa Porter Sumchai against Mayor London Breed for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Section 67.21, by failing to respond to a public records request in a timely and/or complete manner.
4. File No. 20012: Complaint filed by Ahimsa Porter Sumchai against Supervisor Shamann Walton, Board of Supervisors, for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Section 67.21, by failing to respond to a public records request in a timely and/or complete manner.

5. File No. 19131: Complaint filed by Anonymous against Jose Cisneros, Theresa Buckley and the Treasurer's Office for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.21, 67.24, 67.26, 67.27, by failing to respond to a request for records in a timely and/or complete manner, failing to assist, withheld more than the

Documentation (evidence supporting/disputing complaint)

For a document to be considered, it must be received at least five (3) working days before the hearing (see attached Public Complaint Procedure). For inclusion into the agenda packet, supplemental/supporting documents must be received by 5:00 pm, November 19, 2020.

Cheryl Leger
Assistant Clerk, Board of Supervisors
Tel: 415-554-7724


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.

---

On Sept. 14, 2020:
Subject: RE: Follow up to a previous Public Records Request originally submitted on Dec. 7, 2019 - Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector - City and County of San Francisco
Dear Anonymous:

Please find the attached response to your follow up email on September 3, 2020, regarding your original request on December 7, 2019.

Best Regards,

Francisco Chavez
Legal Secretary
Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector
City and County of San Francisco
On Dec. 7, 2019:

Subject: California Public Records Act Request: Calendars and Emails - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF TTX)

To Whom It May Concern:

Attached is an Immediate Disclosure Request (SF Admin Code 67.25(a)).

Your response is required by Dec. 10, 2019. Rolling records responses are requested (67.25(d)).

NOTE: Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. The email address sending this request is a publicly-viewable mailbox. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 84162-44435865@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:

Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 84162
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.
IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE REQUEST - DEC. 7, 2019
Pursuant to the CPRA and SF Sunshine Ordinance

This is an Immediate Disclosure Request (SFAC 67.25(a)) for the records numbered below. Your response is required by Dec. 10, 2019. Rolling records responses are requested (67.25(d)).

NOTE: Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. The email address sending this request is a publicly-viewable mailbox. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock).

Please read carefully the exact wording of my request and follow the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA precisely. Every violation will be appealed, including but not limited to:

• any untimely or incomplete response (SF Admin Code 67.21, 67.25),
• failure to provide records in a rolling fashion as soon as each is available (SF Admin Code 67.25),
• failing to indicate whether you have responsive records or not for each request below and whether or not you withheld any records for each request below (Gov Code 6253(c))
• withholding more than the minimum exempt portion of any record or withholding an entire record if any portion at all is non-exempt (SF Admin Code 67.26),
• failure to justify with a footnote or "other clear reference" to an exemption statute or case law for each and every redaction or withholding (SF Admin Code 67.26, 67.27), including any so-called 'metadata',
• failure to provide "exact copies" of records (Gov Code 6253(b)), for example, by physically printing electronic records and scanning them back in, which degrades their content and causes loss of colors, hyperlinks, metadata, and searchable text content
• failure to provide the "electronic format in which [you] hold[] the information" (Gov Code 6253.9),
• failure to provide any "easily generated" format that we request below (SF Admin Code 67.21(l)),
• redacting or withholding information whose exemption you have already waived by producing it to the public before (Gov Code 6254.5),
• refusing to use email (SF Admin Code 67.21(b)), or requiring me to use a third-party service which imposes on me any terms and conditions beyond those of the CPRA (Gov Code

Requests:
1. the specific calendar required to be kept by SF Admin Code 67.29-5 (aka "Prop G calendar") for your Department Head (whether an employee or elected official, defined pursuant to SF Charter 2A.30 para 1), with each and every meeting/item for Nov 10 - Nov
17, 2019 (inclusive). Since these dates are more than 3 business days prior to this request, you must immediately provide them. You may use any format to provide this calendar as long as it provides at least the location, exact start and end times, general description of topics, and (as required by 67.29-5) identity of meeting participants for every meeting. If all 67.29-5 information is not visible in a summary view, you must print out the individual meeting entries.

2. every meeting/entry on every calendar for your Department Head for Nov 10-17, 2019 (inclusive). This specifically includes both the SFAC 67.29-5/Prop G calendar, and all other calendar records (aka "non-Prop G" calendars) prepared, owned, retained, or used by your Department Head or agency staff (see SOTF Order 19047). Calendars and meeting entries are requested in their original electronic format or in .ICS format, with all non-exempt headers and metadata, and you must preserve all attachments, exhibits, formatting, hyperlinks, images, colors, email addresses, invitees and their attendance status, recurrences, exact start/end times, locations, titles, and descriptions. Daily, weekly, or monthly summary views are non-responsive - each individual meeting entry is requested.

3. every meeting/entry on every calendar for your Department Head for future dates Dec 16-23 (inclusive). This specifically includes both the SFAC 67.29-5/Prop G calendar, and all other calendar records (aka "non-Prop G" calendars) prepared, owned, retained, or used by your Department Head or agency staff (see SOTF Order 19047). Calendars and meeting entries are requested in their original electronic format or in .ICS format, with all non-exempt headers and metadata, and you must preserve all attachments, exhibits, formatting, hyperlinks, images, colors, email addresses, invitees and their attendance status, recurrences, exact start/end times, locations, titles, and descriptions. Daily, weekly, or monthly summary views are non-responsive - each individual meeting entry is requested.

4. the most recent 5 emails sent by your Department Head via their government email account. Emails are requested in their original electronic format, or in .EML or .MSG format, with all non-exempt headers and metadata, and you must preserve all attachments, exhibits, formatting, hyperlinks, images, colors, and From/To/Cc/Bcc email addresses.

5. the most recent 5 emails received by your Department Head via their government email account. Emails are requested in their original electronic format, or in .EML or .MSG format, with all non-exempt headers and metadata, and you must preserve all attachments, exhibits, formatting, hyperlinks, images, colors, and From/To/Cc/Bcc email addresses.

6. the most recent 5 emails relating to the conduct of public business, subject to City of San Jose v Superior Court (Smith, 2017), sent by your Department Head via their personal
email account. Emails are requested in their original electronic format, or in .EML or .MSG format, with all non-exempt headers and metadata, and you must preserve all attachments, exhibits, formatting, hyperlinks, images, colors, and From/To/Cc/Bcc email addresses.

7. The most recent 5 emails relating to the conduct of public business, subject to *City of San Jose v Superior Court (Smith, 2017)*, received by your Department Head via their personal email account. Emails are requested in their original electronic format, or in .EML or .MSG format, with all non-exempt headers and metadata, and you must preserve all attachments, exhibits, formatting, hyperlinks, images, colors, and From/To/Cc/Bcc email addresses.
Attn. General Government Team  
Supervisor of Records  
City Hall, Room 234  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
via email

March 1, 2021

Petition under SF Administrative Code § 67.21(d)

Supervisor of Records Dennis Herrera,

Please determine in writing that the following records or parts thereof requested December 7, 2019 via 84162-44435865@requests.muckrock.com are public and order Treasurer-Tax Collector to disclose them:

Request attached.

The City failed to comply, refused to comply, or incompletely complied because:

1. Future calendar entries involving the mayor were withheld in entirety instead of redacting solely the records of security procedures of a local police agency

2. All email and calendar metadata was withheld even though we know that only some portion of that metadata may be exempt as an information security threat

Sincerely,

Anonymous
Buta, Odaya (CAT)

From: 84166-59035583@requests.muckrock.com
Sent: Monday, March 1, 2021 5:36 AM
To: Supervisor Records (CAT)
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Calendars and Emails - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF City Hall Management)
Attachments: IDR-20191207-CITYHALL.pdf; petition_20210301_CITYHALL.pdf

San Francisco City Hall
PRA Office
1 Doctor Carlton B Goodlett Place
SF, CA 94102

March 1, 2021

This is a follow up to a previous request:

See attached petition.

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 84166-59035583@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:

Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 84166
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.

---

On Feb. 26, 2021:
Subject: SOTF - Agenda Packet for March 3, 2021 Sunshine Task Force hearing; 4:00 pm
Good Afternoon:

The agenda and packet for the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force March 3, 2021 4:00 p.m. meeting is online at the following link:
https://sfgov.org/sunshine/sites/default/files/sotf_030321_agenda.pdf

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

Cheryl Leger
Assistant Clerk, Board of Supervisors
Cheryl.Leger@sfgov.org
Tel: 415-554-7724
Fax: 415-554-5163
www.sfbos.org


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.

---

On Nov. 13, 2020:
Subject: SOTF - Sunshine Ordinance Task Force Complaint Committee November 17, 2020 Remote Meeting - Agenda and Packet Online
Good Afternoon:

The agenda and packet for the Complaint Committee of the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force November 17, 2020 5:30 p.m. meeting is online at the following link:

https://sfgov.org/sunshine/sites/default/files/complaint_111720_agenda.pdf

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

Cheryl Leger
Assistant Clerk, Board of Supervisors
Cheryl.Leger@sfgov.org
Tel: 415-554-7724


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.

---

On Nov. 6, 2020:
Subject: SOTF - Notice of Appearance - Complaint Committee: November 17, 2020, 5:30 p.m.
Good Afternoon:

Notice is hereby given that the Complaint Committee (Committee) of the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force (Task Force) shall hold hearings on complaints listed below to: 1) determine if the Task Force has jurisdiction; 2) review the merits of the complaints; and/or 3) issue a report and/or recommendation to the Task Force.

Date: November 17, 2020

Location: Remote Meeting

Time: 5:30 p.m.

Complainants: Your attendance is required for this meeting/hearing.

Respondents/Departments: Pursuant to Section 67.21 (e) of the Ordinance, the custodian of records or a representative of your department, who can speak to the matter, is required at the meeting/hearing.

Complaints:

File No. 19134: Complaint filed by Anonymous against Rob Reiter and City Hall Building Management for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.21 and 67.25 by failing to respond to an Immediate Disclosure Request in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19136: Complaint filed by Anonymous against Naomi Kelly and the Office of the City Administrator for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.21 and 67.25 by failing to respond to an Immediate Disclosure Request in a timely and/or complete manner.
File No. 19122: Complaint filed by Anonymous against City Librarian Michael Lambert and the Public Library for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Section 67.25, by failing to respond to an Immediate Disclosure Request in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 19146: Complaint filed by Anonymous against City Librarian Michael Lambert and the Public Library for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Section 67.21, by failing to request for public records in a timely and/or complete manner.

Documentation (evidence supporting/disputing complaint)

For a document to be considered, it must be received at least five (4) working days before the hearing. For inclusion into the agenda packet, supplemental/supporting documents must be received by 5:00 pm, November 12, 2020.

Cheryl Leger
Assistant Clerk, Board of Supervisors

Tel: 415-554-7724

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.

---

On Oct. 20, 2020:

Subject: SOTF - Notice of Appearance - Compliance and Amendments Committee; October 27, 2020 4:30 p.m.

Good Afternoon:

You are receiving this notice because you are named as a Complainant or Respondent in one of the following complaints scheduled before the Compliance and Amendments Committee to: 1) hear the merits of the complaint; 2) issue a determination; and/or 3) consider referrals from a Task Force Committee.

Date: October 27, 2020

Location: Remote meeting; participant information to be included on the Agenda

Time: 4:30 p.m.

Complainants: Your attendance is required for this meeting/hearing.
Respondents/Departments: Pursuant to Section 67.21 (e) of the Ordinance, the custodian of records or a representative of your department, who can speak to the matter, is required at the meeting/hearing.

Complaints:

File No. 19134: Complaint filed by Anonymous against Rob Reiter and City Hall Building Management for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.21 and 67.25 by failing to respond to an Immediate Disclosure Request in a timely and/or complete manner.

Documentation (evidence supporting/disputing complaint)

For a document to be considered, it must be received at least five (5) working days before the hearing (see attached Public Complaint Procedure). For inclusion into the agenda packet, supplemental/supporting documents must be received by 5:00 pm, October 22, 2020.

Cheryl Leger
Assistant Clerk, Board of Supervisors

Tel: 415-554-7724


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.

---

On Feb. 11, 2020:
Subject: Response to your Immediate Disclosure Requests sent on February 8, 2020
Dear Requester:

We are in receipt of two requests for e-mails containing BCC fields sent by the Department Head for the Office of Contract Administration and City Hall Building Management sent on Saturday, February 8. They were received as Immediate Disclosure Requests on Monday, February 10. We are responding today Tuesday, February 11.

These agencies are divisions under the Office of the City Administrator. City Administrator Naomi Kelly is the Department Head for these divisions. This e-mail responds to these requests. The City Administrator's Office conducted a diligent search and has no records responsive to your request. City Administrator Naomi Kelly does not use the BCC field in communications she sends from her account.

5
Thank you for your Immediate Disclosure Requests.

Sincerely,

Bill Barnes
Senior Advisor, Policy and Communications
Office of the City Administrator

BUILDING MANAGEMENT REQUEST

---

On Dec. 7, 2019:
Subject: California Public Records Act Request: Calendars and Emails - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF City Hall Management)
To Whom It May Concern:

Attached is an Immediate Disclosure Request (SF Admin Code 67.25(a)).
Your response is required by Dec. 10, 2019. Rolling records responses are requested (67.25(d)).

NOTE: Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. The email address sending this request is a publicly-viewable mailbox. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 84166-59035583@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:
Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 84166
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the
requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.
IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE REQUEST - DEC. 7, 2019
Pursuant to the CPRA and SF Sunshine Ordinance

This is an Immediate Disclosure Request (SFAC 67.25(a)) for the records numbered below. Your response is required by Dec. 10, 2019. Rolling records responses are requested (67.25(d)). Please provide only copies not requiring fees - and a required notice of in-person inspection of fee-based records.

NOTE: Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. The email address sending this request is a publicly-viewable mailbox. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock).

Please read carefully the exact wording of my request and follow the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA precisely. Every violation will be appealed, including but not limited to:

- any untimely or incomplete response (SF Admin Code 67.21, 67.25),
- failure to provide records in a rolling fashion as soon as each is available (SF Admin Code 67.25),
- failing to indicate whether you have responsive records or not for each request below and whether or not you withheld any records for each request below (Gov Code 6253(c))
- withholding more than the minimum exempt portion of any record or withholding an entire record if any portion at all is non-exempt (SF Admin Code 67.26),
- failure to justify with a footnote or "other clear reference" to an exemption statute or case law for each and every redaction or withholding (SF Admin Code 67.26, 67.27), including any so-called 'metadata',
- failure to provide "exact copies" of records (Gov Code 6253(b)), for example, by physically printing electronic records and scanning them back in, which degrades their content and causes loss of colors, hyperlinks, metadata, and searchable text content
- failure to provide the "electronic format in which [you] hold[] the information" (Gov Code 6253.9),
- failure to provide any "easily generated" format that we request below (SF Admin Code 67.21(l)),
- redacting or withholding information whose exemption you have already waived by producing it to the public before (Gov Code 6254.5),
- refusing to use email (SF Admin Code 67.21(b)), or requiring me to use a third-party service which imposes on me any terms and conditions beyond those of the CPRA (Gov Code

Requests:
1. the specific calendar required to be kept by SF Admin Code 67.29-5 (aka "Prop G calendar") for your Department Head (whether an employee or elected official, defined
pursuant to SF Charter 2A.30 para 1), with each and every meeting/item for Nov 10 - Nov 17, 2019 (inclusive). Since these dates are more than 3 business days prior to this request, you must immediately provide them. You may use any format to provide this calendar as long as it provides at least the location, exact start and end times, general description of topics, and (as required by 67.29-5) identity of meeting participants for every meeting. If all 67.29-5 information is not visible in a summary view, you must print out the individual meeting entries.

2. every meeting/entry on every calendar for your Department Head for Nov 10-17, 2019 (inclusive). This specifically includes both the SFAC 67.29-5/Prop G calendar, and all other calendar records (aka "non-Prop G" calendars) prepared, owned, retained, or used by your Department Head or agency staff (see SOTF Order 19047). Calendars and meeting entries are requested in their original electronic format or in .ICS format, with all non-exempt headers and metadata, and you must preserve all attachments, exhibits, formatting, hyperlinks, images, colors, email addresses, invitees and their attendance status, recurrences, exact start/end times, locations, titles, and descriptions. Daily, weekly, or monthly summary views are non-responsive - each individual meeting entry is requested.

3. every meeting/entry on every calendar for your Department Head for future dates Dec 16-23 (inclusive). This specifically includes both the SFAC 67.29-5/Prop G calendar, and all other calendar records (aka "non-Prop G" calendars) prepared, owned, retained, or used by your Department Head or agency staff (see SOTF Order 19047). Calendars and meeting entries are requested in their original electronic format or in .ICS format, with all non-exempt headers and metadata, and you must preserve all attachments, exhibits, formatting, hyperlinks, images, colors, email addresses, invitees and their attendance status, recurrences, exact start/end times, locations, titles, and descriptions. Daily, weekly, or monthly summary views are non-responsive - each individual meeting entry is requested.

4. the most recent 5 emails sent by your Department Head via their government email account. Emails are requested in their original electronic format, or in .EML or .MSG format, with all non-exempt headers and metadata, and you must preserve all attachments, exhibits, formatting, hyperlinks, images, colors, and From/To/Cc/Bcc email addresses.

5. the most recent 5 emails received by your Department Head via their government email account. Emails are requested in their original electronic format, or in .EML or .MSG format, with all non-exempt headers and metadata, and you must preserve all attachments, exhibits, formatting, hyperlinks, images, colors, and From/To/Cc/Bcc email addresses.
6. the most recent 5 emails relating to the conduct of public business, subject to *City of San Jose v Superior Court (Smith, 2017)*, sent by your Department Head via their personal email account. Emails are requested in their original electronic format, or in .EML or .MSG format, with all non-exempt headers and metadata, and you must preserve all attachments, exhibits, formatting, hyperlinks, images, colors, and From/To/Cc/Bcc email addresses.

7. the most recent 5 emails relating to the conduct of public business, subject to *City of San Jose v Superior Court (Smith, 2017)*, received by your Department Head via their personal email account. Emails are requested in their original electronic format, or in .EML or .MSG format, with all non-exempt headers and metadata, and you must preserve all attachments, exhibits, formatting, hyperlinks, images, colors, and From/To/Cc/Bcc email addresses.
Anonymous Public Records Audit of San Francisco

Attn. General Government Team
Supervisor of Records
City Hall, Room 234
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102
via email

March 1, 2021

Petition under SF Administrative Code § 67.21(d)

Supervisor of Records Dennis Herrera,

Please determine in writing that the following records or parts thereof requested December 7, 2019 via 84166-59035583@requests.muckrock.com are public and order City Hall Building Management to disclose them:

Request attached.

The City failed to comply, refused to comply, or incompletely complied because:

1. The City has not in over 1 year ever replied to the request

Sincerely,

Anonymous
March 1, 2021

This is a follow up to request number P013417-090620:

See attached petition.

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 101873-82886409@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:
Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 101873
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.

---

On Sept. 21, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request #P013417-090620
SOTF:

FILE 19112

Because this is not an original hearing on the complaint of SOTF 19112 with a 5-business-day document rule, I will ask the SOTF to consider Lt. Cox's reply to the SOTF, and also SFPD's response to me. They are both attached and also linked to below, and I request that SOTF/Clerk make these documents available to the members of the Compliance committee at tomorrow's hearing, if they will allow it.
Sincerely,
Anonymous

---

On Sept. 21, 2020:
Subject: RE: SOTF File No. 19112 (Clarification)
Good morning,

Please see the attached letter.
Regards,

Lt. R. Andrew Cox #287
San Francisco Police Department
Legal Division-Office of Risk Management
1245 3rd St. San Francisco, CA 94158

---

On Sept. 17, 2020:
Subject: Public Records Request :: P014086-091620
Attachments:
P14086-__2020.09.17_sfpd_response.pdf
https://u8387795.ct.sendgrid.net/ls/click?upn=nZGH0ylxadMp5hTnPkeAFs2KguIDF883TvKUjL5Czaauo89OcQL1XvHpyaO
EmJgdhTktxCQo3dAEL3UN6Iwpbl0IeHwAsG1hipJN4KjQAiGIAQyJDw9hg7-2BqnmU
2BATPWa9alqvyXZc4wXOSXbEpA6jZUGa-2FdeirAwDuVSpmA4HSQE9UWoBj55Y86i0EZnUY7qsFjrT
-2Fmc0EtNT7S8JxqlCtlSHiVMvTgdsGAtw9LO-3DE9YP_vQrb2Qj-2Bka-2FFhj7yyvZ7xz8rCaGgLzf9s6wQsoCLQ
-2BxLMftyK-cFBmleXzd3WGkx-2BvshQHjJ-2BMvuaBNCs0P58ltFnWVBTs020z2Xe-2BpT5
-2BAzeEVMvTz2pOMqoaGQwmz47IAOL-2BVDh3YVmhQTCYkb01ac6x0UUPEoKtqpaCctL1
-2Bks2RvxYyV6fnvzbCry4isv8-2BdyD0ijm1Rnw9sNxmQm0t0sNPF6c3XOv4jke8eTEj6Ghibi1QjIpdp9B2cQqmaviEdz
-2Bs-2FceYafNbfUlyddogw5nPUIA8Z8DNN-2Bc91hUr6XcvTrvnc2jCxooQAlTnVE-2B8gUpUvGig
-2Fdlk0Pkd5eKeY6fDzQFAnMNmVFx5039wJbf-2F3q5SC4GFNZwMON4HuPxAyEtKEw-3D-3D)
P14086-__responsive.pdf
https://u8387795.ct.sendgrid.net/ls/click?upn=nZGH0ylxadMp5hTnPkeAFs2KguIDF883TvKUjL5Czaauo89OcQL1XvHpyaO
EmJgdhTktxCQo3dAEL3UN6Iwpbl0IeHwAsG1hipJN4KjQAiGIAQyJDw9hg7-2BqnmU
2BATPWa9alqvyXZc4wXOSXbEpA6jZUGa-2FdeirAwDuVSpmA4HHRd87xG5UERwV92
-2F4x1A0yo2uZgCKB82RCWrbplHscgg9AkFXXorl0ZKMdtFg350-3Dxt6n_vQrb2Qj-2Bka
-2FFhj7yyvZ7xz8rCaGgLzf9s6wQsoCLQ-2BxLMftyK-cFBmleXzd3WGkx-2BvshQHjJ
-2BMvuaBNCs0P58ftnWvBTs020z2Xe-2BpT5-2BAzeEvMvTz2pOMqoaGQwmz47IAOL
-2BVDh3YvMHqTCykb01aic6x0UUPeOKtqpaCctL1-2Bks2RvxYyV6fnvzbCry4isv8-2BdyDoijm1Rnw9sNxmQm0t0sNPF6c3XOv4jke8eTEj6Ghibi1QjIpdp9B2cQqmaviEdz
--- Please respond above this line ---

September 17, 2020 Via email 101873-82886409@requests.muckrock.com
Anonymous
Anonymous
MuckRock News DEPT MR 101873 411A Highland Ave
Dear Anonymous Anonymous:

In response to your request, please see attached documents.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,
Lieutenant R. Andrew Cox #287
Officer in Charge
Risk Management - Legal Division

To monitor the progress or update this request please log into the SFPD Public Records Center.

---

On Sept. 17, 2020:

Subject: Public Records Request :: P014077-091620

Attachments:

P14077_-__2020.09.17_sfpd_response.pdf

P14077_-_responsive_1.pdf

P14077_-_responsive_2.pdf

This is an auto-generated email and has originated from an unmonitored email account. Please DO NOT REPLY.

---

22nd Annual SOR Report
APPENDIX - Page 1214
September 17, 2020
Via email 101873-82886409@requests.muckrock.com
Anonymous
MuckRock News DEPT MR 101873 411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144
RE: Public Records Request, dated September 16, 2020, Reference # P014077-091620

Dear Anonymous:

In response to your request, please see attached documents.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,

Lieutenant R. Andrew Cox #287
Officer in Charge
Risk Management - Legal Division

To monitor the progress or update this request please log into the SFPD Public Records Center.
(https://u8387795.ct.sendgrid.net/ls/click?upn=nZGH0ylxadMp5hTpNkeAFs2KguIDF883TvKUiL5zauo89OcQLXvHpyaO
EmJgddHzlonDPze8o-2F99A9uUu21n1KQdpHjuPraragcl6i0-2FADzeh66hJeWEP4QvuesLaq3bj_vQrbQj2-2Bka-2FhjFedv7y7xz8BrCaGgLlzF9S6wWQSoCLQ-2BxLMftyK-2FbmIeXDz2WGkx-2BvhshQHjJ-2BMvuoaBNc50pHMmuxlacrQ0FNYG618rir4I4kcdl879T8S55s2uljQddbxvMm9vJfRbFnK2RXgdXyN0H-2F09fxKCgKcOf-2FVfy4-2BjlTaR-2BZWZfu35W1w9wXKddl3dak-2BSz4Nlx7Gy1fOBGj3AWW91IXG3Gs8fIEGqzPckChr9yCpqQtr05tfA0Dk8whhR4YhgiLCYgm2ITyunU-2BS1UEWnU7Dy1PAMCh0-2F55L57hi0Cza9VjjsXMexzuWeTWEMGLflfAzdfIk KyzoX9v7bMsdb-2BqS6bthRQmtgpYnaWGeuDO99qWorSlI476c7s-2FgbPhb950vT3Fic5SpkQ3-3D-3D)

This is an auto-generated email and has originated from an unmonitored email account. Please DO NOT REPLY.
---

On Sept. 17, 2020:
Subject: Public Records Request :: P014077-091620
Attachments:
P14077___-2020.09.17_sfpd_response.pdf

(https://u8387795.ct.sendgrid.net/ls/click?upn=nZGH0ylxadMp5hTpNkeAFs2KguIDF883TvKUiL5zauo89OcQLXvHpyaO
EmJgddHzlonDPze8o-2F99A9uUu21n1KQdpHjuPraragcl6i0-2FADzeh66hJeWEP4QvuesLaq3bj_vQrbQj2-2Bka-2FhjFedv7y7xz8BrCaGgLlzF9S6wWQSoCLQ-2BxLMftyK-2FbmIeXDz2WGkx-2BvhshQHjJ-2BMvuoaBNc50pHMmuxlacrQ0FNYG618rir4I4kcdl879T8S55s2uljQddbxvMm9vJfRbFnK2RXgdXyN0H-2F09fxKCgKcOf-2FVfy4-2BjlTaR-2BZWZfu35W1w9wXKddl3dak-2BSz4Nlx7Gy1fOBGj3AWW91IXG3Gs8fIEGqzPckChr9yCpqQtr05tfA0Dk8whhR4YhgiLCYgm2ITyunU-2BS1UEWnU7Dy1PAMCh0-2F55L57hi0Cza9VjjsXMexzuWeTWEMGLflfAzdfIk KyzoX9v7bMsdb-2BqS6bthRQmtgpYnaWGeuDO99qWorSlI476c7s-2FgbPhb950vT3Fic5SpkQ3-3D-3D)

This is an auto-generated email and has originated from an unmonitored email account. Please DO NOT REPLY. 
---
September 17, 2020 Via email 101873-82886409@requests.muckrock.com
Anonymous Anonymous
MuckRock News DEPT MR 101873 411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144
RE: Public Records Request, dated September 16, 2020, Reference # P014077-091620

Dear Anonymous Anonymous:
In response to your request, please see attached documents.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,
Lieutenant R. Andrew Cox #287
Officer in Charge
Risk Management – Legal Division

To monitor the progress or update this request please log into the SFPD Public Records Center.

September 17, 2020 Via email 101873-82886409@requests.muckrock.com
Anonymous Anonymous
MuckRock News DEPT MR 101873 411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144
RE: Public Records Request, dated September 16, 2020, Reference # P014077-091620

Dear Anonymous Anonymous:
In response to your request, please see attached documents.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,
Lieutenant R. Andrew Cox #287
Officer in Charge
Risk Management – Legal Division

To monitor the progress or update this request please log into the SFPD Public Records Center.

--- Please respond above this line ---

On Sept. 4, 2020:
Subject: California Public Records Act Request: Calendars and Meetings, Round 2 - Immediate Disclosure Request
SFPD and Lt. Cox,

On Sept. 2, 2020, in SOTF 19112 Anonymous v. Scott, et al., SOTF found a violation by SFPD of, inter alia, SFAC 67.26 for

This is an auto-generated email and has originated from an unmonitored email account. Please DO NOT reply.

---
citing Prop G for withholding non-Prop G calendars. Lt. Cox also appeared to state that SFPD had changed its own position re: disclosure policies of calendars to properly disclose future and non-Prop G calendars, notwithstanding the position of the City Attorney’s office.

Therefore, this is an immediate disclosure request for all calendars/schedule records (with all meeting details in Outlook or anywhere else, including all attachments and metadata) for Chief William Scott (both Prop G and non-Prop G) for (a) Oct 1 through Oct 14, 2020 as the schedule exists at this time and (b) Aug 24-Sep 1, 2020 (all dates inclusive). Pursuant to SFAC 67.21(l) and SOTF 19047, please provide the records in PDF format *without* printing and scanning.

Also, you mentioned that you had created a specific email address for records requests - could you please indicate what that email is? I am aware of sfpdlegal@sfgov.org and sfpdmediarelations@sfgov.org. (There are various, independent, anonymous requesters who use MuckRock - so I cannot control what the other users do, but I am happy to request MuckRock use a different email address for SFPD if it will work better.)

Please provide only those copies of records available without any fees. If you determine certain records would require fees, please instead provide the required notice of which of those records are available and non-exempt for inspection in-person if we so choose.

I look forward to your immediate disclosure.

NOTE: THE EMAIL ADDRESS SENDING THIS REQUEST IS A PUBLICLY-VIEWABLE MAILBOX. Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 101873-82886409@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly: 
https://accounts.muckrock.com/accounts/login/?next=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.muckrock.com%2Faccounts%2Flogin%2F%3Fnext%3D%252Faccounts%252Fagency_login%252Fsan-francisco-police-department-367%252Fcalendars-and-meetings-round-2-immediate-disclosure-request-101873%252F%253FeMail%253Dsupervisor.records%2540sfcityatty.org&url_auth_token=AAAlho6-kUH0n-qo3T6PAL_wX5Q%3A1lGj6L3AgQlIWEsBusS72GjoiMx5v0u4ZrKA
Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 101873
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the
requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.
September 21, 2020

Sunshine Ordinance Task Force
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Re: File No.19112

Dear Sunshine Task Force Committee Members,

I am writing to clarify my responses made during the SOTF Hearing on September, 2, 2020, File No. 19112: Complaint filed by Anonymous against Chief William Scott and Lt. R. Andrew Cox and the Police Department. Specifically, I was asked by the committee if SFPD would release future Prop. G calendars upon request and I answered yes. I apologize for causing confusion. When I provided that answer, I did not mean to infer that SFPD would waive any rights to exempt Prop. G calendars in whole or any portion thereof if warranted. We continue to apply exemptions and exceptions to the Chief’s future calendar entries that have not yet occurred under Cal. Gov’t Code § 6254(f); Cal. Gov’t Code § 6254(k); Cal. Evid. Code. § 1040; Times Mirror Company v. Superior Court, 53 Cal.3d 1325 (1991).

Chief Scott is the head Law Enforcement Official for the City and County of San Francisco, which carries a higher risk to his personal safety. His job presents unique security risks that requires unique security procedures and protocols to ensure his safety. Releasing information from his calendar reveals the timing and details of his whereabouts as well as the patterns and habits of the Chief of Police. While we are cautious to release his calendar at all under the laws cited above, we have done so after a careful review of events that have occurred in the past and redact information according to the cites listed above. However, this careful review may only be done by looking back at events that have already occurred. Releasing future calendar entries presents a new set of security issues.

Releasing future calendar entries inherently increases the risk to his security. This would seriously impair the ability of the Department to assure his personal safety and it would constitute a potential threat to his safety because this information would enable a reader to know in advance and with relative precision when and where the Chief may be found, the timing of his departures and arrivals from events or locations. In addition, the reader would know the persons who will be with him, and when he will be alone. We have redacted past Prop. G calendars entries under Cal. Govt Code section 6254(f) Cal. Govt Code § 6254(k); Cal. Evid. Code. § 1040; Times Mirror Company v. Superior Court, 53 Cal.3d 1325 (1991).SFPD has never produced future Prop. G calendars in the past.

In retrospect, I understand that I answered the question poorly and I should have elaborated on our position. I sincerely apologize for any confusion and did not mean to mislead the committee and/or Anonymous. My statement to the committee was of my own volition and should not reflect any misconduct by Chief Scott or the SFPD.

Sincerely,

Lt. R. Andrew Cox #287
Officer in Charge
Risk Management - Legal Division
Anonymous

Attn. General Government Team
Supervisor of Records
City Hall, Room 234
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102
via email

March 1, 2021

Petition under SF Administrative Code § 67.21(d)

Supervisor of Records Dennis Herrera,

Please determine in writing that the following records or parts thereof requested September 6, 2020 reference P013417-090620 are public and order Chief Scott and SFPD to disclose them:

Therefore, this is an immediate disclosure request for all calendars/schedule records (with all meeting details in Outlook or anywhere else, including all attachments and metadata) for Chief William Scott (both Prop G and non-Prop G) for (a) Oct 1 through Oct 14, 2020 as the schedule exists at this time and (b) Aug 24-Sep 1, 2020 (all dates inclusive). Pursuant to SFAC 67.21(l) and SOTF 19047, please provide the records in PDF format *without* printing and scanning.

The City failed to comply, refused to comply, or incompletely complied because:

1. SFPD initially declined to provide any records for (a), but has now conceded in a separate request that at least some portion of Chief Scott’s future calendars are disclosable. See also SOTF Order 19112.
Anonymous

Petition under SF Administrative Code § 67.21(d)

Sincerely,

Anonymous
Buta, Odaya (CAT)

From: 86781-10951840@requests.muckrock.com on behalf of '86781-10951840@requests.muckrock.com' <86781-10951840@requests.muckrock.com>
Sent: Monday, March 1, 2021 7:44 AM
To: Supervisor Records (CAT)
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Index to Records - SOTF 20015 - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF City Admin)
Attachments: petition_20210301_ADM_b.pdf

Office of the City Administrator  
PRA Office  
Room 362  
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, CA 94102

March 1, 2021

This is a follow up to a previous request:

See attached petition.

Filed via MuckRock.com  
E-mail (Preferred): 86781-10951840@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:  
https://accounts.muckrock.com/accounts/login/?next=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.muckrock.com%2Faccounts%2Flogin%2F%3Fnext%3D%253D252Fagency_login%252Fsan-fransisco-311-18636%252Findex-to-records-sotf-20015-immediate-disclosure-request-sf-city-admin-86781%252F252Femail%252Dsupervisor.records%252540sfcityatty.org&url_auth_token=AABkDcrkc2hpnhG1e4bE80_Zx1c%3A1Gkhq%3AK48wq5dplukwKsQcg62HlvNg

Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):  
MuckRock News  
DEPT MR 86781  
411A Highland Ave  
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.

---

On Aug. 18, 2020:  
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Index to Records - SOTF 20015 - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF City Admin)
Dear Requestor,
We have received your request. We are currently processing our response.

Please note that city workers are naturally working under unusual and difficult conditions with many called in for emergency service as disaster relief workers, or otherwise prioritizing work on the public health emergency, and with many working remotely, sometimes while also providing care for children or other family members. This impacts the City’s ability to respond to records requests, particularly in gathering documents when working from a remote location. These issues are noted in the Mayor’s emergency orders (attached) which, among other things, have suspended certain provisions of the Sunshine Ordinance, including immediate disclosure requests and the 10-day period in which to provide or withhold documents.

Pursuant to these orders, we are responding to notify you that the City Administrator’s Office is in receipt of your requests. Furthermore, we will endeavor to disclose responsive documents pursuant to the California Public Records Act as soon as possible.

Thank you,

Office of the City Administrator

---

On June 10, 2020:
Subject: Automatic reply: California Public Records Act Request: Index to Records - SOTF 20015 - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF City Admin)
Thank you for contacting the Office of the City Administrator.

For general inquiries, please contact: city.administrator@sfgov.org.

For media inquiries, please contact: Bill.barnes@sfgov.org.

If this is regarding marriage certificates or City ID program, please contact:

county.clerk@sfgov.org.

Due to the large number of email this office receives, for all other requests, please allow at least three business days for a response.

Office of the City Administrator

San Francisco City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 362
San Francisco, CA 94102
415-554-4852 (Main)
415-554-4849 (Fax)
city.administrator@sfgov.org
---
On Feb. 27, 2020:
Subject: Automatic reply: California Public Records Act Request: Index to Records - SOTF 20015 - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF City Admin)
Thank you for contacting the Office of the City Administrator.

For general inquiries, please contact: city.administrator@sfgov.org.

For media inquiries, please contact: Bill.barnes@sfgov.org.

If this is regarding marriage certificates or City ID program, please contact:

county.clerk@sfgov.org.

Due to the large number of email this office receives, for all other requests, please allow at least three business days for a response.

Office of the City Administrator
San Francisco City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 362
San Francisco, CA 94102
415-554-4852 (Main)
415-554-4849 (Fax)
city.administrator@sfgov.org

---

On Jan. 28, 2020:
Subject: Automatic reply: California Public Records Act Request: Index to Records - SOTF 20015 - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF City Admin)
Thank you for contacting the Office of the City Administrator.

For general inquiries, please contact: city.administrator@sfgov.org.

For media inquiries, please contact: Bill.barnes@sfgov.org.

If this is regarding marriage certificates or City ID program, please contact:

county.clerk@sfgov.org.

Due to the large number of email this office receives, for all other requests, please allow at least three business days for a response.

Office of the City Administrator
San Francisco City Hall
On Jan. 28, 2020:

Subject: California Public Records Act Request: Index to Records - SOTF 20015 - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF City Admin)

RE: Index to Records - SOTF 20015 - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF City Admin)

City Administrator Kelly and Office of the City Administrator,

Below are Immediate Disclosure Requests (SF Admin Code 67.25(a)) directed to City Administrator Kelly and Office of the City Administrator. Your response is required by Jan 29, 2020. Rolling records responses are requested (SFAC 67.25(d)) if you are unable to immediately produce records. Exact copies (not URLs) of every responsive record are requested (Gov Code 6253(b)) - do not or print and scan electronic records or provide black and white versions of any color record - use full-fidelity PDFs. Provide only copies of records not requiring fees and in-person inspection of all other records (GC 6253).

Your non-exhaustive obligations: All withholding of any information must be justified (SFAC 67.27). All withholdings by masking or deletion (aka redactions) must be keyed by footnote or other clear reference to justification and only the minimal exempt portion of a record may be withheld (SFAC 67.26). Respond to emailed requests (SFAC 67.21(b)). You must notify us of whether or not responsive records exist and/or were withheld for each below request (Gov Code 6253(c), 6255(b)). You must state the name and title of each person responsible for withholding any information (Gov Code 6253(d)). You must do all of this in your response, and you cannot wait until we file complaints.

****** We have no duty to, and we will not again, remind the City of its obligations. Instead, we will file complaints for every Sunshine Ordinance or CPRA violation. We will continue to file complaints until your procedures are modified to fully comply with the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA, without caveat or exception. ******

1. an exact copy (not a URL) of the entire index to records you are responsible for maintaining pursuant to SFAC 67.29

Background:
See SOTF Complaint 20015, attached.

NOTE: Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. The email address sending this request is a publicly-viewable mailbox. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,
Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 86781-10951840@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:
%3Fnext%3D%252FAgency_login%252Fsan-fransisco-311-18636%252Findex-to-records-sotf-20015-immediate-disclosure-request-sf-city-admin-86781%252F%253Femail%253Dsupervisor.records%2540sfcityatty.org&url_auth_token=AABkDcrkc2hpnhG1e4bE80_Zx1c%3A1GIkhq%3AK48wqC5dplukwWK5QcG6ZHlvNg
Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 86781
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester’s name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.
Anonymous

Attn. General Government Team
Supervisor of Records
City Hall, Room 234
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102
via email

March 1, 2021

Petition under SF Administrative Code § 67.21(d)

Supervisor of Records Dennis Herrera,

Please determine in writing that the following records or parts thereof requested Jan 28, 2020 via 86781-10951840@requests.muckrock.com are public and order City Administrator to disclose them:

- an exact copy (not a URL) of the entire index to records you are responsible for maintaining pursuant to SFAC 67.29

The City failed to comply, refused to comply, or incompletely complied because:

1. No response.

Sincerely,

Anonymous
March 2, 2021

This is a follow up to a previous request:

See attached distinct 67.21(D) petition about Kelly-Breed messages.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 94992
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.

---

On Feb. 23, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Inter-Agency Text Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF PUC)
Mr. Carlin and SFPUC:
This is a NEW immediate disclosure request for all communications between Harlan Kelly Jr. and Walter Wong in the possession of the PUC for dates (a) BEFORE Jan 1, 2015, and also (b) ON OR AFTER June 11, 2020. These were not responsive to my request on June 11. I'm not arguing PUC has to go talk to Kelly now as a former employee (for this request) - but if you (i.e. PUC, or any of its current employees) have anywhere in your computer systems or in hardcopy any copies (including the black hiliter but unredacted file) of responsive records - you must provide them to me. I know that your agency still possesses at least some of these records both based on the black hiliter file and also based on your admission in the recent letter to me (https://cdn.muckrock.com/foia_files/2021/02/22/2-22-21_Letter_re_Harlan_Kelly_texts.pdf).

Thanks,
Anonymous

---

On Feb. 22, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Inter-Agency Text Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF PUC)
Thank you. We do not concede that any of the still withheld information is in fact lawfully withheld. Analysis and corroboration continue. You will see petitions shortly.

I also enjoyed the part of your letter that speaks on behalf of the entire City's procedures re: personally-held public records - I assume it was dictated by Herrera. Funny stuff.

--Anonymous

---

On Feb. 22, 2021:
Subject: Muckrock June 11, 2020 Request Supplement
Dear Requester,

Please find attached a letter from the SFPUC's Acting General Manager Michael Carlin.

Best Regards,
SFPUC Public Records

---

On Feb. 15, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Inter-Agency Text Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF PUC)
Ms. Leger - This appears to be a duplicate of complaint 20084 filed in July 2020 when Harlan was still a city employee. I'll stick with the older file number 20084....

---

On Feb. 15, 2021:
Subject: SOTF - Complaint Filed with the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force - File No. 20127
Good Afternoon:

Harlan Kelly and the Public Utilities Commission have been named as Respondents in the attached complaint filed with the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force. Please respond to the attached complaint/request within five business days.

The Respondent is required to submit a written response to the allegations including any and all supporting documents, recordings, electronic media, etc., to the Task Force within five (5) business days of receipt of this notice. This is your opportunity to provide a full explanation to allow the Task Force to be fully informed in considering your response prior to its meeting.
Please include the following information in your response if applicable:

1. List all relevant records with descriptions that have been provided pursuant to the Complainant request.
2. Date the relevant records were provided to the Complainant.
3. Description of the method used, along with any relevant search terms used, to search for the relevant records.
4. Statement/declaration that all relevant documents have been provided, does not exist, or has been excluded.
5. Copy of the original request for records (if applicable).

Please refer to the File Number when submitting any new information and/or supporting documents pertaining to this complaint.

The Complainant alleges:

Complaint Attached.

Cheryl Leger
Assistant Clerk, Board of Supervisors
Tel: 415-554-7724


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.

---

On June 11, 2020:

Below are new Immediate Disclosure Requests (SF Admin Code 67.25(a)) directed to your agency and its department head. Your response is required by June 12, 2020. Rolling records responses are requested (SFAC 67.25(d)) if you are unable to immediately produce records. Exact copies of every responsive record are requested (Gov Code 6253(b)) - do not: provide mere URLs, print and scan electronic records, convert native files to PDFs, or provide black and white versions of any color images. Provide only copies of records not requiring fees and in-person inspection of all other records (GC 6253).

1. All text, email, or chat messages (including group messages, in any form or application including but not limited to SMS, MMS, WhatsApp, WeChat, Signal, Instagram, Twitter, Facebook, Hangouts, Skype, Teams) sent or received
to/cc/bcc/from between Harlan Kelly Jr. and London Breed, on government or personal accounts from Jan 1, 2015 and present (you must search personal accounts pursuant to City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017))

2. All text, email, or chat messages (including group messages, in any form or application including but not limited to SMS, MMS, WhatsApp, WeChat, Signal, Instagram, Twitter, Facebook, Hangouts, Skype, Teams) sent or received to/cc/bcc/from between Harlan Kelly Jr. and Walter Wong/Jaidin Consulting Group/Jaidin Associates (including but not limited to jaidin@pacbell.net, jdngrp@pacbell.net, or any email address ending with jaidin.net ), on government or personal accounts from Jan 1, 2015 and present (you must search personal accounts pursuant to City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017))

3. All text, email, or chat messages (including group messages, in any form or application including but not limited to SMS, MMS, WhatsApp, WeChat, Signal, Instagram, Twitter, Facebook, Hangouts, Skype, Teams) sent or received to/cc/bcc/from between Harlan Kelly Jr. and Mohammed Nuru, on government or personal accounts from Jan 1, 2015 and present (you must search personal accounts pursuant to City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017))

4. All text, email, or chat messages (including group messages, in any form or application including but not limited to SMS, MMS, WhatsApp, WeChat, Signal, Instagram, Twitter, Facebook, Hangouts, Skype, Teams) sent or received to/cc/bcc/from between Harlan Kelly Jr. and Naomi Kelly, on government or personal accounts from Jan 1, 2020 and present (you must search personal accounts pursuant to City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017))

For text messages: While the phone numbers are not needed, the following must be preserved: the timestamps, the textual content, attachments, and images, and also ALL sender and recipient names (including groups). Pursuant to SF Admin Code 67.21(l), which requires you to use any electronic format that we request, please provide the records in spreadsheet format. For an example of the format of the response, see SFPD Chief Scott's prior response here: https://cdn.muckrock.com/foia_files/2020/04/14/Text_Messages_Breed_Scott_Redacted.pdf and clearly referenced redaction justifications here: https://cdn.muckrock.com/foia_files/2020/04/14/ChiefOfficeResponse201.pdf (though I do not concede all of them are appropriate redactions). Please provide rolling responses, starting with the most recent records going backwards. Messages to/from before your current department head became the department head must still be provided.

Do not destroy or discard any responsive records - we will appeal all withholdings or Sunshine violations. Remember Mr. Kelly has an obligation to maintain in a professional and businesslike manner their correspondence and release them as public records (SF Admin Code 67.27-9(a)); and we will cross-check your responses with all other parties to ensure you have not destroyed or withheld records improperly.

Your non-exhaustive obligations:
- All withholding of any information must be justified in writing (SFAC 67.27).
- All withholdings by masking or deletion (aka redactions) must be keyed by footnote or other clear reference to the specific justification for that redaction, and only the minimal exempt portion of any record may be withheld (SFAC 67.26).
- You must respond to emailed requests (SFAC 67.21(b)).
- You must notify us of whether or not responsive records exist and/or were withheld for each below request (Gov Code 6253(c), 6255(b)).
- You must state the name and title of each person responsible for withholding any information (Gov Code 6253(d)).
- Do not impose any end-user restrictions upon me (Santa Clara Co. vs Superior Ct, 170 Cal.App 4th 1301); so if you use a third-party website like NextRequest to publish records, please make them completely public without any login or sign-in.

Your agency must do all of the above things in your response, and you cannot wait until we file complaints.
****** We have no duty to, and we will not again, remind the City of its obligations. Instead, we will file complaints for every Sunshine Ordinance or CPRA violation. We will continue to file complaints until the City's procedures are modified to fully comply with the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA, without caveat or exception. ******

Thank you for your anticipated cooperation in this matter.

NOTE: Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. The email address sending this request is a publicly-viewable mailbox. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,
Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 94992-15550486@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly: https://accounts.muckrock.com/accounts/login/?next=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.muckrock.com%2Faccounts%2Flogind%2F%3Fnext%3D%2F%252Faccounts%2Fagency%252F%2Fpublic-utilities-commissions-4834%252Finter-agency-text-messages-immediately-disclosure-request-sf-puc-94992%252F%2525%2Femail%252D%252Dsupervisor.records%2525%2F252540sfcityatty.org%252Furl_auth_token=AABcOvgcKY8Kp2249Biuij8P%252FPBY%2523A1I8h8rd%3AwFVetIwnUv05Sez09t6lMWIS3oc

Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 94992
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.
Anonymous

Attn. General Government Team
Supervisor of Records
City Hall, Room 234
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102
via email

March 2, 2021

New Petition under SF Administrative Code § 67.21(d)

Supervisor of Records Dennis Herrera,

Please determine in writing that the records marked as “1” below or parts thereof (request 2 is not petitioned here, but has been petitioned in prior petitions) requested June 11, 2020 via 94992-15550486@requests.muckrock.com are public and order Public Utilities Commission to disclose them:

1. All text, email, or chat messages (including group messages, in any form or application including but not limited to SMS, MMS, WhatsApp, WeChat, Signal, Instagram, Twitter, Facebook, Hangouts, Skype, Teams) sent or received to/cc/bcc/from between Harlan Kelly Jr. and London Breed, on government or personal accounts from Jan 1, 2015 and present (you must search personal accounts pursuant to City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017))

2. All text, email, or chat messages (including group messages, in any form or application including but not limited to SMS, MMS, WhatsApp, WeChat, Signal, Instagram, Twitter, Facebook, Hangouts, Skype, Teams) sent or received to/cc/bcc/from between Harlan Kelly Jr. and Walter Wong/Jaidin Consulting Group/Jaidin Associates (including but not limited to jaidin@pacbell.net, jdngrp@pacbell.net, or any email address ending with jaidin.net), on government or personal accounts from Jan 1, 2015 and present (you must search personal accounts pursuant to City
of San Jose v Superior Court (2017))

...

For text messages: While the phone numbers are not needed, the following must be preserved: the timestamps, the textual content, attachments, and images, and also ALL sender and recipient names (including groups).

PUC provided on July 6, 2020 certain records responsive to request “1” above in Exhibit B. PUC redacted a majority of the messages. It is presumed that Harlan Kelly Jr. personally performed the redactions based on Exhibit A – a letter issued by PUC to me recently, purportedly in cooperation with your office, with regards to request “2.” Given that both parties Kelly and Breed are high-ranking City officials, their conversations must be presumed to be about the conduct of public business and not purely personal.

Harlan Kelly, Jr. was at the time of the request and response an employee of PUC and thus of the City; as the City Attorney’s memo regarding City of San Jose v Superior Court notes, the City is legally responsible for the judgment and actions of its employees, including production of records.

As now accepted by PUC in Exhibit A, PUC previously unlawfully redacted certain Harlan Kelly – Walter Wong text messages in request “2”. There is no reason to believe that the July 6 records provided in “1” were lawfully redacted. Each text message must be reviewed, and a determination made by you whether each is public. PUC’s supposed standard practices and Herrera’s supposedly long-standing advice as described in Exhibit A is not a defense to violations of the Public Records Act or Sunshine Ordinance.

All records in the constructive possession of the City at the time of my request must be produced. PUC’s failure to retain and preserve all respon-
sive records at the time of my request does not mean that you can refuse to make a determination when I allege that the response is incomplete.

Sincerely,

Anonymous
February 22, 2021

Muckrock Anonymous Requester
94992-15550486@requests.muckrock.com

Dear Requester:

We write to supplement our response to your June 11, 2020 request for communications contained in personal or government accounts of former San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (“SFPUC”) General Manager Harlan Kelly, Jr. As you know, the SFPUC provided responsive records to you on July 2 and July 6, 2020, including a document showing numerous text messages between Mr. Kelly and Walter Wong on Mr. Kelly’s personal cell phone. In that document, which the SFPUC produced in Bates-stamped pages 161 to 219, Mr. Kelly redacted a significant number of text messages. As explained below, in light of the unique and extraordinary circumstances surrounding these records, the City Attorney, working with the SFPUC, has recently reviewed an unredacted draft of the document containing those text messages in the City’s possession. Following that review, we are now providing you with a new version of the document. We have redacted certain portions of the text messages that do not contain information relating to the conduct of the public’s business and therefore do not constitute public records responsive to your request (see Cal. Gov’t Code § 6252(e); City of San Jose v. Superior Court, 2 Cal.5th 608 (2017) (San Jose)), would constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy (Cal. Const. Art. I, Sec. 1; Cal. Gov’t Code § 6254(c)), or would disclose confidential personnel information (Cal. Gov’t Code § 6254(c)).

Your request sought text messages, chats, and emails between Mr. Kelly and other individuals including Walter Wong “on government or personal accounts” during the period from January 1, 2015 through June 11, 2020. Under the California Supreme Court’s 2017 decision in San Jose, communications on City employees’ personal accounts or devices, including text messages on personal cell phones, may be public records subject to disclosure if those communications involve the conduct of the public’s business. As the City Attorney described in a public memorandum dated March 24, 2017, departments generally satisfy the legal duty under the Public Records Act to search for and produce public records on an employee’s personal electronic device by entrusting the employee to conduct the search and retrieve responsive records. That memorandum instructs that the department must notify the employee of the request and acquaint the employee with the standards for determining whether a writing on the device is a public record and responsive to the request. And should there be a court proceeding
concerning the request, the employee may be required to testify under oath or submit a statement under penalty of perjury, describing the search conducted on the device and explaining the types of writings on the device that were not provided to the requester because of not being responsive public records.

Consistent with the longstanding advice of the City Attorney’s Office as described in the March 24, 2017 memorandum, the SFPUC asked Mr. Kelly to conduct a search of his personal cell phone and email accounts and produce all responsive records related to City business. In response, Mr. Kelly provided a document (Bates-stamped pages 161-219) containing a series of text messages between himself and Mr. Wong beginning January 1, 2015. Mr. Kelly redacted a significant number of text messages in the document, asserting that the redacted communications between him and Mr. Wong did not relate to City business. Following the standard practice of City departments and the general guidance of the City Attorney’s Office, the SFPUC relied on Mr. Kelly to prepare the redactions, and did not ask to review the unredacted text messages before producing the document to you in response to your records request.

Mr. Kelly attempted to redact text messages in the document by covering those text messages with black rectangles. But this redaction method was insufficient; it did not completely redact the content that Mr. Kelly wanted to withhold. On July 7, 2020, after the SFPUC provided you with the document prepared by Mr. Kelly including redacted text messages, you informed us that Mr. Kelly had not properly redacted the text messages, so a member of the public could make the redacted text visible on a computer. You informed us that at least some of that information appeared to be sensitive personal information like a security code. We appreciate your letting us know. After receiving your email, the SFPUC asked you to destroy the original document in your possession and remove it from the internet. The SFPUC based this request on its understanding that the redacted text messages in the document did not relate to City business, relying on Mr. Kelly’s representation.

Subsequent events have caused the SFPUC to reconsider whether it is appropriate for it to review the text messages in their original, unredacted form. On June 24, 2020, approximately one week before the SFPUC responded to your initial request for records, the U.S. Attorney for the Northern District of California announced that he had charged Walter Wong with conspiring for over 15 years to defraud the public of its right to the honest services of City officials, including schemes involving bribery, kickbacks, and money laundering. On November 30, 2020, the U.S. Attorney’s Office announced that it had charged Mr. Kelly in a federal criminal complaint with honest services wire fraud. The complaint alleged that Mr. Kelly engaged in a long-running bribery scheme and corrupt partnership with Walter Wong, and that as part of the scheme, Mr. Wong provided items of value to Mr. Kelly in exchange for official acts by Mr. Kelly that benefited or attempted to benefit Mr. Wong’s business ventures. The U.S. Attorney alleged that Mr. Kelly and Mr. Wong had a longstanding relationship involving multiple international trips paid for or subsidized by Wong, cash exchanges, free meals, repairs to Mr. Kelly’s personal residence, and personal car services, all while Mr. Kelly tried to use his City position to benefit Mr. Wong and his businesses.
Although the criminal charges are still pending and have not been proven in a court of law, the complaint alleges that the entire course of Mr. Kelly’s personal relationship with Mr. Wong was entangled with City business because Mr. Wong allegedly gave Mr. Kelly personal favors and gifts in the hope of exchange for Mr. Kelly’s acts as the General Manager of the SFPUC. Given the seriousness of these criminal allegations and the compelling public interest in potential misconduct by government employees, certain text messages between Mr. Kelly and Mr. Wong that previously appeared to be purely personal, non-City business may now reasonably be understood as related to the conduct of the City’s business. In reaching this conclusion, we emphasize that Mr. Kelly, like any criminal defendant, is entitled to a presumption of innocence, and we do not suggest or imply anything to the contrary. But given the allegations in the criminal complaints against Mr. Kelly and Mr. Wong, the SFPUC deemed it prudent to review the unredacted text messages to determine whether they were clearly private or unrelated to City business. The redactions in the new version we are providing today redact only those matters that are clearly private or clearly unrelated to City business.

Two extraordinary factors, unlikely to recur, support this unorthodox approach. First, the SFPUC now has in its possession a copy of the full text exchange unredacted, such that the City is able to review the full text exchange. Second, the charges against Mr. Kelly and Mr. Wong allege that personal communications between the two men actually relate to City business and memorialize interactions and transactions related to Mr. Kelly’s exercise of duties as the SFPUC’s General Manager. The SFPUC’s decision to review the unredacted text messages is based on these unique circumstances and does not change the City’s usual protocols for responding to requests for communications on employees’ personal devices, as described in the City Attorney’s 2017 memorandum.

Accordingly, please find attached a new copy of the document provided by Mr. Kelly reflecting his communications with Mr. Wong between January 1, 2015 and June 11, 2020. As noted above, we have redacted several portions of the text exchange. We redacted those portions of the exchange the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy, such as discussions of family illnesses, children, and personal residential addresses or personal cell phone numbers, and a reference to a personnel matter on page 51 of the document. See Cal. Const., Art. I, § 1; Cal. Gov. Code § 6254(c),(k); S.F. Admin. Code § 67.1(g). We have also redacted the text message on page 1, dated January 1, 2015, because it does not contain information relating to the conduct of the public’s business and therefore is not a public record responsive to your request. See Cal. Gov’t Code § 6252(e). We have also excluded the portions of the first page that Mr. Kelly previously redacted because that portion of the text exchange occurred before January 1, 2015 and is not responsive to your June 11, 2020 request.

Best Regards,

Michael P. Carlin
Acting General Manager
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
EXHIBIT B

"MLB*.pdf" records published by SFPUC July 6, 2020 at:

https://sfpuc.sharefile.com/d-sfaf513caac747dcb

(Compressed for file size)
1/27/15, 5:07 PM

Spoke with the mayor. Can we touch base before the LAFCO meeting about CCA?

You have time for a quick lunch at noon tomorrow?
The mayor's press release?

When will rates be set?

Perfect

We will show a timeline in our presentation

1/30/15, 4:19 PM

I can probably meet you over there at 5:10

Great! Thank you

I am going to meet Barbara Smith regarding street light at 5.

At Plaza East

Ok

1/30/15, 5:25 PM

Can't make it over there. Sorry

No problem!
Hey London here is an update on Plaza East and Robert Pitts Plaza. We are contacting Barbara to find out if the landlord is replacing the lights on the building. We performed a night inspection and replaced all the lights with issues. We agreed to install two new street lights. We completed the engineering. Just planning now to install. And I texted Mohammed to ask him to prioritize pruning the trees.

Thanks a million.
Hey there. Saw u needed to reschedule our mtg today. We will find a new time to talk to you about Central Shops but wanted to follow up on CCA. We got the new rates from PGE, the power procurement costs, and changed the customer mix to be more commercial customers vs residential for phase 1. As a result it’s looking good and we will be able to launch. Item goes to our commission tomorrow for final approval. :)

3/9/16, 9:59 AM

Please join us to oppose AB1110. The bill has major problems. This bill will hurt cleanpowerSF build out and our Hetch hetchy system. We will brief Conner on the details.

9/8/16, 12:00 PM
Hey London, want to check in with you on the alameda creek EIR appeal that going to bos today. PUC briefed Michael on ur staff last week. There are several issues. Can you call me if you have questions or concerns once you speak with Michael?
10/8/18, 5:09 PM
I wanted to let you know that today one of PUCs customers in the Sunset posted on Next Door that she had bought an online testing kit and tested her water and it was positive for pesticides. She said residents should not drink their tap water. We have not been able to reach her directly and would need to test the water at the lab in order to substantiate her home kit which is not as thorough. Media has reached out to us and to Neighbors. We have sent staff out. I will keep you posted.

This is Harlan.

4/27/20, 9:49 PM
Hi Mayor,
The supplemental declaration you made as part of the COVID emergency that suspends water shutoffs, liens, and late fees expires on May 12. I am hoping you can extend that and also include a new residential customer relief program that we want to offer our customers that are financially impacted as a result of COVID. It would provide a 15 percent water and 35 percent wastewater discount on customers' bills that are facing financial hardship as a result of COVID. It would be great to have your leadership to announce this program and the extension of existing supplemental declaration.

Harlan
MLB, We have a deal. The moderate NGOs are not happy because so much was thrown at them at the last minute. Governor has been meeting with State Board members over the weekend. They are still working on narrative for next Wednesday. Will know more tomorrow.
Harlan

2/6/19, 12:13 PM
Just wanted to inform you Sophie reached out last night to me. She sounds very excited about serving on PUC commission. I think she would be great addition. Talked to Sean today. He mentioned trades would want their own person.
6/20/19, 8:19 AM
Hey Mayor, I know that we have a 6" main break around your house. We have a gatemain there to choked down the valve but not to turn off. This is so folk can have water in the morning to take showers. We also need to have running water in the pipes so we can detect the leak location. I'll keep you posted.

Would be helpful to post something on next-door to explain to people what's going on
311 should also post something

6/20/19, 10:14 AM
Got it. Will do ASAP.

6" cast iron main
135 years old
Installed 1884
Attached is a petition for the below request.

**NOTE:** 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

------- Original Message -------
On Wednesday, February 17th, 2021 at 6:36 PM, Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:

Given that none of you are turning over any records the next question is what ties each of you have to Mr. Kelly and what incentives you may have to protect him. This is the first in various sets of requests you will receive.

All requests below include City of San Jose v Superior Court searches of ALL accounts/servers/devices, regardless of whether they are owned by the City or not. Preserve all records until the final adjudication of all appeals. Justify every redaction or withholding to a specific legal citation in writing. We may appeal all withholdings of any information.

The "Former Officials" are Harlan Kelly Jr., Juliet Ellis, and Naomi Kelly. The "Financially Interested Parties" are defined as:

- Derived from FPPC filings: Jim Rally, SF Community Investment Fund, University of San Francisco, 2018 San Francisco Inaugural Fund, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, Drew School, Soha Engineers
- Others: Walter Wong, Florence Kong, W. Wong Construction Co. Inc.; Jaidin International Ventures, LLC; Jaidin Consulting Group, LLC; Sfl & W Partnership; Center Cafe; Construction Center, Inc.; Pacific Star Capital, LLC; Recology Inc. and its affiliates.

The "Subject Parties" are defined as: the Former Officials and the Financially Interested Parties.

**To Mr. Carlin ("You"):**
1a) This is an immediate disclosure request for all phone call logs (including metadata such as date/time/duration/direction (outgoing vs incoming) of call), phone call or meeting recordings, voicemails, emails, calendar invites, meeting entries, texts, chats, IMs, or communications in any physical or electronic form sent or received by you where any of the Subject Parties is any party in the
communication and another party is YOU, including after anyone left city employment. YOU MUST PRODUCE EXACT COPIES OF ALL ELECTRONIC RECORDS, preserving all hyperlinks, urls, To/From/Cc AND Bcc email addresses, images, participants in all conversations, timestamps, attachments, invitee lists, attendee statuses, and all other non-exempt parts of the record. See SOTF Orders 19044, 19047, 19097, 19098, and 19119. Consult Dept of Technology on how to produce exact electronic records. For records where the SOLE party other than YOU is either Harlan Kelly Jr. or Juliet Ellis (but not the others), this (1a) request is limited as follows: produce only records dated July 6, 2020 and later, and you can exclude email records if ALL email addresses on the email thread are solely sfgov.org or sfwater.org addresses.

1b) This is an immediate disclosure request for all payments, offers of pay, invoices, promissory notes, or evidence of indebtedness, regardless of whether the document is merely a draft and not executed or unpaid, where any party is one of the Subject Parties and another party is either YOU or any LLC, trust, partnership, unincorporated association, or corporation (whether or not for profit) that you have any financial interest in, or that has ever provided you with a W-2 or a 1099-MISC, or for which you are on the board - excluding publicly-traded corporations - without time limitation. You must produce records in your constructive possession, which includes records by your contractors which you have the legal or contractual right to access (see Community Youth Athletic Center v City of National City).

The City will soon receive additional requests to others for similar records. Each of requests 1a, 1b, and every other request you are about to receive must get a distinct determination under Gov Code 6253(c) of whether or not you have responsive records.

**NOTE:**
1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.
2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous
Anonymous

Attn. General Government Team
Supervisor of Records
City Hall, Room 234
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102
via email

March 2, 2021

New Petition under SF Administrative Code § 67.21(d)

Supervisor of Records Dennis Herrera,

Please determine in writing that the records requested below are public and order PUC to disclose them:

See request within email thread “Your Own Kelly Records - Immediate Disclosure Request - 1a,b”

The City has failed or refused to comply with the request because no response has occurred within 10 days, as required by Gov Code sec 6253(c).

Sincerely,

Anonymous
See attached petition.

**NOTE:** 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

------- Original Message -------
On Friday, February 12th, 2021 at 8:52 PM, Heckel, Hank (MYR) <hank.heckel@sfgov.org> wrote:

Anonymous,

On behalf of OWED, please see the attached texts of Mr. Torres responsive to your request below. Please note that certain material has been redacted because it constitutes the draft recommendation of the author of the document. See Admin Code 67.24(a)(1); Cal. Gov. Code 6254(a).

Regards,

Hank Heckel
Legal Compliance Officer
Office of the Mayor
City and County of San Francisco
From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 2, 2021 4:22 PM
To: Torres, Joaquin (ECN) <joaquin.torres@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: Immediate Disclosure Request - Mayor texts

Apologies - correction:

This is an immediate disclosure request for all text messages, chat messages, or instant messages of any kind or app between you and any member of the Office of the Mayor (including Mayor Breed), dated Dec 2, 2020 to present, in a rolling fashion.

NOTE: 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

------- Original Message -------
Mr. Torres:

This is an immediate disclosure request for all text messages, chat messages, or instant messages of any kind or app between you and any member of the Office of the Mayor (including Mayor Breed), dated Dec 2, 2021 to present, in a rolling fashion.

**NOTE:** 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous
iMessage
Mon, Jan 11, 7:49 AM

Good morning!
On small biz call this am - will miss check in.

Andrea Bruss
Tue, Sep 22, 6:01 PM

Just landed $2M for Right to Recover through Crankstart. Ronen has helped as well and she’s asking for update. Unless otherwise directed, I will share with her and ask her to hold on news so we can do collective announcement. This also addresses - heather knight article and forthcoming LatinX announcement.

Thu, Jan 14, 6:15 PM

Potential story re Uber and their “exploration” of subleasing space from one of their Mission Bay bldgs. It’s a sure thing. Not sure on timing of story. Sean - in addition to planned broader biz engagement - may be good to advance one on one MLB call w Dara.
Andres Power

We may exit state stay at home order before the end of January. Huge change. We will need to accelerate our work on reopening.

Natasha Mihal

Thanks for the news. We should put together a brief ppt on our proposed path forward so we can make sure we’re getting all agreement (not just Susan) after tomorrow’s meeting.
Good morning!
On small biz call this am - will miss check in.
Andres Power

Good morning Joaquin. We're looking to have a story run Tuesday morning to announce our small business relief plan. Could you please help get a few folks to provide quotes? Possible to get a black or Latino small business to say how critical this support is?

AP

Confirming story but not press release yet, correct? So I'm getting folks who will talk and/or provide quote to press?

Andres Power

Press release will go out after story runs Tuesday, which should be around 10am.

We don't need anyone to talk to press. I don't think. Let me confirm.
Just a quote. No need to speak to reporter.

Copy. Confirming: $50M 0% loan program; $12.5M grant program. Terms as presented.

Andres Power

Yes.

Draft Recommendation

Let me know when board engagement begins as I’ll expect calls … and … thank you!

Andres Power

We will do that starting tomorrow, after we do a final check in with mayor in the morning.
iMessage
Thursday 7:39 AM

Jeff Cretan
Matier wants to talk to you
Joaquin

Juan Carlos Cancino
Thx. Do you a number for him?

Jeff Cretan

Phil Matier
PM

JC
Anonymous

Attn. General Government Team
Supervisor of Records
City Hall, Room 234
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102
via email

March 2, 2021

New Petition under SF Administrative Code § 67.21(d)

Supervisor of Records Dennis Herrera,

Please determine in writing that the records requested on Feb 2, 2021 and described below are public and order OEWD and Joaquin Torres to disclose them:

This is an immediate disclosure request for all text messages, chat messages, or instant messages of any kind or app between you and any member of the Office of the Mayor (including Mayor Breed), dated Dec 2, 2021 to present, in a rolling fashion.

The City has incompletely complied with the request because the City has withheld attachments within the text messages. For example at least some portion of the contact card for Phil Matier in record “JQ 7” is public, and must be disclosed.

No different than in emails, text message attachments must be provided. The attachment is in fact retained within the text message electronically...
Anonymous

New Petition under SF Administrative Code § 67.21(d)

(its contents are not a hyperlink to other content).

Sincerely,

Anonymous
Buta, Odaya (CAT)

From: Anonymous Records Requester <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 4, 2021 4:27 PM
To: dpa.legalteam@sfgov.org; Supervisor Records (CAT)
Cc: SOTF, (BOS)
Subject: New 67.21(d) petition - SOTF 19144

Supervisor of Records Herrera,

In ongoing response to my Nov 28, 2019 request for SB 1421 records of the DPA, today DPA released text and image records in https://sfdpa.nextrequest.com/documents/6679688 but did not release the audio records in that complaint due to purported time and expense. Time and expense do not constitute a legal citation under Admin Code 67.27. Given that these records were already requested, their demand that I make a subsequent request just for audio records and examine a cost sheet is irrelevant and I refuse to do so. They can't charge me anything but the physical cost of media, which should be 0 on NextRequest.

No legal justification having been provided for the failure or refusal to release audio records in this case, please determine in writing that the audio records are public and order them disclosed.

NOTE: 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. I am not an attorney. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

Sent from ProtonMail Mobile
Buta, Odaya (CAT)

From: 84491-02900968@requests.muckrock.com
Sent: Thursday, March 4, 2021 5:07 PM
To: Supervisor Records (CAT)
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request #21-951

Department of Public Works
PRA Office
Room 348
1 Doctor Carlton B Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

March 4, 2021

This is a follow up to request number 21-951:

Supervisor of Records,

This is a 67.21(d) petition against DPW to determine in writing public and order disclosed the records withheld in request 21-951 under the citation "per the San Francisco Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code Article IV. ". First that is not a specific section of law, it is an entire article. Second, local law cannot exempt information that is disclosable under state law; local law can only increase transparency not decrease it. A state PRA exemption must be cited, and it is possible that none exists.

--Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 84491-02900968@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:
%3Fnext%3D%253D2Faccounts%252Fagency_login%252Fdepartment-of-public-works-4835%252Fcalendars-and-emails-
immediate-disclosure-request-sf-dpw-
84491%252F%253Femail%253Dsupervisor.records%252540sfcityatty.org&url_auth_token=AAA14tlgHc_LSy2NcHzvRK7
U34%3A1HyvJ%3Av61oltxGwDA5YmNymIaRsJIjjeuY

Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 84491
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.

---
On March 4, 2021:
Subject: Your City and County of San Francisco public records request #21-951 has been closed.
City and County of San Francisco

************************************************************************
Hi there

Record request #21-951 has been closed and published. The closure reason supplied was:

We have conducted a diligent search for records responsive to your request. We have located responsive records and are releasing them to you. If you have trouble accessing the files, we can burn the responsive records onto a CD at a rate of $1 per CD or load the responsive records onto a flash drive at a rate of $4 per flash drive. Fees for duplication are subject to change and postage is an additional cost.

If hard copies are needed, we can provide hard copies of any 8.5x11 documents that are made available to you at a cost of 10 cents per copy, as allowed by the San Francisco Administrative Code § 67.28(c). This section states “a fee not to exceed 10 cents per page may be charged.” Postage is an additional cost.

Please note that the Public Records Act requires an agency to make available to any person a copy of an “identifiable record or records” in its possession, unless the record is specifically exempt from disclosure. (Please see California Government Code § 6253(b).) The City’s obligation under the Sunshine Ordinance, like the Public Records Act, is to produce public records in its custody. (See San Francisco Administration Code § 67.20(b).) There is no requirement that a department or officer construct a document to meet the specifications of the request.

Please note that it is not necessary to create a NextRequest account to view responsive records. Once they have been released, a link, valid for 30 days, will be provided to view the records. Additionally, unless privacy concerns prevent it, Public Works makes all records requests visible to the public. You may search for requests at https://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/.

We have withheld records responsive to your request per the San Francisco Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code Article IV.

This concludes your public records request.

Regards,

David A. Steinberg
Custodian of Records
San Francisco Public Works

************************************************************************
Questions about your request? Reply to this email or sign in to contact staff at City and County of San Francisco. Technical support: See our help page

---

On March 4, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request #21-951
#21-951
If you produce records in HTML (NOT plain text) format (converted then to PDF) and produce all attachments and produce all email addresses in the To/From/Cc/Bcc and preserve all hyperlinks, formatting, and everything else in the HTML and have redacted and withheld nothing, then yes, producing records in HTML format converted to PDFs and with attachments associated with the email in a single folder (so I know which is which) is acceptable.

But if any of that is not the case in any particular record, an exact PDF copy will be necessary as described earlier.

---

On March 3, 2021:
Subject: [External Message Added] City and County of San Francisco public records request #21-951
City and County of San Francisco

************************************************************************

Hi there

A message was sent to you regarding record request #21-951:

We have conducted a diligent search for records responsive to Item 2 of your request. We have located responsive records, which we have released to you. Due to the need to continue searching and reviewing records, and your request to produce on a rolling basis, we will produce any additional responsive records as soon as reasonably possible on an incremental or rolling basis.

As nothing was redacted from these files, we believe that the form we have produced these documents will provide you with all of the records that you have requested. Please let us know if they are acceptable.

Regards,

David A. Steinberg
Custodian of Records
San Francisco Public Works

************************************************************************

<em>Questions about your request?</em> Reply to this email or sign in to contact staff at City and County of San Francisco.<br><em>Technical support:</em> See our <a href='https://www.nextrequest.com/support'>help page</a>

---

On March 3, 2021:
Subject: [Document Released] City and County of San Francisco public records request #21-951
City and County of San Francisco

************************************************************************
Documents have been released for record request #21-951:

* RE: Approved Procedures Manual.html

* image002.png

* image001.png


* BOS and Committee Update for week of January 28, 2019.html

* 2019 Committee Assignments.pdf

* rc_agenda_01.28.19.pdf

* lut_agenda_01.28.19.pdf

* Ll012219.pdf

* bos_agenda_01.29.19.pdf

* image003.jpg

* image001.jpg

* bfc_agenda_01.30.19.pdf

* Public Records Request #21-951.html

* Public Records Request #21-951.html

* RE: California Public Records Act Request #20-4988.html

* RE: California Public Records Act Request #20-4988.html

* BOS and Committee Update for week of March 1, 2021.html

* image003.jpg

* 03.04 .21 Government Audit and Oversight Committee Agenda.pdf

* 03.03.21Budget and Appropriations Committee Agenda.pdf

* 03.03.21 Budget and Finance Committee Agenda.pdf

* 03.02.21 Full BOS Agenda.pdf

* 03.01.21 Rules Committee Agenda.pdf

* 03.01.21 Land Use Committee Agenda.pdf
On March 1, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request #20-4988
Mr. Steinberg:

I have requested exact copies in all of my requests, therefore please produce exact copies in PDF form. Plain text files do not preserve all parts of an email record.
I definitely want to be able to see the structure and formatting of an email, and I am entitled to do so.

Thank you,
Anonymous

---

On Dec. 15, 2019:
Subject: California Public Records Act Request: Calendars and Emails - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF DPW)
To the Department Head,

Attached is an Immediate Disclosure Request (SF Admin Code 67.25(a)).
Your response is required by Dec. 17, 2019. Rolling records responses are requested (67.25(d)).
NOTE: Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. The email address sending this request is a publicly-viewable mailbox. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 84491-02900968@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:
%3Fnext%3D%252Faccounts%252Fagency_login%252Fdepartment-of-public-works-4835%252Fcalendars-and-emails-
immediate-disclosure-request-sf-dpw-84491%252F%253Femail%253Dsupervisor.records%2540sfcityatty.org&url_auth_token=AAA14tllgHc_LSy2NcHvzRK7U34%3A1IIhyvJ%3Av61oltxGwDA5YmNymlaRsJljeuY
Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 84491
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.
March 5, 2021

This is a follow up to a previous request:

This is a 67.21(d) petition to determine in writing that all records requested in June 2020 from this email address to Office of Mayor are public and order them disclosed.

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 94535-90402488@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:
%3Fnext%3D%252Faccounts%252Fagency_login%252Foffice-of-the-mayor-3891%252FUse-of-personal-accounts-for-
public-business-immediate-disclosure-request-sf-mayor-
94535%252F%253Femail%253Dsupervisor.records%2540sfcityatty.org&url_auth_token=AAAxJOK2OUULoYu4xv2F8W
XKzSU%3A1IlHDL%3A86ggUTcVbWnDxX4k9keuufShY
Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 94535
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.

---

On July 7, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Use of Personal Accounts for Public Business - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF Mayor)
Anonymous,

See the attached additional records responsive to Item 1 below. Please note that personal contact information has been redacted to protect personal privacy. Cal. Govt. Code Secs. 6254(c), California Constitution, Art. I, Sec. 1.

Regards,

Hank Heckel
Compliance Officer
Office of the Mayor
On June 23, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Use of Personal Accounts for Public Business - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF Mayor)
Nothing is missing. You can ignore the redaction statement. That was sent in error. Same thing with the other email.

---

On June 23, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Use of Personal Accounts for Public Business - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF Mayor)
Are there attachments missing? You claimed redactions so I assume we should have some records in that email.

NOTE: Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. The email address sending this request is a publicly-viewable mailbox. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,  
Anonymous

---

On June 23, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Use of Personal Accounts for Public Business - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF Mayor)
Anonymous,  

Please note that we are continuing to process your request and we are invoking an extension of time to continue our response for up to 14 days due to the need to consult with another department and to check remote locations for documents. See Cal. Gov. Code § 6253(c) and San Francisco Admin. Code § 67.25(b). Please note that personal contact information has been redacted to protect personal privacy. Cal. Govt. Code Secs. 6254(c), California Constitution, Art. I, Sec. 1.  

Some records responsive to Item 1 below were already produced to you in response to your request from the email address 81856-14311352@requests.muckrock.com on June 5, 2020. 

Regards,  
Hank Heckel  
Compliance Officer  
Office of the Mayor  
City and County of San Francisco

---
On June 19, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Use of Personal Accounts for Public Business - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF Mayor)
Anonymous,

Please see the responsive records attached. Please note that we are continuing to process your request and we are invoking an extension of time to continue our response for up to 14 days due to the need to consult with another department and to check remote locations for documents. See Cal. Gov. Code § 6253(c) and San Francisco Admin. Code § 67.25(b). Please note that personal contact information has been redacted to protect personal privacy. Cal. Govt. Code Secs. 6254(c), California Constitution, Art. I, Sec. 1.

---

On June 6, 2020:
Subject: California Public Records Act Request: Use of Personal Accounts for Public Business - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF Mayor)
London Breed, Hank Heckel, Sean Elsbernd, Andrea Bruss, and Marjan Philhour ("Named Public Officials"),

Below are new Immediate Disclosure Requests (SF Admin Code 67.25(a)) directed to the Mayor's Office and each individual addressed above.

****** We have no duty to, and we will not again, remind the City of its obligations. Instead, we will file complaints for every Sunshine Ordinance or CPRA violation. We will continue to file complaints until the City's procedures are modified to fully comply with the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA, without caveat or exception. ******

1. Due to your June 5, 2020 public records response (https://cdn.muckrock.com/foia_files/2020/06/05/Anonymous_Request_Response_6.5.20_Redacted.pdf), we know your office uses your personal email accounts to conduct public business. Please provide all writings related to the conduct of public business sent or received by any of the Named Public Officials from Jan 14 2020 to present (inclusive) using their personal email accounts.

2. London Breed has previously refused to provide any public records from her personal accounts; yet we know that londonbreed@gmail.com is used for public business due to at least Page 72 of the following public record: https://sfbos.org/ftp/uploadedfiles/bdstrupvs/communications/2013/130066.pdf . Please provide for each of the Named Public Officials every email on their SFGOV email account from Jan 26 2020 to present (inclusive) that was sent TO, CC, or BCC londonbreed@gmail.com (note this is not restricted to email sent by the Named Public Official - they could simply be additional recipients of a Breed-received email).

3. Please provide for each of the Named Public Officials every email on their SFGOV email account from Jan 14 2020 to present (inclusive) that was sent FROM londonbreed@gmail.com.

4. Please provide for each of the Named Public Officials every email on their SFGOV email account from Jan 14 2020 to present (inclusive) that has the case insensitive keyword "londonbreed@gmail.com" (this will for example catch forwards of threads that Breed was previously included on but then removed from).

Do not destroy or discard any responsive records - we will appeal all withholdings or Sunshine violations. Remember your department head has an obligation to maintain in a professional and businesslike manner their correspondence and release them as public records (SF Admin Code 67.27-9(a)); and we will cross-check your responses with all other parties, including every city agency, to ensure you have not destroyed or withheld records improperly.

Your response is required by June 9, 2020. Rolling records responses are requested (SFAC 67.25(d)) if you are unable to immediately produce records. Exact copies of every responsive record are requested (Gov Code 6253(b)) - do not:
provide mere URLs, print and scan electronic records, convert native files to PDFs, or provide black and white versions of any color images. Provide only copies of records not requiring fees and in-person inspection of all other records (GC 6253).

Your non-exhaustive obligations:
- All withholding of any information must be justified in writing (SFAC 67.27).
- All withholdings by masking or deletion (aka redactions) must be keyed by footnote or other clear reference to the specific justification for that redaction, and only the minimal exempt portion of any record may be withheld (SFAC 67.26).
- You must respond to emailed requests (SFAC 67.21(b)).
- You must notify us of whether or not responsive records exist and/or were withheld for each below request (Gov Code 6253(c), 6255(b)).
- You must state the name and title of each person responsible for withholding any information (Gov Code 6253(d)).
- Do not impose any end-user restrictions upon me (Santa Clara Co. vs Superior Ct, 170 Cal.App 4th 1301); so if you use a third-party website like NextRequest to publish records, please make them completely public without any login or sign-in.

Your agency must do all of the above things in your response, and you cannot wait until we file complaints.

Thank you for your anticipated cooperation in this matter.

NOTE: Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. The email address sending this request is a publicly-viewable mailbox. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requestee is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,
Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 94535-90402488@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly: https://accounts.muckrock.com/accounts/login/?next=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.muckrock.com%2Faccounts%2Flogin%2F%3Fnext%3D%252Faccounts%252Fagency_login%252FOffice-of-the-mayor-3891%252Fuse-of-personal-accounts-for-public-business-immediate-disclosure-request-sf-mayor-94535%252F%252Femail%252Dsupervisor.records%252Dsfcityatty.org&url_auth_token=AAAxJOK2OULoYu4xv2F8WXkz5U%3A1IHDlb%3A86ggUTcVbWnDx4k9keiuufShY
Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 94535
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the
requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.
San Francisco Police Department  
PRA Office  
1245 3rd Street  
SF, CA 94158  

March 5, 2021  

This is a follow up to a previous request:  

Supervisor of Records,  

In August 2020, I requested from SFPD:  
1. Incident report 130188386 (initial and supplementals/amendeds)  
2. Incident report 130184889 (initial and supplementals/amendeds)  

#1 was never provided.  
#2 has what appear to be numerous redactions, none lawfully justified.  

Please determine in writing both records public and order them disclosed.  

--Anonymous  

Filed via MuckRock.com  
E-mail (Preferred): 100103-97805901@requests.muckrock.com  
Upload documents directly:  
Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.  

For mailed responses, please address (see note):  
MuckRock News  
DEPT MR 100103  
411A Highland Ave  
Somerville, MA 02144-2516  

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the
requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.

---

On March 5, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Special Incident Reports - Immediate Disclosure Request - SFPD
Please provide as an immediate disclosure request exact copies of all Incident reports from september 20 2009 with a REPORTED date/time of between 1:40pm and 2:00pm.

---

On Aug. 20, 2020:
Subject: Police Report Request - Incident Report #: 130-184-889
Hello,
Please find attached the report(s) you requested.

FAQs:
Report Corrections:
If you need to request a correction to a report you should go to the nearest police station to file a supplemental report.
If you are not in San Francisco you can go to your local police station and have them take a courtesy police report for them to forward to us.

To Add Lost or Stolen Items, Choose One:

2. Phone: Call 311 and relay the information over the phone.
3. Person: Go to your local police station and file a supplemental report.

To Request Photos/Statements/Evidence:
File a public records request online at http://sanfranciscopolice.org/publicrecordsrequest
Regards,

San Francisco Police Department
Crime Information Services Unit
1245 3rd Street, 1st FL
San Francisco, CA 94158
A05965 EM

---

On Aug. 10, 2020:
Subject: Re: California Public Records Act Request: Special Incident Reports - Immediate Disclosure Request - SFPD
There is no police report associated with this CAD:

INCIDENT DETAIL: S160401141
S160401141 C 917 745 CLEMENT ST, SF (D=btwn 8TH AV and 9TH AV) G3
10:08 DT02 CREATE <A05721>
LocCross:, Sector/Stn:G3
LocAddInfo(F):
Urgency(F):
10:08 DT02 ENTRY <A05721>
10:08 DT02 DISPOS 3G43C <A05721>
Location:745 CLEMENT ST, SF, OperNames:WU, EDDIE #18
10:08 PRIU 3G43C
10:14 DT02 CLEAR 3G43C <A05721>
Dispo:HAN, Comment:ONE MOVED ALONG...SUBJ DOING A LINE DANCE FOR CHINESE NEW YEAR W/FIREWORKS IN CASE ANY CALLS COME IN
10:14 CLEAR
10:14 DT02 CLOSE <A05721>
Call Recap:
S1141 CLOSED
PRIMARY UNIT: 3G43C

JURISDICTION: SP
DISPOSITION: HAN
INITIATE: 10:08:56 02/09/16
ENTRY: 10:08:56 02/09/16
DISPATCH: 10:08:56 02/09/16
ENROUTE: 10:08:56 02/09/16
ONSCENE: 10:08:56 02/09/16
CLEAR:

TYPE: 917 SUSPICIOUS PERSON
PRIORITY: C
745 CLEMENT ST, SF
(btwn 8TH AV and 9TH AV)
DIST: 3G RAREA: 722B

San Francisco Police Department

Crime Information Services Unit

1245 3rd Street, 1st FL

San Francisco, CA 94158

---

On Aug. 8, 2020:
Subject: Automatic reply: California Public Records Act Request: Special Incident Reports - Immediate Disclosure Request - SFPD

Your email request has been received and will be processed within ten (10) days in the order it was received. If applicable, your request will be expedited pursuant to the statutory guidelines.

Under CA Family Code § 6228, incident reports requested by a victim or his or her representative for the alleged crimes of domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking, human trafficking, and abuse of an elder or dependent adult are entitled to receive copies within five (5) working days of the request, unless good cause for delay exists. If good cause exists, reports shall be released no later than ten (10) working days after request is made.

Thank you,
On Aug. 8, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Special Incident Reports - Immediate Disclosure Request - SFPD
This is a further, new, immediate disclosure request for:
3. all incident reports bearing "CAD Number" 160401141.

NOTE: Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. The email address sending this request is a publicly-viewable mailbox. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,
Anonymous
---

On Aug. 7, 2020:
Subject: California Public Records Act Request: Special Incident Reports - Immediate Disclosure Request - SFPD
Chief Scott and Police Department,

Below are Immediate Disclosure Requests (SF Admin Code 67.25(a)). Rolling records responses are requested (SFAC 67.25(d)) if you are unable to immediately produce all records. Exact copies of every responsive record are requested (Gov Code 6253(b)) - do not or print and scan electronic records or provide black and white versions of any color record. Provide only copies of records not requiring fees and in-person inspection of all other records (GC 6253).

1. Incident report 130188386 (initial and supplementals/amendeds)
2. Incident report 130184889 (initial and supplementals/amendeds)

Your non-exhaustive obligations: All withholding of any information must be justified (SFAC 67.27). All withholdings by masking or deletion (aka redactions) must be keyed by footnote or other clear reference to justification and only the minimal exempt portion of a record may be withheld (SFAC 67.26). Respond to emailed requests (SFAC 67.21(b)). You must notify us of whether or not responsive records exist and/or were withheld for each below request (Gov Code 6253(c), 6255(b)). You must state the name and title of each person responsible for withholding any information (Gov
You must do all of this in your response, and you cannot wait until we file complaints. If you wait to comply with the Sunshine Ordinance until after we file complaints, we will not withdraw any complaints and request SOTF find you in violation, regardless of what you do after filing.

****** We have no duty to, and we will not again, remind the City of its obligations. Instead, we will file complaints for every Sunshine Ordinance or CPRA violation. We will continue to file complaints until your procedures are modified to fully comply with the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA, without caveat or exception. ******

Please indicate "no responsive records" for each request if that is true.

NOTE: Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. The email address sending this request is a publicly-viewable mailbox. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 100103-97805901@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:
https://accounts.muckrock.com/accounts/login/?next=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.muckrock.com%2Faccounts%2Flogin%2F%3Fnext%3D%253D%252Faccounts%252Fagency_login%252Fsan-francisco-police-department-367%252Fspecial-incident-reports-immediate-disclosure-request-sfpd-100103%252F252F%252F%252Demail%252Dfemail%252Dsupervisor.records%252D40sfcityatty.org&url_auth_token=AAAihO6-kUH0n-q03T6PAL_wX5Q%3A11JuO%3A4GxnOT8CpHTdS8i3nARfMYYdW1
Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 100103
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.
Supervisor of Records Dennis Herrera:

This is a petition to determine in writing that the records requested below are public and to order Vallie Brown, Grant for the Arts, Office of the City Administrator, Mayor Breed, Sean Elsbernd, Andrea Bruss, Sophia Kittler, Hank Heckel, Mason Lee, Tyra Fennell, and Office of the Mayor to disclose them.

Respondents have failed to respond in any way to a request from Feb 21, 2020 - violating Admin Code 67.21 and Gov Code 6253(c).

SOTF complaints will be filed momentarily as well.

NOTE: 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. I am not an attorney. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

------- Original Message -------
On Sunday, February 21st, 2021 at 11:21 PM, Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:

AMENDED:

Vallie Brown and Grant for The Arts/Office of the City Administrator: This is an immediate disclosure request for all Vallie Brown text, chat, or instant messages, or voicemails received, or recorded phone calls or meetings, where any party is: Mayor Breed, Sean Elsbernd, Andrea Bruss, Carmen Chu, Hank Heckel, Mason Lee, Sophia Kittler, Tyra Fennell, or any member of the Office of the Mayor, on all accounts government or personal.

Mayor Breed, Sean Elsbernd, Andrea Bruss, Sophia Kittler, Hank Heckel, Mason Lee, Tyra Fennell: This is an immediate disclosure request for all text, chat, or instant messages, or voicemails received, or recorded phone calls or meetings, where any party is Vallie Brown, on all accounts government or personal.

All parties: provide rolling responses and exact copies of all electronic records.
NOTE: 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

-------- Original Message --------
On Sunday, February 21st, 2021 at 10:44 PM, Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:

**Vallie Brown and Grant for The Arts/Office of the City Administrator:** This is an immediate disclosure request for all Vallie Brown text, chat, or instant messages, or voicemails received, or recorded phone calls or meetings, where any party is: Mayor Breed, Sean Elsbernd, Andrea Bruss, Carmen Chu, Hank Heckel, Mason Lee, Sophia Kittler, or any member of the Office of the Mayor, on all accounts government or personal.

**Mayor Breed, Sean Elsbernd, Andrea Bruss, Sophia Kittler, Hank Heckel, Mason Lee:** This is an immediate disclosure request for all text, chat, or instant messages, or voicemails received, or recorded phone calls or meetings, where any party is Vallie Brown, on all accounts government or personal.

All parties: provide rolling responses and exact copies of all electronic records.

**NOTE:** 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous
See attached petition and exhibits.

**NOTE:** 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. I am not an attorney. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

Sent from ProtonMail Mobile
Please see attached the records responsive to your request below. As indicated on the face of the documents some material has been redacted as 1) personal information unrelated to City business withheld for personal privacy (Cal. Gov. Code § 6254(c), California Constitution, Art. I); 2) attorney/client privileged communications (Cal. Gov. Code § 6254(k); Evidence Code § 954; SF Admin. Code § 67.21(k)); or 3) the recommendation of the author (Admin Code 67.24(a)(1); Cal. Gov. Code § 6254(a)). Further, some records have been withheld in their entirety pursuant to the attorney/client privilege. § Cal. Gov. Code § 6254(k); Evidence Code § 954; SF Admin. Code § 67.21(k)).

Regards,

Hank Heckel

Compliance Officer

Office of the Mayor

City and County of San Francisco

From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 29, 2020 9:27 PM
To: Heckel, Hank (MYR) <hank.heckel@sfgov.org>; Elsbernd, Sean (MYR) <sean.elsbernd@sfgov.org>
Subject: Heckel-Elsbernd comms - Immediate disclosure request

Hank Heckel and Sean Elsbernd:

This is an immediate disclosure request to Heckel for every communication from Heckel to Elsbernd or Elsbernd to Heckel in any form whatsoever, in any app, in any type of communication, on govt or personal property from Dec 2, 2020 to present (inclusive). Include any communication sent by either of you that is received by more persons than just the other (ex. messages sent by Heckel to Elsbernd and Bruss are included).

This is an immediate disclosure request to Elsbernd for every communication from Heckel to Elsbernd or Elsbernd to Heckel in any form whatsoever, in any app, in any type of communication, on govt or personal property from Dec 2, 2020 to present (inclusive). Include any communication sent by either of
you that is received by more persons than just the other (ex. messages sent by Heckel to Elsbernd and Bruss are included).

**NOTE:** Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the government all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous
NOTE
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Do
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Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Date: December 28, 2020 at 7:53:04 PM PST
To: "SOTF, (BOS)" <sotf@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: Amending the Sunshine Ordinance to Force Compliance by the City of San Francisco
Reply-To: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.
Not opening it. If it’s text messages, I don’t have any.

Sean

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Date: December 15, 2020 at 12:49:07 AM PST
To: "Heckel, Hank (MYR)" <hank.heckel@sfgov.org>, "Breed, Mayor London (MYR)" <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>, "MayorSunshineRequests, MYR (MYR)" <mayorsunshinerequests@sfgov.org>, "Elsbernd, Sean (MYR)" <sean.elsbernd@sfgov.org>
Cc: "SOTF, (BOS)" <sotf@sfgov.org>, "Press Office, Mayor (MYR)" <mayorspressoffice@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: Enforcement of last night's SOTF 19103 ruling, Immediate Disclosure Request for Future Breed Calendars
Reply-To: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.
I am concerned about opening this message for fear of viruses.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Date: December 7, 2020 at 12:30:31 PM PST
To: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Subject: Important - Text/Chat message retention and metadata
Reply-To: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.
What does s/he want now?

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Date: December 29, 2020 at 7:07:11 PM PST
To: "Elsbernd, Sean (MYR)" <sean.elsbernd@sfgov.org>
Cc: "MayorSunshineRequests, MYR (MYR)"
<mayorsunshinerequests@sfgov.org>, "Heckel, Hank (MYR)"
<hank.heckel@sfgov.org>
Subject: Sean Elsbernd Word file - Immediate Disclosure Request
Reply-To: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.
Heckel, Hank (MYR)

From: Elsbernd, Sean (MYR)
Sent: Wednesday, December 23, 2020 6:50 AM
To: Heckel, Hank (MYR)
Subject: Fwd: Mayor's Office Texts - Immediate Disclosure Request
Attachments: RE: Mayor's Office Texts - Immediate Disclosure Request

Again, not opening this.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Date: December 23, 2020 at 6:48:05 AM PST
To: "Heckel, Hank (MYR)" <hank.heckel@sfgov.org>
Cc: "Elsbernd, Sean (MYR)" <sean.elsbernd@sfgov.org>, "Bruss, Andrea (MYR)"
<andrea.bruss@sfgov.org>, "Breed, Mayor London (MYR)" <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>,
"MayorSunshineRequests, MYR (MYR)" <mayorsunshinerequests@sfgov.org>
Subject: RE: Mayor's Office Texts - Immediate Disclosure Request
Reply-To: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.
I'm not opening emails from this person. For what are they asking?

-----Original Message-----
From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 22, 2020 12:05 PM
To: Elsbernd, Sean (MYR) <sean.elsbernd@sfgov.org>; Bruss, Andrea (MYR) <andrea.bruss@sfgov.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; Heckel, Hank (MYR) <hank.heckel@sfgov.org>; MayorSunshineRequests, MYR (MYR) <mayorsunshinerequests@sfgov.org>; Steinberg, David (DPW) <david.steinberg@sfdpw.org>
Subject: Re: Mayor’s Office Texts to or from - Immediate Disclosure Request

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.
From: Elsbernd, Sean (MYR)
Sent: Thursday, December 3, 2020 10:51 AM
To: Heckel, Hank (MYR)
Subject: the 4 emails
Attachments: Housing Project loans; Re: Updated Food Support Memo/Menu; Re: Enforcement Corps_10_9_2020.pptx; FW: Housing Conservatorship Implementation and Outpatient LPS Referrals
Anonymous

Attn. General Government Team
Supervisor of Records
City Hall, Room 234
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102
via email

March 10, 2021

Petition under SF Admin Code § 67.21(d)

Supervisor of Records Dennis Herrera,

Please determine in writing that the following parts of records are public and order Hank Heckel, Sean Elsbernd, and the Office the Mayor to disclose them:

1. all redactions in "Redactions_ - Immediate Disclosure Request 1 (002)_Redacted.pdf"

2. all missing attachments to "the 4.pdf"

3. all redactions in 'Redactions RE_ Screenshot 2020-12-03 at 11.30.08 AM'. The message between Elsbernd and Heckel (not the separate text) cannot be A/C privileged - neither of them are each other's attorneys.

Sincerely,

Anonymous
I am continuing to send you the requested London Beddoes (now known as the Mayo London Beddoes) engagements calendar reports under the Sunlight Ordinance and under the CPRA for the County and City of San Francisco.

May 16, 2019

Cty and County of San Francisco
Hank Hecke
RGAs

The responsive information has been provided in a PDF format for ease of transmission and access. The City and County of San Francisco has already accepted the public disclosure nature of the information by providing some, but not all of the ICS reports previously. The City and County of San Francisco Office of the Mayor Compliance Office has a record of the public disclosure nature of the information by providing some, but not all of the ICS reports previously. The City and County of San Francisco Office of the Mayor Compliance Office has a record of the public disclosure nature of the information by providing some, but not all of the ICS reports previously.

On February 4, 2020

---
Why have we not received these calendars?
---

In response to your request, the City of San Francisco is providing the responsive information in a PDF format consistent with California Government Code sections 6253 and 6254,19. The PDF format ensures the accuracy and integrity of the original document as well as the security. Please see the responsive calendar entries of Mayo London Beddoes.

On July 1, 2020

---

If you have any questions, please add me to the communication with other departments as appropriate. Also, I am a public records requester and I may consider suggestions - however, this will not affect this request.

April 1, 2020

---

1) IMMEDIATE DISCLOSE 2) Mayo Office has already accepted the public disclosure nature of the information by providing some, but not all of the ICS reports previously. I am continuing to send you the responsive information.

Have we not received these calendars?

---

On February 4, 2020

---
Why have we not received these calendars?
---

In response to your request, the City of San Francisco is providing the responsive information in a PDF format consistent with California Government Code sections 6253 and 6254,19. The PDF format ensures the accuracy and integrity of the original document as well as the security. Please see the responsive calendar entries of Mayo London Beddoes.

On July 1, 2020

---

If you have any questions, please add me to the communication with other departments as appropriate. Also, I am a public records requester and I may consider suggestions - however, this will not affect this request.

April 1, 2020

---

1) IMMEDIATE DISCLOSE 2) Mayo Office has already accepted the public disclosure nature of the information by providing some, but not all of the ICS reports previously. I am continuing to send you the responsive information.

Have we not received these calendars?

---

On February 4, 2020

---
Why have we not received these calendars?
---

In response to your request, the City of San Francisco is providing the responsive information in a PDF format consistent with California Government Code sections 6253 and 6254,19. The PDF format ensures the accuracy and integrity of the original document as well as the security. Please see the responsive calendar entries of Mayo London Beddoes.
Thanks Sean. Great to meet you, Meron. Glad to discuss your questions when you have a moment.

Meron, meet Hank. Hank, meet Meron.

Hank, Meron is our new protocol officer. She has some general gift questions.

Meron, Hank is the Mayor’s chief compliance officer. He can answer your questions.

All the best,
Sean
Yes I’ll respond. Thanks.

Sent from my iPhone

> On Dec 9, 2020, at 7:26 PM, Elsbernd, Sean (MYR) <sean.elsbernd@sfgov.org> wrote:
> >
> > Not opening this.
> >
> > That said, if it's calendar, I assume you already have that.
> >
> >
> > Sean
> >
> > ----Original Message-----
> > > From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
> > > Sent: Wednesday, December 9, 2020 4:25 PM
> > > To: Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; Heckel, Hank (MYR) <hank.heckel@sfgov.org>; MayorSunshineRequests, MYR (MYR) <mayorsunshinerequests@sfgov.org>; Elsbernd, Sean (MYR) <sean.elsbernd@sfgov.org>
> > > Cc: SOTF, (BOS) <sotf@sfgov.org>
> > > Subject: Immediate Disclosure Request - Personal Calendars - SOTF 19047
> > >
> > > This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.
> > >
> > >
> > > <mime-attachment>
That is a good policy. I have seen the content elsewhere anyway. I will send a separate email with an update.

I am concerned about opening this message for fear of viruses.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.
From: Heckel, Hank (MYR)
To: Elsbernd, Sean (MYR); Cretan, Jeff (MYR)
Cc: Lynch, Andy (MYR)
Subject: RE: Public Records Request #20-4788
Date: Friday, December 18, 2020 4:13:00 PM

Thanks.

From: Elsbernd, Sean (MYR)
Sent: Friday, December 18, 2020 4:13 PM
To: Heckel, Hank (MYR); Cretan, Jeff (MYR)
Cc: Lynch, Andy (MYR)
Subject: RE: Public Records Request #20-4788

No problem

From: Heckel, Hank (MYR)
Sent: Friday, December 18, 2020 3:58 PM
To: Elsbernd, Sean (MYR); Cretan, Jeff (MYR)
Cc: Lynch, Andy (MYR)
Subject: FW: Public Records Request #20-4788

FYI – DPW has these texts to produce in response to Anonymous. I will instruct them to redact the numbers. I don’t necessarily see an issue beyond that but let me know if you do.

Thanks

From: Steinberg, David (DPW)
Sent: Friday, December 18, 2020 3:24 PM
To: Heckel, Hank (MYR)
Subject: Public Records Request #20-4788

Hi Hank,

The attached contain text messages between Alaric and the following:

- London Breed
- Sean Elsbernd

I haven’t reviewed them yet, so please let me know if you see anything that appears problematic.

-d.

David A. Steinberg
Custodian of Records & Executive Assistant to the Director
San Francisco Public Works | City and County of San Francisco
For public records requests, please go to sfpublicworks.org/records.
No records

From: Heckel, Hank (MYR)
Sent: Monday, December 14, 2020 1:47 PM
To: Elsbernd, Sean (MYR) <sean.elsbernd@sfgov.org>; Bruss, Andrea (MYR) <andrea.bruss@sfgov.org>; Power, Andres (MYR) <andres.power@sfgov.org>; Sawyer, Amy (MYR) <amy.sawyer@sfgov.org>
Cc: Cretan, Jeff (MYR) <jeff.cretan@sfgov.org>; Lynch, Andy (MYR) <andy.lynch@sfgov.org>
Subject: Sunshine Request - Direction from HSOC re camping in Mission/SOMA

Hi,

We received a request from Doug Powell for any records relating to:

“any direction from HSOC telling or suggesting campers where to camp in the Mission and SOMA neighborhood. And, any direction from the city to private or non-profit agencies telling or suggesting the campers where to camp.”

I will refer this to HSOC/HSH, but if you have any responsive records, please let me know.

Thanks,

Hank Heckel
Legal Compliance Officer
Office of the Mayor
City and County of San Francisco
No records

Sent from my iPhone

On Dec 22, 2020, at 4:33 PM, Heckel, Hank (MYR) <hank.heckel@sfgov.org> wrote:

Hi all,

We have received a records request from “J Ader” through the Muckrock website seeking the following from the Office of the Mayor:

   All documents, briefs, and agency emails - created and/or disseminated from July 1st, 2020 to December 14th, 2020 - mentioning any of the following terms:

   - District 8 Residents Task Force
   - d8rtf.com

If you have any responsive records, please let me know.

If you do not have any responsive records, please respond accordingly.

Thanks and Happy Holidays!

Hank Heckel
Legal Compliance Officer
Office of the Mayor
City and County of San Francisco
Here you go

Sean,
Hope that you are well. I wanted to pick back up on the pursuit of purchasing the two BMW motorcycles from Chief Connolly at Broadmoor PD. Sheriff is comfortable with that purchase now that there is some time between media hot piece on Connolly and the present. if you can help with OCA allowing for purchase and registration of bikes, that was the hold up before.

Sheriff is meeting with Mayor Breed today at 430 on other matters.

Looking forward to seeing you.

Joe >
Looking forward to seeing you around the building soon.

Joe

Sent from my iPhone
Yes, we do. I will put one together. Thanks.

Ok. I’ll bring it up with folks if they are using these platforms without a good justification.

I made clear to Tyronne not to communicate with me in that fashion again.

Ok, so we don’t have to worry about that. I remember Ty had sent you something a while back on one of the other platforms and we collected it for an earlier request. We should probably try to discourage staff from using all of these extraneous platforms unless there is some benefit to it. The problem is it creates retention and collection issues when things are scattered across so many media.

I can bring it up at a check-in if you agree.

I do have Signal, it’s purely social.

Got it, thanks. The first is privileged. The second is non-City business. I’ve never even heard of half of the platforms he mentions so I am not overly concerned that people use them for City business.

The extent of my text messages.

I don’t have Facebook or any other social media.
Messages

AC Privileged

California Const.
Sent from my iPhone
Sean, we received a request for your work calendar for the last year from Garrett Leahy of 48 Hills. I have previous entries but need July 15, 2020 through the end of November.

I will review for any necessary redactions and provide you a copy before production.

Thanks,

Hank Heckel
Legal Compliance Officer
Office of the Mayor
City and County of San Francisco
This is a follow up to a previous request:

Supervisor of Records Dennis Herrera:

This is a petition under SF Admin Code 67.21(d) to determine in writing that the redacted portions of the attached exhibits and of the attachment on page 7 of the Melanie records are public and order them disclosed. It continues to challenge various previously-unappealed parts of the PUC's response to the June 11, 2020 request from this email address. You may wish to consider it as part of the prior-filed March 2 and March 9 petitions re: overly-redacted Kelly-Breed messages, and March 9 petition re: overly-redacted Naomi Kelly-Harlan Kelly messages, as long as you make determinations on all challenged records. The Melanie record has been redacted voluntarily by us to remove a phone number which was published by PUC itself.

As we have already proven via prior petitions, the PUC previously unlawfully redacted certain text messages between Harlan Kelly Jr. and Walter Wong. Moreover, the PUC has admitted as such in its Feb 22, 2021 letter (in which it also re-released a new version of mostly-unredacted Kelly-Wong texts) and via DCA Jon Givner's letter of March 8, 2021. The PUC apparently violated the law because it allowed Harlan Kelly Jr. to control the redaction of his own records without any oversight by the PUC itself -- which also was apparently then and remains now the policy and practice of the City, pursuant to your long-standing advice to the City re: your interpretation of City of San Jose v. Superior Court. However, as you discuss in your memo interpreting, the City is always ultimately responsible for the actions and judgments of its employees in such matter.

Given Kelly's prior mis-redaction of the Walter Wong texts to protect sensitive-but-disclosable communications, there is no reason to believe that the redactions made in the attached text messages were then or are currently lawful, and each must be justified under a specific provision of the law.

Furthermore, a copy of the attachment on page 7 of the Melanie records must be produced as required by Admin Code 67.21. This tiny, compressed, printed and scanned version is unreadable and thus withholds its textual content, which is precisely why we have successfully previously argued that such production does not even constitute a "copy" of the underlying record (see SOTF decisions 19098 Anonymous v Police Department, 19131 Anonymous v Cisneros).
On March 10, 2021, you asserted a right to simply refuse to issue determinations to petitions filed pursuant to Admin Code 67.21(d). It is telling that you have decided to do so as we have continued to successfully uncover violations of the law by City agencies and officials, including both by yourself personally and your office (see SOTF decisions 19108 Anonymous v Herrera, 19044 Anonymous v Office of the City Attorney, 19120 Anonymous v Office of the City Attorney).

If you refuse to review the records and issue a determination and order if needed, you will be violating Admin Code 67.21(d) yourself and potentially aiding your City clients in violating the law as a direct result of willfully refusing to perform your own legally-mandated duties.

The City has throughout its history, whether by declaring war on the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force or on successful transparency advocates themselves, attempted to neuter the Sunshine Ordinance to prevent disclosure of all lawfully-disclosable public information which may be unfriendly to senior officials' political prospects. Yet the public has the right to know whether its representatives conduct the public business in the interest of the public or in their private interest.

As such advocates become more successful, your office appears to consider them a threat to your control over the City's public records regime, instead of treating us fairly as petitioners in a proceeding where you act in a quasi-judicial role. There is no doubt I file numerous petitions -- and those petitions and complaints have forced the City to become significantly more compliant with the Sunshine Ordinance, which can be seen by the additional disclosures your office causes agencies to provide in response to my petitions and the nearly entirely successful series of complaints I have won at the SOTF.

As long as the City continues to violate the law -- apparently often due to your deputies' poor advice or training -- no ethical option exists other than to continue to petition and appeal for complete, timely, and lawful disclosure, without exception.

Sincerely,

An Anonymous Independent Journalist

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 94992-15550486@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:

Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 94992
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.

---
On March 9, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Inter-Agency Text Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF PUC)
See attached 2nd petition for Breed-Herrera records.
---

On March 9, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Inter-Agency Text Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF PUC)
This is an immediate disclosure request for the original unredacted PDF of texts between Kelly and Wong, in its original electronic format.
I remember it had selectable text (not OCR text) which is why I could see the black rectangle messages. You can of course redact what you think is redactable, but I want the original format document.

Sincerely,
Anonymous
---

On March 9, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Inter-Agency Text Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF PUC)
Supervisor of Records Herrera:

New 67.21(d) petition.

The attached record produced by PUC in response to a records request from this email address is challenged.
An email between Sean Elsbernd and Naomi Kelly cannot be Attorney-Client Privileged - neither of them is the attorney for the other.
Furthermore the two attachments were not provided.
Furthermore the email addresses of the Kellys were clearly available as hyperlinks in the records, but have been stripped for no legal reason - likely because the government continues to fail to produce even simple PDFs as actual full-fidelity PDFs instead of image renderings.
Please determine some portion of these records are public (in writing) and order them disclosed.

--Anonymous
---

On March 8, 2021:
Subject: RE: Subsequent 67.21(d) petition re Kelly-Wong records (also filed to SOTF 20084)
Please see attached response to your petition.

The information in this email is confidential and may be protected by the attorney/client privilege and/or the attorney work product doctrine. If you are not the intended recipient of this email or received this email inadvertently, please notify the sender and delete it.

---

On March 5, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Inter-Agency Text Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request (SF PUC)
FOR FILE 20084 and FILE 20127:

1. As the Task Force is aware, attempting to produce records months after I file a complaint does not in any way mean that the Respondents did not violate the ordinance at the time I filed the complaint. By the City's logic as long as some point down the line you produce records, there are never any violations of the Ordinance. You've never made a determination in that manner, and you should not now do so.
2. The records have still not been produced in full even to this day. Various text messages had attachment parts, have been admitted to be public, and the attachments have not yet been provided. That remains non-minimal withholding and an incomplete response.

While I do not have to specifically request attachments (since attachments are in fact stored within the text message electronic record), I did specifically request them:

"For text messages: While the phone numbers are not needed, the following must be preserved: the timestamps, the textual content, attachments, and images, and also ALL sender and recipient names (including groups)."

Thanks,
Anonymous

---

On June 11, 2020:

Below are new Immediate Disclosure Requests (SF Admin Code 67.25(a)) directed to your agency and its department head. Your response is required by June 12, 2020. Rolling records responses are requested (SFAC 67.25(d)) if you are unable to immediately produce records. Exact copies of every responsive record are requested (Gov Code 6253(b)) - do not: provide mere URLs, print and scan electronic records, convert native files to PDFs, or provide black and white versions of any color images. Provide only copies of records not requiring fees and in-person inspection of all other records (GC 6253).

1. All text, email, or chat messages (including group messages, in any form or application including but not limited to SMS, MMS, WhatsApp, WeChat, Signal, Instagram, Twitter, Facebook, Hangouts, Skype, Teams) sent or received to/cc/bcc/from between Harlan Kelly Jr. and London Breed, on government or personal accounts from Jan 1, 2015 and present (you must search personal accounts pursuant to City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017))

2. All text, email, or chat messages (including group messages, in any form or application including but not limited to SMS, MMS, WhatsApp, WeChat, Signal, Instagram, Twitter, Facebook, Hangouts, Skype, Teams) sent or received to/cc/bcc/from between Harlan Kelly Jr. and Walter Wong/Jaidin Consulting Group/Jaidin Associates (including but not limited to jaidin@pacbell.net, jdngrp@pacbell.net, or any email address ending with jaidin.net ), on government or personal accounts from Jan 1, 2015 and present (you must search personal accounts pursuant to City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017))

3. All text, email, or chat messages (including group messages, in any form or application including but not limited to SMS, MMS, WhatsApp, WeChat, Signal, Instagram, Twitter, Facebook, Hangouts, Skype, Teams) sent or received to/cc/bcc/from between Harlan Kelly Jr. and Mohammed Nuru, on government or personal accounts from Jan 1, 2015 and present (you must search personal accounts pursuant to City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017))

4. All text, email, or chat messages (including group messages, in any form or application including but not limited to SMS, MMS, WhatsApp, WeChat, Signal, Instagram, Twitter, Facebook, Hangouts, Skype, Teams) sent or received to/cc/bcc/from between Harlan Kelly Jr. and Naomi Kelly, on government or personal accounts from Jan 1, 2020 and present (you must search personal accounts pursuant to City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017))

For text messages: While the phone numbers are not needed, the following must be preserved: the timestamps, the textual content, attachments, and images, and also ALL sender and recipient names (including groups). Pursuant to SF Admin Code 67.21(l)), which requires you to use any electronic format that we request, please provide the records in spreadsheet format. For an example of the format of the response, see SFPD Chief Scott's prior response here:
https://cdn.muckrock.com/foia_files/2020/04/14/Text_Messages_Breed_Scott_Redacted.pdf and clearly referenced redaction justifications here: https://cdn.muckrock.com/foia_files/2020/04/14/ChiefOfficeResponse201.pdf (though I do not concede all of them are appropriate redactions). Please provide rolling responses, starting with the most recent records going backwards. Messages to/from before your current department head became the department head must still be provided.

Do not destroy or discard any responsive records - we will appeal all withholdings or Sunshine violations. Remember Mr. Kelly has an obligation to maintain in a professional and businesslike manner their correspondence and release them as public records (SF Admin Code 67.27-9(a)); and we will cross-check your responses with all other parties to ensure you have not destroyed or withheld records improperly.

Your non-exhaustive obligations:
- All withholding of any information must be justified in writing (SFAC 67.27).
- All withholdings by masking or deletion (aka redactions) must be keyed by footnote or other clear reference to the specific justification for that redaction, and only the minimal exempt portion of any record may be withheld (SFAC 67.26).
- You must respond to emailed requests (SFAC 67.21(b)).
- You must notify us of whether or not responsive records exist and/or were withheld for each below request (Gov Code 6253(c), 6255(b)).
- You must state the name and title of each person responsible for withholding any information (Gov Code 6253(d)).
- Do not impose any end-user restrictions upon me (Santa Clara Co. vs Superior Ct, 170 Cal.App 4th 1301); so if you use a third-party website like NextRequest to publish records, please make them completely public without any login or sign-in.

Your agency must do all of the above things in your response, and you cannot wait until we file complaints.

****** We have no duty to, and we will not again, remind the City of its obligations. Instead, we will file complaints for every Sunshine Ordinance or CPRA violation. We will continue to file complaints until the City’s procedures are modified to fully comply with the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA, without caveat or exception. ******

Thank you for your anticipated cooperation in this matter.

NOTE: Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. The email address sending this request is a publicly-viewable mailbox. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,
Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 94992-15550486@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:
Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 94992
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.
March 11, 2021

Petition under SF Admin Code § 67.21(d)

Supervisor of Records Dennis Herrera:

This is a petition under SF Admin Code 67.21(d) to determine in writing that the redacted portions of the attached exhibits and of the attachment on page 7 of the Melanie records are public and order them disclosed. It continues to challenge various previously-unappealed parts of the PUC’s response to the June 11, 2020 request from this email address. You may wish to consider it as part of the prior-filed March 2 and March 9 petitions re: overly-redacted Kelly-Breed messages, and March 9 petition re: overly-redacted Naomi Kelly-Harlan Kelly messages, as long as you make determinations on all challenged records. The Melanie record has been redacted voluntarily by us to remove a phone number which was published by PUC itself.

As we have already proven via prior petitions, the PUC previously unlawfully redacted certain text messages between Harlan Kelly Jr. and Walter Wong. Moreover, the PUC has admitted as such in its Feb 22, 2021 letter (in which it also re-released a new version of mostly-unredacted Kelly-Wong texts) and via DCA Jon Givner’s letter of March 8, 2021. The PUC apparently violated the law because it allowed Harlan Kelly Jr. to control the redaction of his own records without any oversight by the PUC itself — which also was apparently then and remains now the policy and practice of the City, pursuant to your long-standing advice to the City re: your interpretation of City of San Jose v. Superior Court. However, as you discuss in your memo interpreting, the City is always ultimately responsible
for the actions and judgments of its employees in such matter.

Given Kelly’s prior mis-redaction of the Walter Wong texts to protect sensitive-but-disclosable communications, there is no reason to believe that the redactions made in the attached text messages were then or are currently lawful, and each must be justified under a specific provision of the law.

Furthermore, a copy of the attachment on page 7 of the Melanie records must be produced as required by Admin Code 67.21. This tiny, compressed, printed and scanned version is unreadable and thus withholds its textual content, which is precisely why we have successfully previously argued that such production does not even constitute a "copy" of the underlying record (see SOTF decisions 19098 Anonymous v Police Department, 19131 Anonymous v Cisneros).

On March 10, 2021, you asserted a right to simply refuse to issue determinations to petitions filed pursuant to Admin Code 67.21(d). It is telling that you have decided to do so as we have continued to successfully uncover violations of the law by City agencies and officials, including both by yourself personally and your office (see SOTF decisions 19108 Anonymous v Herrera, 19044 Anonymous v Office of the City Attorney, 19120 Anonymous v Office of the City Attorney).

If you refuse to review the records and issue a determination and order if needed, you will be violating Admin Code 67.21(d) yourself and potentially aiding your City clients in violating the law as a direct result of willfully refusing to perform your own legally-mandated duties.

The City has throughout its history, whether by declaring war on the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force or on successful transparency advocates themselves, attempted to neuter the Sunshine Ordinance to prevent disclosure of all lawfully-disclosable public information which may be unfriendly to senior officials’ political prospects. Yet the public has the right to know
whether its representatives conduct the public business in the interest of the public or in their private interest.

As such advocates become more successful, your office appears to consider them a threat to your control over the City’s public records regime, instead of treating us fairly as petitioners in a proceeding where you act in a quasi-judicial role. There is no doubt I file numerous petitions – and those petitions and complaints have forced the City to become significantly more compliant with the Sunshine Ordinance, which can be seen by the additional disclosures your office causes agencies to provide in response to my petitions and the nearly entirely successful series of complaints I have won at the SOTF.

As long as the City continues to violate the law – apparently often due to your deputies’ poor advice or training – no ethical option exists other than to continue to petition and appeal for complete, timely, and lawful disclosure, without exception.

Sincerely,

An Anonymous Independent Journalist

This rectangle only: Redacted voluntarily by petitioner
Neither Wayne, Cynthia or I have any work with PUC. Julie has set up another lose-win scenario for us. : ( Check your email.
Here are the details of the project we’re having trouble getting paid on:

SFMTA Contract Number CN-1289 Van Ness Corridor Transit Improvement Project. Here are the invoices we have submitted to Walsh Construction. We have not been paid anything on
We are having problems paying our PUC subcontractors because we are out so much money on this project. We have asked Rosie to release retention on our PUC task orders for this same reason. Rosie has also brought this up with CMD (I did not talk to them about it), but nothing has happened.

Can you please call Ed or someone at MTA to see if they can pay us?

lol Pay us ASAP?
Lol. This is the description of the one position they have in project controls. I don't know if I can find anyone like that. The 20 years experience is the killer.

Program Construction Controls Manager (PCCM)
A minimum of twenty (20) years of recent experience in construction management of large and complex engineering/construction programs similar to the WSIP. Experience as a PCM in at least three (3) relevant, verifiable projects and at least two (2) related water-delivery projects with features (dams, tunnels, large diameter pipelines, pump stations, treatment plants, reservoirs, and etc.) similar to those being implemented under the WSIP. Experience as a PCM in at least three (3) relevant, verifiable projects that have utilized Primavera (P3E or P6) and Expedition, and possess knowledge of Primavera and Expedition. Must also have a baccalaureate degree in Engineering, Construction Management, Business Administration or relevant discipline from an accredited institution.

The ideal candidate would possess one or more certifications such as a CCE/CCC from the various industry related associations such as the AACE; a certified PSP, or other similar certifications (e.g. CCM; PMP) from other industry associations (e.g. CMAA; PMI).
We didn't get onto the AECOM team. They didn't want us even though I proposed to do the administrative document controls specialist which is more in our wheelhouse.

:(

They didn't like the other guy we proposed for the lead role. :(

What is this about? Mayor has just been asked about this on live television and we don’t know about it. What do I need to know to brief her before she calls and yells at PUC for not briefing her?

Aug 20, 2019, 6:51 PM

18th and Pacheco
Large sink hole, getting deeper.
I believe it is our sewer. Keep u posted.

Sep 18, 2019, 8:04 PM

BC-US--Trump-The Latest,235
The Latest: Trump accuses SF of environmental violations
President Donald Trump says the Environmental Protection
Agency will be "putting out a notice" of violations in San
Francisco related to its homeless population
AP Photo CAEV504, CAEV320, CAEV326, CAEV323,
CAEV325, CAEV109, CAEV103, CAEV128, CAEV419,
CAEV424, CAEV430
Eds: AP Video. With AP Photos.
%classify(id:218628ed691e4ae39d3c85be781db511;section:AP Event;name:Trump;
SAN DIEGO (AP) -- The Latest on President Donald
Trump in California (all times local):
10:15 p.m.
President Donald Trump says the Environmental
Protection Agency will be "putting out a notice" of
violations in San Francisco related to its homeless
population.
Trump told reporters Wednesday aboard Air Force One
that a tremendous amount of waste, including needles, is
going through storm drains into the ocean.
He says: "It's a terrible situation that's in Los Angeles and
in San Francisco. And we're going to be giving San
Francisco -- they're in total violation -- we're going to be
giving them a notice very soon."
Trump says: "They have to clean it up. We can't have our
cities going to hell."
Trump is returning to Washington after two days of
fundraising in California.

----

Jeff Creatan is getting blown up by the press. Is this the
EPA question hanging over us?

Wed, Apr 29, 2017, 7:21 AM

https://www.change.org/p/san-francisco-mayor-london-
breed-mayor-breed-city-of-sf-essential-workers-deserve-
safety-52ada24b-f404-4ea8-81d7-17574aa33768

Harlan, Mayor saw this and is wondering what's going on.
Anything I can tell her?

Wed, Jul 22, 1:11 PM

Sat, Aug 8, 7:46 AM

Supervisor of Records Herrera,

Supervisors Preston and Mar refuse to provide their future calendars or respond to this request. Under Admin Code 67.21(D) you must determine that such records are public, in writing, and order them to disclose the records.

NOTE: 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. I am not an attorney. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,
Anonymous

-------- Original Message --------
On Friday, March 12th, 2021 at 10:18 AM, Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org> wrote:

To Whom It May Concern,

Thank you for your patience.

Per my previous correspondences, our office had issued an inquiry to all Board member’s offices to compile available responsive records. In consultation with the Office of the City Attorney, our office has completed review of the calendar entries that were available, compiled, and produced to our office, the Office of the Clerk of the Board, as of the date of our last correspondence on February 26, 2021.

Please see the attached records responsive to your request. Note that all exempt information in this production is redacted in accordance with CA Government Code 6254(c), 6254(k) and Evidence Code 1040.
Our office did not receive responsive records from District 4 (Mar) and District 5 (Preston) offices. For follow up or questions regarding records for these offices, you may contact their offices directly; contact information for District 4 and 5 is available here and here, respectively.

Sincerely,

—

Wilson L. Ng

Deputy Director of Operations

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

Web: www.sfbos.org

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form

Disclosures: Personal information that is provided in communications to the Clerk of 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.

From: Ng, Wilson (BOS)
Sent: Friday, February 26, 2021 2:52 PM
To: arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com
Subject: RE: All Supervisors and the Clerk - Future calendars - Immediate disclosure request
To Whom It May Concern,

To provide you with an update, our office has conducted an inquiry to department staff, and has collected and compiled records of calendar entries available to date that are responsive to your request.

However, our office will require additional time to review the compiled records for applicable redactions to personal, privileged, and personnel information and consult the City Attorney’s office prior to production.

We intend to provide you with an update or response by Friday, March 12, 2021 close of business, and will keep you apprised if a response can be provided sooner or if additional time is required.

Sincerely,

—

Wilson L. Ng
Deputy Director of Operations

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Web: www.sfbos.org

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form
**Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Clerk of 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.

---

**From:** Ng, Wilson (BOS)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 16, 2021 1:24 PM  
**To:** Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>  
**Subject:** RE: All Supervisors and the Clerk - Future calendars - Immediate disclosure request

To Whom It May Concern,

Thank you for your inquiry. On behalf of the Office of the Clerk of the Board, I am confirming receipt of your request.

As you may also know, in accordance with the second and fifth supplementals to the Mayor’s proclamation of local emergency, public records production deadlines – including immediate disclosure requests – under San Francisco Administrative Code, Chapter 67 (Sunshine Ordinance), have been suspended for the duration of the COVID-19 state of emergency. However, our office endeavors to respond to records requests within the normal deadlines as feasible.

As you may have noticed from my out of office reply, I have been on leave and just returned to the office today to confirm receipt of your request. I also noticed that your email was flagged as spam by the City’s email system, so the intended recipients may not have received your request. However, I will be glad to assist and coordinate with the Clerk of the Board and all Board member’s offices to compile, review, and provide you with responsive records to your request.

Given the circumstances, our office will require additional time to process your request, and I intend to provide you with an update or response by next Friday, February 26, 2021. I will keep you apprised if additional time is required.

Thank you for your patience and understanding.
Sincerely,

___

Wilson L. Ng  
Deputy Director of Operations

San Francisco Board of Supervisors  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco, CA 94102

Web: www.sfbos.org

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form

Disclosures: Personal information that is provided in communications to the Clerk of 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.

From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 2, 2021 5:59 PM
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; Haney, Matt (BOS) <matt.haney@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; PrestonStaff (BOS) <prestonstaff@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>
Cc: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org>
Subject: All Supervisors and the Clerk - Future calendars - Immediate disclosure request
Clerk Calvillo, and Supervisors Chan, Haney, Mandelman, Mar, Melgar, Peskin, Preston, Ronen, Safai, Stefani, and Walton, and all Offices thereof:

As promised, this is an immediate disclosure request to each Supervisor and the Clerk of the Board for:

- the details of each entry on all calendars or scheduling documents containing your future meetings (physical, virtual, phone, or in any other form) for the dates of March 1st through March 14th, 2021 regardless of whether that calendar is electronic or physical, or on your government account, your personal account (see City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017)), or the government or personal accounts of your staff members/assistants documenting your own meetings, and preserving all details including but not limited to attendees, date and time stamps, email addresses, subject lines, category/importance flags, locations, attendee/invite status, hyperlinks, images, body text, and attachments. Pursuant to SFAC 67.21(L), please produce electronic records in individual meeting details format (called "Memo Style" in Microsoft Outlook) and NOT as a monthly, daily, or weekly summary. If records of business-related meetings that you (the Supervisor/Clerk) will attend are documented on someone else's calendar (like an aide's), I am indeed requesting those records as well.

In San Francisco, the deliberative process privilege is prohibited (SFAC 67.24(h)) - therefore the people do indeed have the right to know who you will meet with and for what purpose even in the future. Please also note that if you decide to redact security information, it is only redactable if the info is a security procedure of a police agency (i.e. if the sheriff or SFPD are protecting you at the meeting - see Gov Code 6254(f)). Redacting or withholding supposedly "sensitive" information not explicitly exempt under a law will be challenged.

Please see:

- SOTF Order 19103 Anonymous v Breed ordering Mayor Breed to produce her future calendars with redactions for security procedures (which Breed claims she will comply with),
- SOTF Order 19112 Anonymous v Scott ordering Chief Scott to produce his future calendars with redactions for security procedures (and SOTF's referral of Scott to the Ethics Commission for willful violation due to non-compliance with the Order), and
- City Attorney Herrera's Feb 1, 2021 voluntary change of mind and decision to disclose in redacted form his own future calendars after SOTF Order 19103, quoting: "In light of recent discussions at the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force regarding public officials’ disclosure of their future calendars, we have re-evaluated the legal question and consulted with the Police Department about security risks. Following that evaluation, we have concluded that in most circumstances the City Attorney may safely and legally disclose certain information about his future meetings, including the subject matter of the meeting and the attendees, if that information is recorded in his calendar, and the week during which the meeting will occur. Due to security concerns, we will continue to withhold the location, time, and specific date of each meeting. There may be circumstances in the future where information about the subject matter or attendees of a meeting should be withheld based on fact-specific security concerns or other legal grounds, but your current request does not raise those concerns."
If you wait to produce the entries after the meetings occur (as happened in 19103/19112) or attempt to hide politically sensitive meetings (which are not exempt under any law), I will file immediate appeals and complaints, and given past rulings I expect to win.

Thank you for your expected cooperation in this matter.

NOTE: 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous
Note:
All exempt information in this production is redacted in accordance with CA Government Code 6254(c), 6254(k) and Evidence Code 1040.

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

You are an alternate host for this Web seminar.

Host: Arthur Khoo (arthur.khoo@sfgov.org)

Monday, March 1, 2021 1:00 pm, Pacific Standard Time (San Francisco, GMT-08:00)

Start event

Join the audio conference only

Join from a video system or application

Need help  Go to https://help.webex.com
Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)

Subject: Clerk of the Board - Live Meet
Location: Microsoft Teams

Start: Mon 3/1/2021 3:00 PM
End: Mon 3/1/2021 5:00 PM

Recurrence: Weekly
Recurrence Pattern: Occurs every Monday from 3:00 PM to 5:00 PM effective 6/22/2020. (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada)

Meeting Status: Accepted

Organizer: Ng, Wilson (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Tse, John (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Lew, Lisa (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Leger, Cheryl (BOS); Major, Erica (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); Young, Victor (BOS); Wong, Linda (BOS); Madhwan, Nav (BOS); Shiue, Billy (BOS); Wong, Jocelyn (BOS); Wong, Jessica (BOS); Chow, Victoria (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS); Hickey, Jacqueline (BOS); Lagunte, Richard (BOS); Khoo, Arthur (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS)

Optional Attendees: Nagasundaram, Sekhar (BOS)

Virtual office hours hosted by the Clerk of the Board and staff to help address legislative, operational, or administrative process questions.

Join Microsoft Teams Meeting

[Redacted information]

[Redacted information]
Subject: Operations Team Weekly Standing Meeting (Wilson Ng, Arthur Khoo, Jacqueline Hickey, Richard Lagunte) (Angela Calvillo, Eileen McHugh)

Start: Mon 11/9/2020 8:30 AM
End: Mon 11/9/2020 9:00 AM

Recurrence: Weekly
Recurrence Pattern: every Monday from 8:30 AM to 9:00 AM

Organizer: Calvillo, Angela (BOS)

Wilson Ng, Deputy Director, review weekly duties with staff, administer any changes, share information and any outstanding ideas.
Additionally, review operational deadlines, special handling items and documents for signature.

Join Microsoft Teams Meeting

[Link to Meeting]
Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)

Subject: Morning Check-In: Legislative Division (Alisa Somera, Victor Young, Linda Wong, Erica Major, John Carroll, Cheryl Leger, Brent Jalipa, Lisa Lew, Jocelyn Wong) (Angela Calvillo and Eileen McHugh)

Start: Mon 9/21/2020 9:00 AM
End: Mon 9/21/2020 9:30 AM
Show Time As: Tentative

Recurrence: Weekly
Recurrence Pattern: Occurs every weekday from 9:00 AM to 9:30 AM effective 9/21/2020.

Meeting Status: Not yet responded

Organizer: Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Required Attendees: Wong, Linda (BOS); Young, Victor (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); Major, Erica (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Leger, Cheryl (BOS); Lew, Lisa (BOS); Wong, Jocelyn (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)

TeamsVtcTenantId: [Redacted]

Alisa Somera, Deputy Director - review the weekly duties with staff, administer any changes, share information and any outstanding ideas.
Additionally, review operational deadlines, special handling items and documents for signature.

Join Microsoft Teams Meeting
[Redacted]
[Redacted]
[Redacted]
You are an alternate host for this Web seminar.

Host: Arthur hoo (arthur.khoo@sfgov.org)

Monday, March 1, 2021 9:30 am, Pacific Standard Time (San Francisco, GMT-08:00)

Start event

Join the audio conference only

Join from a video system or application

Need help Go to https://help.webex.com
Subject: Compliance Meeting - Angela Calvillo and Jackie Hickey

Start: Mon 3/1/2021 9:30 AM
End: Mon 3/1/2021 10:00 AM
Show Time As: Tentative

Recurrence: Weekly
Recurrence Pattern: Occurs every Monday from 9:30 AM to 10:00 AM effective 9/28/2020.

Meeting Status: Tentatively accepted

Organizer: Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)

Required Attendees: Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Hickey, Jacqueline (BOS)

TeamsVtcTenantId: [redacted]

Review of Weekly Board and Committee Schedules.

Review of any upcoming deadlines.

Review of Compliance and performance.

---

Join Microsoft Teams Meeting

[redacted]
[redacted]
[redacted]
Microsoft Teams meeting

Join on your computer or mobile app

Or call in (audio only)
Subject: Work Block - Send Roll Call Email to Legislative Aides - CONFIRMED

Start: Mon 3/1/2021 10:30 AM
End: Mon 3/1/2021 11:00 AM

Recurrence: Weekly
Recurrence Pattern: every Monday from 10:30 AM to 11:00 AM

Meeting Status: Meeting organizer

Organizer: Calvillo, Angela (BOS)

Categories: Board Related, Purple Category
Meeting to review the BLA Reports for the week.
To review the agenda and prepare for the Board Meeting.
Review the Board agenda with the Board President and prepare for the Tuesday's Board Meeting.

Microsoft Teams meeting

Join on your computer or mobile app

Or call in (audio only)

---
## Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)

**Subject:** Full Board  
**Location:**  
**Start:** Tue 3/2/2021 1:30 PM  
**End:** Tue 3/2/2021 11:30 PM  
**Show Time As:** Tentative  
**Recurrence:** (none)  
**Meeting Status:** Not yet responded  
**Organizer:** Arthur Khoo

---

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

---

You are an alternate host for this Web seminar.

**Host:** Arthur Khoo (arthur.khoo@sfgov.org)

Tuesday, March 2, 2021 1:30 pm, Pacific Standard Time (San Francisco, GMT-08:00)

**Start event**

Join the audio conference only

Join from a video system or application

Need help  Go to [https://help.webex.com](https://help.webex.com)
Subject: Board of Supervisors Meeting - CONFIRMED

Start: Tue 3/2/2021 2:00 PM
End: Tue 3/2/2021 5:00 PM

Recurrence: Weekly
Recurrence Pattern: every Tuesday from 2:00 PM to 5:00 PM

Organizer: Calvillo, Angela (BOS)

Categories: Board/Committee Meetings
Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)

Subject: Weekly Meeting with Alisa Somera regarding Legislative Items
Location: Angela's Office Rm. 244

Start: Tue 3/2/2021 9:30 AM
End: Tue 3/2/2021 10:00 AM

Recurrence: Weekly
Recurrence Pattern: every Tuesday from 9:30 AM to 10:00 AM

Meeting Status: Meeting organizer

Organizer: Calvillo, Angela (BOS)
Required Attendees: Somera, Alisa (BOS)

Review of Legislative Items on the Board Agenda.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Subject:</strong></th>
<th>Weekly Meeting with Alisa Somera regarding Legislative Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
<td>Angela's Office Rm. 244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Start:</strong></td>
<td>Tue 3/2/2021 9:30 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End:</strong></td>
<td>Tue 3/2/2021 10:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recurrence:</strong></td>
<td>Weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recurrence Pattern:</strong></td>
<td>every Tuesday from 9:30 AM to 10:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meeting Status:</strong></td>
<td>Meeting organizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizer:</strong></td>
<td>Calvillo, Angela (BOS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Required Attendees:</strong></td>
<td>Somera, Alisa (BOS)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Review of Legislative Items on the Board Agenda.
Subject: Work Block: Board of Supervisors Meeting Prep

Start: Tue 3/2/2021 10:00 AM
End: Tue 3/2/2021 2:00 PM

Recurrence: Weekly
Recurrence Pattern: every Tuesday from 10:00 AM to 2:00 PM

Organizer: Calvillo, Angela (BOS)

Categories: Board Related
The meeting should not last longer than one hour, but reserve an hour and a half in case. Eileen will send out call for agenda items the preceding week. All managers to provide their items* to Eileen by Friday. COB will provide agenda items by Thursday the preceding week. Eileen will send out the Agenda by Fridays by close of business.

Items*
- Operational or programmatic or process issues or functions impacting one or more divisions; upcoming challenges or changes impacting the department.
- Report on any employee achievements or highlights
- Purchases, events
- Employee/human resources issues
- Review Birthday celebrations
- CCBSA Conference
- Election
- Infrastructure (everything IT)
- Advice, ideas, or news for the COB

Microsoft Teams meeting
Join on your computer or mobile app
[Redacted]

Or call in (audio only)
[Redacted]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Subject:</strong></th>
<th>Work Block - Sign Legislation from Tuesday's Board of Supervisors Meeting - Eileen McHugh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
<td>Teams Call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Start:</strong></td>
<td>Wed 3/3/2021 4:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End:</strong></td>
<td>Wed 3/3/2021 5:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recurrence:</strong></td>
<td>Weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recurrence Pattern:</strong></td>
<td>every Wednesday from 4:00 PM to 5:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizer:</strong></td>
<td>Calvillo, Angela (BOS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Categories:</strong></td>
<td>Board Related</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)

Subject: Morning Check-In: Legislative Division (Alisa Somera, Victor Young, Linda Wong, Erica Major, John Carroll, Cheryl Leger, Brent Jalipa, Lisa Lew, Jocelyn Wong) (Angela Calvillo and Eileen McHugh)

Start: Wed 3/3/2021 9:00 AM
End: Wed 3/3/2021 9:30 AM
Show Time As: Tentative

Recurrence: Weekly
Recurrence Pattern: Occurs every weekday from 9:00 AM to 9:30 AM effective 9/21/2020.

Meeting Status: Not yet responded

Organizer: Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Required Attendees: Wong, Linda (BOS); Young, Victor (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); Major, Erica (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Leger, Cheryl (BOS); Lew, Lisa (BOS); Wong, Jocelyn (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)

TeamsVtcTenantId: ********

Alisa Somera, Deputy Director will review the weekly duties with staff, administer any changes. Additionally, review operational deadlines, special handling items and documents for signature.

---

Join Microsoft Teams Meeting

---

---
Subject: Work Block - Review Minutes from Board Meeting

Start: Wed 3/3/2021 9:30 AM
End: Wed 3/3/2021 10:30 AM

Recurrence: Weekly
Recurrence Pattern: every Wednesday from 9:30 AM to 10:30 AM

Organizer: Calvillo, Angela (BOS)

Categories: Board Related

Also any Minutes for the following weeks agenda.
You are an alternate host for this Web seminar.

Host: Arthur Khoo (arthur.khoo@sfgov.org)

Wednesday, March 3, 2021 10:00 am, Pacific Standard Time (San Francisco, GMT-08:00)

Start event

Join the audio conference only

Join from a video system or application

Need help Go to https://help.webex.com
Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)

Subject: EOC Briefing - (BOS, DEM, CAT, DPH, MYR, HOM)
Location: Microsoft Teams Meeting
Start: Wed 3/3/2021 12:00 PM
End: Wed 3/3/2021 1:00 PM
Recurrence: Weekly
Recurrence Pattern: every Wednesday from 12:00 PM to 1:00 PM
Meeting Status: Meeting organizer
Organizer: Calvillo, Angela (BOS)
Required Attendees: Imperial, Megan (BOS); Fregosi, Ian (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Bintliff, Jacob (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Monge, Paul (BOS); Kittler, Sophia (MYR); Mar, Gordon (BOS); PEARSON, ANNE (CAT); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Li-D9, Jennifer (BOS); Mcdonald, Courtney (BOS); Mullan, Andrew (BOS); Carroll, Maryellen (DEM); Gee, Natalie (BOS); Gallardo, Tracy (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Angulo, Sunny (BOS); Snyder, Jen (BOS); Bennett, Samuel (BOS); Herzstein, Daniel (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Berenson, Samuel (BOS); Chinchilla, Monica (BOS); Sandoval, Suhagey (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); Lerma, Santiago (BOS); Beinart, Amy (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Yu, Avery (BOS); Smeallie, Kyle (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Koeppel, Geri (BOS); Yan, Calvin (BOS); Hepner, Lee (BOS); Evans, Abe (BOS); Wright, Edward (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Quan, Daisy (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Adkins, Joe (BOS); Mundy, Erin (BOS); Temprano, Tom (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Zou, Han (BOS); RivamonteMesa, Abigail (BOS); Mahogany, Honey (BOS); Haney, Matt (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Falzon, Frankie (BOS); Kilgore, Preston (BOS); Patil, Sneha (DPH); Lim, Victor (DEM); Chan, Connie (BOS); Groth, Kelly (BOS); Tenner, Andrea (DPH); Morris, Geoffrea (BOS); Chung, Lauren (BOS); Fieber, Jennifer (BOS); Carrillo, Lila (BOS); Yu, Angelina (BOS)
Optional Attendees: Tse, John (BOS); Lindsay, Claire (DPH); Kent, Lani (DEM); Bechelli, Adrienne (DEM); Merlone, Audrey (CPC); Zamora, Francis (DEM); Fleisher, Arielle (DPH); Hogan, Kristin (DEM); MelgarStaff (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Schneider, Dylan (HOM); Jue, Tyrone (MYR); Jones, Ernest (BOS)

TeamsVtcTenantId: [Redacted]

Weekly COVID-19 updates. (Pursuant to Governor Newsom’s Executive Order N-35-20)

Join Microsoft Teams Meeting
[Redacted]
Subject: Work Block - Review and Approve the LI and Draft Agenda

Start: Thu 3/4/2021 1:00 PM
End: Thu 3/4/2021 3:00 PM

Recurrence: Weekly
Recurrence Pattern: every Thursday from 1:00 PM to 3:00 PM

Organizer: Calvillo, Angela (BOS)

Categories: Board Related
Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)

Subject: Morning Check-In: Legislative Division (Alisa Somera, Victor Young, Linda Wong, Erica Major, John Carroll, Cheryl Leger, Brent Jalipa, Lisa Lew, Jocelyn Wong) (Angela Calvillo and Eileen McHugh)

Start: Thu 3/4/2021 9:00 AM
End: Thu 3/4/2021 9:30 AM
Show Time As: Tentative

Recurrence: Weekly
Recurrence Pattern: Occurs every weekday from 9:00 AM to 9:30 AM effective 9/21/2020.

Meeting Status: Not yet responded

Organizer: Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Required Attendees: Wong, Linda (BOS); Young, Victor (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); Major, Erica (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Leger, Cheryl (BOS); Lew, Lisa (BOS); Wong, Jocelyn (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)

TeamsVtcTenantId: *************

Alisa Somera, Deputy Director will review the weekly duties with staff, administer any changes. Additionally, review operational deadlines, special handling items and documents for signature.

Join Microsoft Teams Meeting

[Link]

[Link]

[Link]
Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)

Subject: Government Audit & Oversight
Location: 
Start: Thu 3/4/2021 9:30 AM
End: Thu 3/4/2021 3:30 PM
Show Time As: Tentative
Recurrence: (none)
Meeting Status: Not yet responded
Organizer: Arthur Khoo

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

You are an alternate host for this Web seminar.

Host: Arthur hoo (arthur.khoo@sfgov.org)

Thursday, March 4, 2021 9:30 am, Pacific Standard Time (San Francisco, GMT-08:00)

Start event

Join the audio conference only

Join from a video system or application

Need help  Go to https://help.webex.com
Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)

Subject: Clerk of the Board - Live Meet  
Location: Microsoft Teams

Start: Fri 3/5/2021 1:00 PM  
End: Fri 3/5/2021 3:00 PM  
Show Time As: Tentative

Recurrence: Weekly  
Recurrence Pattern: Occurs every Friday from 1:00 PM to 3:00 PM effective 6/26/2020.

Meeting Status: Tentatively accepted

Organizer: Ng, Wilson (BOS); Tse, John (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Lew, Lisa (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Leger, Cheryl (BOS); Major, Erica (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); Young, Victor (BOS); Wong, Linda (BOS); Madhwan, Nav (BOS); Shiu, Billy (BOS); Wong, Jocelyn (BOS); Wong, Jessica (BOS); Chow, Victoria (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS); Hickey, Jacqueline (BOS); Lagunte, Richard (BOS); Bullock, John (BOS); Khoo, Arthur (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS)

Optional Attendees: Nagasundaram, Sekhar (BOS)

Virtual office hours hosted by the Clerk of the Board and staff to help address legislative, operational, or administrative process questions.

Join Microsoft Teams Meeting

[Redacted]
Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)

Subject: Work Block - Review Weekly Submitted Legislation

Start: Fri 3/5/2021 3:00 PM
End: Fri 3/5/2021 3:30 PM

Recurrence: Weekly
Recurrence Pattern: every Friday from 3:00 PM to 3:30 PM

Organizer: Calvillo, Angela (BOS)

Categories: Board Related
Weekly IT Update - Angela Calvillo and Sekhar Nagasundaram

Fri 3/5/2021 4:00 PM
Fri 3/5/2021 5:00 PM
Tentative

Weekly

Occurs every Friday from 4:00 PM to 5:00 PM effective 1/29/2021. (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada)

Tentatively accepted

Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)

Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Nagasundaram, Sekhar (BOS)

Weekly IT and Cybersecurity Update.

Microsoft Teams meeting

Join on your computer or mobile app

Or call in (audio only)

22nd Annual SOR Report
APPENDIX - Page 1375
Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)

**Subject:** Morning Check-In: Legislative Division (Alisa Somera, Victor Young, Linda Wong, Erica Major, John Carroll, Cheryl Leger, Brent Jalipa, Lisa Lew, Jocelyn Wong) (Angela Calvillo and Eileen McHugh)

**Start:** Fri 3/5/2021 9:00 AM  
**End:** Fri 3/5/2021 9:30 AM  
**Show Time As:** Tentative

**Recurrence:** Weekly  
**Recurrence Pattern:** Occurs every weekday from 9:00 AM to 9:30 AM effective 9/21/2020.

**Meeting Status:** Not yet responded

**Organizer:** Somera, Alisa (BOS)

**Required Attendees:** Wong, Linda (BOS); Young, Victor (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); Major, Erica (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Leger, Cheryl (BOS); Lew, Lisa (BOS); Wong, Jocelyn (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)

**TeamsVtcTenantId:** [redacted]

Alisa Somera, Deputy Director will review the weekly duties with staff, administer any changes. Additionally, review operational deadlines, special handling items and documents for signature.

---

**Join Microsoft Teams Meeting**

[redacted]

---

22nd Annual SOR Report  
APPENDIX - Page 1376
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Subject:</strong></th>
<th>Work Block - Prepare the Annotated Agenda and AGENDA - CONFIRMED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Start:</strong></td>
<td>Fri 3/5/2021 10:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End:</strong></td>
<td>Fri 3/5/2021 11:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recurrence:</strong></td>
<td>Weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recurrence Pattern:</strong></td>
<td>every Friday from 10:00 AM to 10:30 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizer:</strong></td>
<td>Calvillo, Angela (BOS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Categories:</strong></td>
<td>Board Related</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)

Subject: Clerk of the Board - Live Meet
Location: Microsoft Teams

Start: Mon 3/8/2021 3:00 PM
End: Mon 3/8/2021 5:00 PM

Recurrence: Weekly
Recurrence Pattern: Occurs every Monday from 3:00 PM to 5:00 PM effective 6/22/2020. (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada)

Meeting Status: Accepted

Organizer: Nq. Wilson (BOS)
Required Attendees: Nq, Wilson (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Tse, John (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Lew, Lisa (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Leger, Cheryl (BOS); Major, Erica (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); Young, Victor (BOS); Wong, Linda (BOS); Madhwan, Nav (BOS); Shi, Bing (BOS); Wong, Jessica (BOS); Chow, Victoria (BOS); Laxman, Koko (BOS); Hickey, Jacqueline (BOS); Lagunte, Richard (BOS); Khoo, Arthur (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS)

Optional Attendees: Nugasundaram, Sekhar (BOS)

SkypeTeamsProperties:

SkypeTeamsMeeting:

SchedulingServiceUpdateUrl:

OnlineMeetingConf:

TeamsVtcTenantId:

Virtual office hours hosted by the Clerk of the Board and staff to help address legislative, operational, or administrative process questions.

Join Microsoft Teams Meeting
Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)

Subject: Operations Team Weekly Standing Meeting (Wilson Ng, Arthur Khoo, Jacqueline Hickey, Richard Lagunte) (Angela Calvillo, Eileen McHugh)

Start: Mon 3/8/2021 8:30 AM
End: Mon 3/8/2021 9:00 AM

Recurrence: Weekly
Recurrence Pattern: every Monday from 8:30 AM to 9:00 AM

Organizer: Calvillo, Angela (BOS)

Wilson Ng, Deputy Director, review weekly duties with staff, administer any changes, share information and any outstanding ideas.
Additionally, review operational deadlines, special handling items and documents for signature.

Join Microsoft Teams Meeting
Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)

Subject: Morning Check-In: Legislative Division (Alisa Somera, Victor Young, Linda Wong, Erica Major, John Carroll, Cheryl Leger, Brent Jalipa, Lisa Lew, Jocelyn Wong) (Angela Calvillo and Eileen McHugh)

Start: Mon 3/8/2021 9:00 AM
End: Mon 3/8/2021 9:30 AM
Show Time As: Tentative

Recurrence: Weekly
Recurrence Pattern: Occurs every weekday from 9:00 AM to 9:30 AM effective 9/21/2020.

Meeting Status: Not yet responded

Organizer: Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Required Attendees: Wong, Linda (BOS); Young, Victor (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); Major, Erica (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Leger, Cheryl (BOS); Lew, Lisa (BOS); Wong, Jocelyn (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)

TeamsVtcTenantId: **************

Alisa Somera, Deputy Director - review the weekly duties with staff, administer any changes, share information and any outstanding ideas.
Additionally, review operational deadlines, special handling items and documents for signature.

Join Microsoft Teams Meeting

[Link]

[Link]
Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)

Subject: Compliance Meeting - Angela Calvillo and Jackie Hickey

Start: Mon 3/8/2021 9:30 AM
End: Mon 3/8/2021 10:00 AM
Show Time As: Tentative

Recurrence: Weekly
Recurrence Pattern: Occurs every Monday from 9:30 AM to 10:00 AM effective 9/28/2020.

Meeting Status: Tentatively accepted

Organizer: Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)
Required Attendees: Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Hickey, Jacqueline (BOS)

TeamsVtcTenantId: [redacted]

Review of Weekly Board and Committee Schedules.

Review of any upcoming deadlines.

Review of Compliance and performance.

---

Join Microsoft Teams Meeting

[redacted]

[redacted]
Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)

Subject: Weekly Morning Update - Angela Calvillo, Junko Laxamana, Wilson Ng and Eileen McHugh

Start: Mon 3/8/2021 10:00 AM
End: Mon 3/8/2021 10:30 AM
Show Time As: Tentative

Recurrence: Weekly
Recurrence Pattern: Occurs every Monday from 10:00 AM to 10:30 AM effective 10/26/2020.

Meeting Status: Not yet responded

Organizer: Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)
Required Attendees: Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS)

TeamsVtcTenantId: [redacted]

Microsoft Teams meeting

Join on your computer or mobile app

[redacted]

Or call in (audio only)

[redacted]
## Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)

**Subject:** Work Block - Send Roll Call Email to Legislative Aides - CONFIRMED

**Start:** Mon 3/8/2021 10:30 AM  
**End:** Mon 3/8/2021 11:00 AM

**Recurrence:** Weekly  
**Recurrence Pattern:** every Monday from 10:30 AM to 11:00 AM

**Meeting Status:** Meeting organizer  
**Organizer:** Calvillo, Angela (BOS)

**Categories:** Board Related, Purple Category
Subject: Budget & Legislative Analyst Briefing: Angela Calvillo, Severin Campbell and Nicolas Menard - CONFIRMED

Start: Mon 3/8/2021 11:00 AM
End: Mon 3/8/2021 11:30 AM

Recurrence: Weekly
Recurrence Pattern: every Monday from 11:00 AM to 11:30 AM

Organizer: Calvillo, Angela (BOS)

Categories: BLA/AAB

Meeting to review the BLA Reports for the week.
**Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)**

**Subject:** Board Agenda Review - Alisa Somera, DCA Anne Pearson

**Start:** Mon 3/1/2021 12:00 PM  
**End:** Mon 3/1/2021 12:30 PM

**Recurrence:** Weekly  
**Recurrence Pattern:** every Monday from 12:00 PM to 12:30 PM

**Organizer:** Calvillo, Angela (BOS)

To review the agenda and prepare for the Board Meeting.
Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)

Subject: Board Agenda Review - Angela Calvillo, President Shamann Walton, Alisa Somera, DCA Anne Pearson, Natalie Gee, Tracy Gallardo, Percy Burch, Abe Evans

Start: Mon 3/8/2021 12:30 PM
End: Mon 3/8/2021 1:00 PM
Show Time As: Tentative

Recurrence: Weekly
Recurrence Pattern: Occurs every Monday from 12:30 PM to 1:00 PM effective 1/18/2021.

Meeting Status: Not yet responded

Organizer: Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)
Required Attendees: Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Gee, Natalie (BOS); PEARSON, ANNE (CAT); Gallardo, Tracy (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Evans, Abe (BOS)

Microsoft Teams meeting

Join on your computer or mobile app

Or call in (audio only)

---

---
Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)

Subject: Morning Check-In: Legislative Division (Alisa Somera, Victor Young, Linda Wong, Erica Major, John Carroll, Cheryl Leger, Brent Jalipa, Lisa Lew, Jocelyn Wong) (Angela Calvillo and Eileen Mchugh)

Start: Tue 3/9/2021 9:00 AM
End: Tue 3/9/2021 9:30 AM
Show Time As: Tentative

Recurrence: Weekly
Recurrence Pattern: Occurs every weekday from 9:00 AM to 9:30 AM effective 9/21/2020.

Meeting Status: Not yet responded

Organizer: Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Required Attendees: Wong, Linda (BOS); Young, Victor (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); Major, Erica (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Leger, Cheryl (BOS); Lew, Lisa (BOS); Wong, Jocelyn (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)

TeamsVtcTenantId: [redacted]

Alisa Somera, Deputy Director - review the weekly duties with staff, administer any changes, share information and any outstanding ideas. Additionally, review operational deadlines, special handling items and documents for signature.

Join Microsoft Teams Meeting

[redacted]
Review of Legislative Items on the Board Agenda.
Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)

**Subject:** Work Block: Board of Supervisors Meeting Prep

**Start:** Tue 3/9/2021 10:00 AM  
**End:** Tue 3/9/2021 2:00 PM

**Recurrence:** Weekly  
**Recurrence Pattern:** every Tuesday from 10:00 AM to 2:00 PM

**Organizer:** Calvillo, Angela (BOS)

**Categories:** Board Related
Calling all CCBSA Clerks!

Please join us for a CCBSA Roundtable on Wednesday, March 10, 2021 at 2:00 p.m.! The purpose of the roundtable discussion is to provide our members the opportunity to gather online and take part in LIVE discussion regarding various topics.

It will be like the CCBSA Forum.......but LIVE! The roundtable will enable Clerks to network, learn and benefit from the shared knowledge and experience through moderated dialogue around specific topics. Your CCBSA President Robin Stieler will be moderating the discussion.

To register for the event

1. Confirm your attendance ➔ Please accept this appointment to confirm your attendance. Meeting link and numbers are below.

2. Send your topics to your CCBSA President Robin Stieler ➔ Prior to the March 10, email the topic(s) you would like to discuss during the roundtable to Robin at Robin.Stieler@ocgov.com.

The Roundtable Discussions are available as an exclusive member benefit and are open to CCBSA members only. For more information on the Roundtable Discussions, please email your CCBSA President Robin Stieler at Robin.Stieler@ocgov.com.
We look forward to joining us on March 10!

Microsoft Teams meeting

Join on your computer or mobile app

Or call in (audio only)

[Redacted]
### COB Weekly Manager’s Meeting - Tentative

**Subject:** COB Weekly Manager’s Meeting - Tentative - Alisa Somera, Junko Laxamana, Wilson Ng, Jackie Hickey, Sekhar Nagasundaram

**Start:** Wed 3/10/2021 2:00 PM

**End:** Wed 3/10/2021 3:30 PM

**Recurrence:** Weekly

**Recurrence Pattern:** every Wednesday from 2:00 PM to 3:30 PM

**Meeting Status:** Meeting organizer

**Organizer:** Calvillo, Angela (BOS)

**Required Attendees:** Somera, Alisa (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Hickey, Jacqueline (BOS); Nagasundaram, Sekhar (BOS)

**Categories:** Internal Meeting

---

The meeting should not last longer than one hour, but reserve an hour and a half in case.

Eileen will send out call for agenda items the preceding week.

All managers to provide their items* to Eileen by Friday.

COB will provide agenda items by Thursday the preceding week.

Eileen will send out the Agenda by Fridays by close of business.

**Items**

- Operational or programmatic or process issues or functions impacting one or more divisions; upcoming challenges or changes impacting the department.
- Report on any employee achievements or highlights
- Purchases, events
- Employee/human resources issues
- Review Birthday celebrations
- CCBQA Conference
- Election
- Infrastructure (everything IT)
- Advice, ideas, or news for the COB

---

**Microsoft Teams meeting**

Join on your computer or mobile app

[Redacted]

Or call in (audio only)

[Redacted]
**Subject:** Work Block - Sign Legislation

**Start:** Wed 3/10/2021 4:00 PM
**End:** Wed 3/10/2021 5:00 PM

**Recurrence:** Weekly
**Recurrence Pattern:** every Wednesday from 4:00 PM to 5:00 PM

**Organizer:** Calvillo, Angela (BOS)

**Categories:** Board Related
Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)

Subject: Morning Check-In: Legislative Division (Alisa Somera, Victor Young, Linda Wong, Erica Major, John Carroll, Cheryl Leger, Brent Jalipa, Lisa Lew, Jocelyn Wong) (Angela Calvillo and Eileen McHugh)

Start: Wed 3/10/2021 9:00 AM
End: Wed 3/10/2021 9:30 AM
Show Time As: Tentative

Recurrence: Weekly
Recurrence Pattern: Occurs every weekday from 9:00 AM to 9:30 AM effective 9/21/2020.

Meeting Status: Not yet responded

Organizer: Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Required Attendees: Wong, Linda (BOS); Young, Victor (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); Major, Erica (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Leger, Cheryl (BOS); Lew, Lisa (BOS); Wong, Jocelyn (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)

TeamsVtcTenantId: [Redacted]

Alisa Somera, Deputy Director - review the weekly duties with staff, administer any changes, share information and any outstanding ideas.
Additionally, review operational deadlines, special handling items and documents for signature.

Join Microsoft Teams Meeting
[Redacted]
[Redacted]
[Redacted]
Subject: Work Block - Review Minutes from Board Meeting

Start: Wed 3/10/2021 9:30 AM
End: Wed 3/10/2021 10:30 AM

Recurrence: Weekly
Recurrence Pattern: every Wednesday from 9:30 AM to 10:30 AM

Organizer: Calvillo, Angela (BOS)

Categories: Board Related

Also any Minutes for the following weeks agenda.
Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)

Subject: EOC Briefing - (BOS, DEM, CAT, DPH, MYR, HOM)
Location: Microsoft Teams Meeting

Start: Wed 3/10/2021 12:00 PM
End: Wed 3/10/2021 1:00 PM

Recurrence: Weekly
Recurrence Pattern: every Wednesday from 12:00 PM to 1:00 PM

Meeting Status: Meeting organizer

Organizer: Calvillo, Angela (BOS)
Required Attendees: Imperial, Megan (BOS); Fregosi, Ian (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Bintliff, Jacob (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Monge, Paul (BOS); Kittler, Sophia (MYR); Mar, Gordon (BOS); PEARSON, ANNE (CAT); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Li-D9, Jennifer (BOS); Mcdonald, Courtney (BOS); Mullan, Andrew (BOS); Carroll, Maryellen (DEM); Gee, Natalie (BOS); Gallardo, Tracy (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Angulo, Sunny (BOS); Snyder, Jen (BOS); Bennett, Samuel (BOS); Herzstein, Daniel (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Berenson, Samuel (BOS); Chinchilla, Monica (BOS); Sandoval, Suhaye (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); Lerma, Santiago (BOS); Beinart, Amy (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Yu, Avery (BOS); Smeallie, Kyle (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Koeppel, Geri (BOS); Yan, Calvin (BOS); Hepner, Lee (BOS); Evans, Abe (BOS); Wright, Edward (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Quan, Daisy (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Adkins, Joe (BOS); Mundy, Erin (BOS); Temprano, Tom (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Zou, Han (BOS); RivamontesMesa, Abigail (BOS); Mahogany, Honey (BOS); Haney, Matt (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Falzon, Frankie (BOS); Kilgore, Preston (BOS); Patil, Sneha (DPH); Lim, Victor (DEM); Chan, Connie (BOS); Groth, Kelly (BOS); Tenner, Andrea (DPH); Morris, Geoffrea (BOS); Chung, Lauren (BOS); Fieber, Jennifer (BOS); Carrillo, Lila (BOS); Yu, Angelina (BOS)

Optional Attendees: Tse, John (BOS); Lindsay, Claire (DPH); Kent, Lani (DEM); Bechelli, Adrienne (DEM); Merlone, Audrey (CPC); Zamora, Francis (DEM); Fleisher, Arielle (DPH); Hogan, Kristin (DEM); MelgarStaff (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Schneider, Dylan (HOM); Jue, Tyrone (MYR); Jones, Ernest (BOS)

TeamsVtcTenantId: 

Weekly COVID-19 updates. (Pursuant to Governor Newsom’s Executive Order N-35-20)

---

Join Microsoft Teams Meeting

---

22nd Annual SOR Report
APPENDIX - Page 1397
Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)

Subject: Work Block - Review and Approve the LI and Draft Agenda

Start: Thu 3/11/2021 1:00 PM
End: Thu 3/11/2021 3:00 PM

Recurrence: Weekly
Recurrence Pattern: every Thursday from 1:00 PM to 3:00 PM

Organizer: Calvillo, Angela (BOS)

Categories: Board Related
Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)

Subject: Morning Check-In: Legislative Division (Alisa Somera, Victor Young, Linda Wong, Erica Major, John Carroll, Cheryl Leger, Brent Jalipa, Lisa Lew, Jocelyn Wong) (Angela Calvillo and Eileen McHugh)

Start: Thu 3/11/2021 9:00 AM
End: Thu 3/11/2021 9:30 AM
Show Time As: Tentative

Recurrence: Weekly
Recurrence Pattern: Occurs every weekday from 9:00 AM to 9:30 AM effective 9/21/2020.

Meeting Status: Not yet responded

Organizer: Somera, Alisa (BOS)

Required Attendees: Wong, Linda (BOS); Young, Victor (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); Major, Erica (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Leger, Cheryl (BOS); Lew, Lisa (BOS); Wong, Jocelyn (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)

TeamsVtcTenantId: [Redacted]

Alisa Somera, Deputy Director - review the weekly duties with staff, administer any changes, share information and any outstanding ideas. Additionally, review operational deadlines, special handling items and documents for signature.

---

Join Microsoft Teams Meeting
[Redacted]
Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)

Subject: Clerk of the Board - Live Meet
Location: Microsoft Teams
Start: Fri 3/12/2021 1:00 PM
End: Fri 3/12/2021 3:00 PM
Show Time As: Tentative
Recurrence: Weekly
Recurrence Pattern: Occurs every Friday from 1:00 PM to 3:00 PM effective 6/26/2020.
Meeting Status: Tentatively accepted
Organizer: Ng, Wilson (BOS); Tse, John (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Lew, Lisa (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Leger, Cheryl (BOS); Major, Erica (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); Young, Victor (BOS); Wong, Linda (BOS); Madhwan, Nav (BOS); Shiu, Billy (BOS); Wong, Jocelyn (BOS); Wong, Jessica (BOS); Chow, Victoria (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS); Hickey, Jacqueline (BOS); Lagunte, Richard (BOS); Bullock, John (BOS); Khoo, Arthur (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS)
Optional Attendees: Nagasundaram, Sekhar (BOS)

Virtual office hours hosted by the Clerk of the Board and staff to help address legislative, operational, or administrative process questions.

Join Microsoft Teams Meeting

[Redacted]
Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)

Subject: Work Block - Review Weekly Submitted Legislation

Start: Fri 3/12/2021 3:00 PM
End: Fri 3/12/2021 3:30 PM

Recurrence: Weekly
Recurrence Pattern: every Friday from 3:00 PM to 3:30 PM

Organizer: Calvillo, Angela (BOS)

Categories: Board Related
Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)

Subject: IT Update - Angela Calvillo and Sekhar Nagasundaram

Start: Fri 3/12/2021 4:00 PM
End: Fri 3/12/2021 5:00 PM
Show Time As: Tentative

Recurrence: Weekly
Recurrence Pattern: Occurs every Friday from 4:00 PM to 5:00 PM effective 1/29/2021. (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada)

Meeting Status: Tentatively accepted

Organizer: Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)
Required Attendees: Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Nagasundaram, Sekhar (BOS)

TeamsVtcTenantId: [Redacted]

Microsoft Teams meeting

Join on your computer or mobile app

Or call in (audio only)

[Redacted]
Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)

Subject: Morning Check-In: Legislative Division (Alisa Somera, Victor Young, Linda Wong, Erica Major, John Carroll, Cheryl Leger, Brent Jalipa, Lisa Lew, Jocelyn Wong) (Angela Calvillo and Eileen McHugh)

Start: Fri 3/12/2021 9:00 AM
End: Fri 3/12/2021 9:30 AM
Show Time As: Tentative

Recurrence: Weekly
Recurrence Pattern: Occurs every weekday from 9:00 AM to 9:30 AM effective 9/21/2020.

Meeting Status: Not yet responded

Organizer: Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Required Attendees: Wong, Linda (BOS); Young, Victor (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); Major, Erica (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Leger, Cheryl (BOS); Lew, Lisa (BOS); Wong, Jocelyn (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS); McHugh, Eileen (BOS)

TeamsVtcTenantId: 

Alisa Somera, Deputy Director - review the weekly duties with staff, administer any changes, share information and any outstanding ideas. Additionally, review operational deadlines, special handling items and documents for signature.

---

Join Microsoft Teams Meeting

---
Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)

Subject: Work Block - Prepare the Annotated Agenda and AGENDA - CONFIRMED

Start: Fri 3/12/2021 10:00 AM
End: Fri 3/12/2021 10:30 AM

Recurrence: Weekly
Recurrence Pattern: every Friday from 10:00 AM to 10:30 AM

Organizer: Calvillo, Angela (BOS)

Categories: Board Related
ONLINE Team Check-In

Time
9am - 10am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 1, 2021

Where

Guests

✓ angelina organizes
Frances Hsieh
Ian Fregosi
Kelly Groth

Description
Description: Zoom link

Agenda Folder:

WHO: Connie, Ian, Frances, Kelly, Angelina

Note:
All exempt information in this production is redacted in accordance with CA Government Code 6254(c), 6254(k) and Evidence Code 1040.
ONLINE: Rules Committee

Time
10am - 1pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 1, 2021

Description
Rules Committee Meetings
Scheduled as: Weekly Mondays at 10:00am
Info: https://sfbos.org/meetings/46

Staff: Ian

My Notes
IN PERSON: Self Help Vaccination Event

Time
10am - 10:45am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 1, 2021

Description
What: Self Help Vaccination Event
Who: Dr. Joseph (Joe) Woo, Anni Chung

My Notes
ONLINE BLA Briefings

Time
2pm - 2:30pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 1, 2021

Description
Microsoft Teams meeting

WHAT: Weekly BLA briefings with BLA staff

Staff: Kelly

My Notes
ONLINE SFPUC briefing

Time
2:30pm - 3pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 1, 2021

Where
(Blurred)

Description
WHAT: Meet and greet with SFPUC, agency's priorities for 2021 & D1 goals

WHO: Michael Carlin, Acting General Manager, SFPUC; Masood Ordikhani, Deputy Director, External Affairs; John Scarpulla, Policy and Public Affairs Manager

Staff: Frances
Confirmed for 3/1 at 2:30pm

Microsoft Teams meeting
ONLINE: Board Agenda Review/Digest

Time
4:15pm - 4:45pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 1, 2021

Where

Description
- Review Agenda Items: https://sfbos.org/meetings/42
- Legislation Introduced: https://sfbos.org/legislation-introduced-2021

Join Zoom Meeting

Guests
- Ian Fregosi
- Angelina organizes
- Kelly Groth
- Frances Hsieh
ONLINE: PD Mano Raju+Carolyn Goosen

Time
9:30am - 10am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Tue Mar 2, 2021

Where

Description
Meeting rescheduled as follows:
Tuesday, March 2
9:30am-10:00am

Microsoft Teams meeting
ONLINE BOS Meeting

Time
2pm - 10pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Tue Mar 2, 2021
ONLINE: Derick Brown Connect

Time
10:45am - 11:15am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Tue Mar 2, 2021

Where

Description
Scheduled as: Tues Mar 2 from 10:45-11:15

Meeting: Sup Chan/ Derick
Rescheduled as: Tuesday, March 2, 10:45am-11:15am
Via Teams
Microsoft Teams meeting

https://www.usfca.edu/news/Brown-leading-example
https://www.blackwinning.org/post/derick-brown

Derick

My Notes
ONLINE: Human Service Network (HSN)

Time
11:30am - 12pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Tue Mar 2, 2021

Where

Description
What: San Francisco Human Services Network would like to request a meeting to brief you on current issues and priorities for the nonprofit health and human services sector.

Who:
Sherilyn Adams, HSN Co-Chair (Larkin Street Youth Services)
Brett Andrews, HSN Co-Chair (PRC)
Debbi Lerman, HSN Director
Others to be determined

Staff: Frances
debbi Lerman, HSN is inviting you to a scheduled
Zoom meeting.

Join Zoom Meeting

Dial by your location
Contact:
Debbi Lerman
S.F. Human Services Network
187 Golden Gate Ave.
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 668-0444 (office)
(415) 846-4637 (mobile)
PHONE CALL: Carmen Chu Check-In (Monthly)

Time
1pm - 1:30pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Wed Mar 3, 2021

Where
dial over to Carmen's cell phone: [redacted]

Description
[for March, scheduled as March 3 at 1:00pm-1:30pm]

What: Monthly check-in CALL with Administrator Chu.

When: Scheduled as recurring on 2nd Wednesdays at 1:00pm
Connie dial over to Carmen's cell phone: [redacted]

Scheduled via: Kay Phan
FYI-BOS weekly briefing with EOC

**Time**
12pm - 1pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

**Date**
Wed Mar 3, 2021

**Where**
[Redacted]

**Description**
WHAT: Weekly Covid Command Center / EOC - BOS

WHO: Seems to be a rotating list of speakers from Covid Command Center / EOC

Staff: Frances

Join Microsoft Teams Meeting
[Redacted]
ONLINE: Hospital Council

Time
2:15pm - 2:45pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Wed Mar 3, 2021

Description
What: Meeting with Hospital Council on discussion beyond vaccination roll out, and to look into longer term issues including stockpiling program for PPE specifically for the health care workers working in San Francisco as well as other hospital services serving our housed and unhoused residents.

Who: Michon Coleman

Staff: Frances

Microsoft Teams meeting

Contact:
Michon A. Coleman
Regional Vice President | San Francisco-Marin Section

Hospital Council-Northern & Central California
235 Montgomery Street, Suite 910
San Francisco, CA 94104
Phone: 415-616-9990 (office) Personal Info.
Fax: 415-616-9992
mcoleman@hospitalcouncil.org
www.hospitalcouncil.org

My Notes
ONLINE: Jeff Hamilton

Time
12:15pm - 12:45pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Wed Mar 3, 2021

Where

Description
Join Zoom Meeting
ONLINE St. James Preschool Intro/Meet

Time
3:45pm - 4:15pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Wed Mar 3, 2021

Where

Description
What: Introductory meeting to St James Preschool, Director/Assistant Director and a few board members.

Who: Moe Jamil <[redacted]>, Lauren Keane- Shaw <[redacted]>, Olivia Tsang <olivia@stjamespreschoolsf.org>, Roger Setterfield <roger@stjamespreschoolsf.org>

confirmed for Wednesday, March 3 at 3:45-4:15pm.

Join Zoom Meeting

confirmed for Wednesday, March 3 at 3:45-4:15pm.
ONLINE Team Check-In

Time
9am - 10am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Wed Mar 3, 2021

Where

Description
Description: Zoom link

Agenda Folder:

WHO: Connie, Ian, Frances, Kelly, Angelina

Guests
- angelina organizes
  - Frances Hsieh
  - Ian Fregosi
  - Kelly Groth
ONLINE: Vaccinations Townhall (Cantonese w/ Dr. Pak)

Time
11am - 12pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Wed Mar 3, 2021

Description
we are trying to get Dr. Sunny Pak to speak at the Cantonese-only event on March 3rd at 11:00am - would that work for your office? Dr. Pak’s availability is still TBC.

My Notes
ONLINE: Ward Naughton, Jenny Lyons

Time
3pm - 3:30pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Wed Mar 3, 2021

Where
[Redacted]

Description
What: Meeting to identify ideas for discussion with subsequent broader SOAR group.

Who: Ward Naughton (+Jenny Lyons, Programs Director)

Topic: Meeting with Ward
Time: Mar 3, 2021 03:00 PM Pacific Time (US and Canada)

Join Zoom Meeting
[Redacted]
ONLINE: DOPE Project

Time
2:45pm - 3:15pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Thu Mar 4, 2021

Where

Description
What: Meet/ greet regarding Overdose Prevention, Harm Reduction in D1.

Who: Kristen Marshall, DOPE Project Manager; Laura Thomas, Harm Reduction Policy Director at SF AIDS Foundation

Staff: Ian

Microsoft Teams meeting
Contact:

Kristen Marshall (she/her)
DOPE Project Manager
628-225-2801
Based in: San Francisco, CA
marshall@harmreduction.org
harmreduction.org
ONLINE: Board Agenda Review/Digest

Time
4:15pm - 4:45pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 8, 2021

Where

Description
- Review Agenda Items: https://sfbos.org/meetings/42
- Legislation Introduced: https://sfbos.org/legislation-introduced-2021

Join Zoom Meeting

Guests
- Ian Fregosi
- angelina organizes
- Frances Hsieh

Kelly Groth
ONLINE: GAO Committee

Time
10am - 1pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Thu Mar 4, 2021

Description
Government Audit & Oversight Committee
Scheduled as: 1st & 3rd Thursday 10:00am
Info: https://sfbos.org/meetings/46

Staff: Frances

My Notes
ONLINE: Meeting w/ Myrna

Time
3:30pm - 4pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Thu Mar 4, 2021

Where
need to send invite

Description
What: one-on-one meeting with Connie and Myrna

My Notes
ONLINE: Public Bank Coalition

Time
2pm - 2:30pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Thu Mar 4, 2021

Where
[Redacted]

Description
What: Meeting introduce the Public Bank coalition, vision, and priorities for 2021

Who: SF Public Bank Coalition,

Staff: Kelly

Join Zoom Meeting
[Redacted]
note: prioritize for "office hours"

Time
11:30am - 1pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Fri Mar 5, 2021

My Notes
[awaiting link] ONLINE: SF POWER Committee re. MidMarket w/ Siu
(30min slot TBD per agenda)

Time
10am - 10:30am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Fri Mar 5, 2021

Where
forthcoming zoom

Description
Invitation for Supervisor Chan to join the SFPOWER committee zoom meeting on Friday, February 19, 2021 from 10am to 11am (or 9am to 10am), we will discuss how we can support to develop mid-Market Street of San Francisco.

Contact: Siu Cheung
ONLINE meet w/City Lobbyist (SYASL)

Time
11am - 11:30am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Fri Mar 5, 2021

Description
WHAT: meet with our City Lobbyist Firm

WHO: Paul Yoder, Erica Smith, Karen Lange (SYASL), and Eddie McCaffrey (Mayor)

Staff: Ian

Erica Smith is inviting you to a scheduled Zoom meeting.

Join Zoom Meeting
One tap mobile

Dial by your location

Thanks everyone your understanding and flexibility. Below are a couple windows that Supervisor Chan and I are available to reschedule our 30 minute virtual meeting, please
let me know what works on your end:

Wednesday, 3/3 between 10:30am and 11:30am
Friday, 3/5 between 11am and 12:30pm

Best,

Ian Fregosi  范義仁
Legislative Aide
Office of Supervisor Connie Chan
San Francisco Board of Supervisors  District 1
415–554–7412

My Notes
ONLINE Team Check-In

Time
9am - 10am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Fri Mar 5, 2021

Where

Description
Description: Zoom link

Agenda Folder:

WHO: Connie, Ian, Frances, Kelly, Angelina
ONLINE: Vaccines Townhall (English) - Connie's unique login link

Time
1:40pm - 3:20pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Fri Mar 5, 2021

Where

Description
Proposed Agenda w/ SMEs

- 1:40 PM - SMEs and Supervisor join event to troubleshoot technology and test screenshare
- 2:00 PM - Title and Housekeeping Slides by VOT
- VOT introduces Supervisor
- Supervisor Remarks
- VOT introduces SME of the Department of
Public Health
- COVID-19 Vaccine Presentation by
- VOT reminds audience to submit their questions via chat
- Q&A moderated by Katy Tang
- VOT thanks SMEs and offers Supervisor Chan to give closing remarks
- Closing Remarks
- 3:00 PM - VOT puts up closing slide and ends meeting
- Speakers and SMEs stay on for a short debrief

Registration Link: [Redacted]

My Notes
ONLINE Team Check-In

- Your response: ☑ Yes, I'm going

Time
9am - 10am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 8, 2021

Guests
- angelina organizes
- Frances Hsieh
- Ian Fregosi
- Kelly Groth

Where

Description
Description: Zoom link

Agenda Folder:

WHO: Connie, Ian, Frances, Kelly, Angelina
ONLINE: Rules Committee

Time
10am - 1pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 8, 2021

Description
Rules Committee Meetings
Scheduled as: Weekly Mondays at 10:00am
Info: https://sfbos.org/meetings/46

Staff: Ian

My Notes
ONLINE BLA Briefings

Time
2pm - 2:30pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 8, 2021

Description
Microsoft Teams meeting

WHAT: Weekly BLA briefings with BLA staff

Staff: Kelly

My Notes
ONLINE monthly briefing with CTA

Time
3pm - 3:45pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 8, 2021

Description
WHAT: Monthly briefing with SFCTA

WHO: Tilly Chang & SFCTA staff

Staff: Kelly

My Notes
ONLINE: Board Agenda Review/Digest

Time
4:15pm - 4:45pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 8, 2021

Where

Description
- Review Agenda Items: https://sfbos.org/meetings/42
- Legislation Introduced: https://sfbos.org/legislation-introduced-2021

Join Zoom Meeting
SFCTA Board Meeting
Created by: connie@conniechansf.com

Time
10am - 12pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Tue Mar 9, 2021

My Notes
ONLINE BOS Meeting

Time
2pm - 10pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Tue Mar 9, 2021

My Notes
FYI-BOS weekly briefing with EOC

Time
12pm - 1pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Wed Mar 10, 2021

Where

Description
WHAT: Weekly Covid Command Center / EOC - BOS

WHO: Seems to be a rotating list of speakers from Covid Command Center / EOC

Staff: Frances

Join Microsoft Teams Meeting
ONLINE Team Check-In

Time
9am - 10am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Wed Mar 10, 2021

Where

Description
Description: Zoom link

Agenda Folder:

WHO: Connie, Ian, Frances, Kelly, Angelina
ONLINE: State Legislation Committee

Time
11am - 12:30pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Wed Mar 10, 2021

Description
WHAT: State Legislation Committee March meeting

Staff: Ian

Colleagues,

The next State Legislation Committee Meeting will be held in three weeks on Wednesday, March 10, 2021. Details are as follows:

Date: Wednesday, March 10, 2021

Time: 11:00am - 1:00pm (unless we adjourn earlier)

Location: Webex Live Event (Details forthcoming)
The proposal template and a sample version are attached to this email for your reference. For inclusion on January’s agenda, please forward your proposals to Eddie and me no later than 5:00pm on Monday, March 1, 2021.

Rebecca Peacock (they/them)
(415) 554-6982 | Rebecca.Peacock@sfgov.org
Office of Mayor London N. Breed
City & County of San Francisco

My Notes
FYI-BOS weekly briefing with EOC

Time
12pm - 1pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Wed Mar 10, 2021

Where

Description
WHAT: Weekly Covid Command Center / EOC - BOS

WHO: Seems to be a rotating list of speakers from Covid Command Center / EOC

Staff: Frances

Join Microsoft Teams Meeting
ONLINE: Meet w/ HRC & Westside Tenants Assn.

Time
3:30pm - 4pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Wed Mar 10, 2021

Where
[Redacted]

Description
What: Current state of tenants issues on the ground from HRC

Who: Cynthia Fong, Evie Hidysmith + Westside Tenants Assn.

Join Zoom Meeting
[Redacted]
ONLINE Richmond Community Coalition (RCC) meeting

Time
9:30am - 10:30am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Thu Mar 11, 2021

Description
WHO: Richmond Community Coalition (RCC) meeting.
WHAT: Quarterly check-in with the network of CBOs and city departments that serves D1 and meets quarterly.
Staff: Angelina

Topic: Quarterly RCC Meeting: March 11
Time: Mar 11, 2021 09:30 AM Pacific Time (US and Canada)

Join Zoom Meeting

Dial by your location
Hi everyone,

How's it going? TNDC (https://www.tndc.org/property/4200-geary) will be joining us for an in-depth look at the ground floor commercial space at 4200 Geary, they are seeking a community partner to occupy the space and will release their RFP later next month. You can learn more about the project on the One Richmond website (https://www.onerichmondsf.com/housing).

If your organization is looking for a new home in the district, or a second home, this is an early opportunity to bring your proposals and meet directly with them before the RFP is released. Come and share your ideas with RCC to also get feedback and gain support. TNDC staff and their architects will go over the selection process and answer questions about the space itself.

I will send out the final agenda next week, our newly elected Supervisor, Connie Chan, will also be joining us. If you have any questions, please let me know. Thank you, I hope you're coping well and see you soon.
Naomi Hui
Community Relations Manager
Pronouns: She/Her

My Notes
ONLINE: Chief Katherine Miller re. JPD

Time
10:45am - 11:15am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Thu Mar 11, 2021

Description
Meeting: Overview of the juvenile hall closure process, DJJ closure (state detention facilities), and JPD transformative efforts

Who: Chief Katherine Miller, Steve Arcelona (JUV)

Staff: Frances

Scheduled as: Thursday, March 11 at 10:45am - 11:15am
Via Teams

Microsoft Teams meeting
Contact:

Sheryl Cowan
Executive Assistant to
Chief Katherine Weinstein Miller, and
Assistant Chief Paula Hernandez
San Francisco Juvenile Probation Department
375 Woodside Avenue, Room 243
San Francisco, CA 94127

My Notes
ONLINE: SEIU2015 Members meet

Time
2pm - 2:45pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Thu Mar 11, 2021

Description
Connie Chan 陳詩敏 is inviting you to a scheduled Zoom meeting.

Topic: Meeting with SEIU2015 Members
Time: Mar 11, 2021 02:00 PM Pacific Time (US and Canada)

Join Zoom Meeting

Dial by your location
HOLD PHONE CALL Sing Tao Radio Show

Time
9am - 10am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Fri Mar 12, 2021

Description
WHERE: Call into studio

My Notes
ONLINE Team Check-In

- Your response: Yes, I'm going

Time
9am - 10am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Fri Mar 12, 2021

Where

Guests
- angelina organizes
  - Frances Hsieh
  - Ian Fregosi
  - Kelly Groth

Description
Description: Zoom link:

Agenda Folder:

WHO: Connie, Ian, Frances, Kelly, Angelina
note: prioritize for "office hours"

Time
11am - 12pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Fri Mar 12, 2021

My Notes
CALL BACK (flexible): Lynne Beeson

Time
11:15am - 11:30am (Pacific Time
- Los Angeles)

Date
Fri Mar 12, 2021

Where

Description
What: A callback to Lynne as she reached out about schools; happy to connect by phone with Connie at her convenience.

My Notes
[send invite] ONLINE: Kathryn+Catherine re. GHwy (Office Hours)

Time
11:30am - 11:45am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Fri Mar 12, 2021

Description
What: We would LOVE to meet with Connie and discuss how the GH closure is affecting our residents.

Who: Kathryn Van Koughnett + Catherine Wenzler (they have been working to bring our group together, as well as connecting with other SF residents (two groups in the Sunset) who share same concerns.

Scheduled as 3/12 at 11:30-11:45am zoom slot.

My Notes
Time
1pm - 1:30pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Fri Mar 12, 2021

My Notes
ONLINE: Westside Affordable Housing Capacity Building

Time
1:30pm - 2pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Fri Mar 12, 2021

Description
WHAT: monthly meeting on Westside Affordable Housing Capacity Building. (meeting starts at 1pm, join if you can after Edo's parent teacher conference)

WHO: Joseph, Karoleen Feng from MEDA. D1, D4, and D7 offices. The participating CBOs will also be joining the meeting.

Staff: Ian (will be on for the full meeting)

Joseph Smooke is inviting you to a scheduled Zoom meeting.
Topic: Westside Affordable Housing w/ D1, 4, 7 Aides
Time: Mar 5, 2021 01:00 PM Pacific Time (US and Canada)
Every month on the First Fri, until Jun 3, 2022, 16 occurrence(s)
Mar 5, 2021 01:00 PM
Apr 2, 2021 01:00 PM
May 7, 2021 01:00 PM
Jun 4, 2021 01:00 PM
Jul 2, 2021 01:00 PM
Aug 6, 2021 01:00 PM
Sep 3, 2021 01:00 PM
Hi Daisy, Ian and Jen

We're wondering if it might be possible to reschedule our March meeting with the Westside CBOs?

Instead of meeting Friday, March 5, can we move it to Friday March 12? Still at 1pm?

Also- we're wondering if Supervisors Chan, Mar and Melgar might be able to join us?

--joseph
SCS: Zoom Meeting with Alex Tourk and SF SAFE

Time
11am - 12pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 1, 2021

Description
Join Zoom Meeting

[Redacted]

Passcode [Redacted]

My Notes

Note:
All exempt information in this production is redacted in accordance with CA Government Code 6254(c), 6254(k) and Evidence Code 1040.
Supervisor Stefani,

I would like to introduce myself to you as a member of your District and as commissioner on the Veterans Affairs Commission. We are spending time as a Commission reflecting on the past year and planning for the year ahead.

If you're available over the next couple of weeks for 15 minutes, I'd like the opportunity to introduce myself and discuss a few of the VAC's initiatives.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Courtney Miller
SCS: Zoom Meeting with Hotel Council

Time
1pm - 2pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 1, 2021

Where
[Redacted]
[Redacted]
[Redacted]

Description
Attendees:
chris@newdealadvisers.com - organizer
kpowers@hotelcouncilsf.org catherine.
stefani@sfgov.org laura@newdealadvisers.com
samuel.bennett@sfgov.org kevin@hotelcouncilsf.org

From: Laura Hilgart <laura@newdealadvisers.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 4, 2021 3:10 PM
To: Bennett, Samuel (BOS) <samuel.bennett@sfgov.org>
Subject: Meeting Request
Hi Sam!

I hope you are well! I am hoping to find a time with
the Supervisor for late February or early March with
the Hotel Council. This would be to reintroduce the
Supervisor to some of the policy leaders on the
Board and few of the General Managers. Please let
me know if there are any openings.
SCS: Board Prep

Time
9am - 10am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Tue Mar 2, 2021

My Notes
SCS: BOS Meeting

Created by: Kanishka Karunaratne

Time
2pm - 6pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Tue Mar 2, 2021

Where
BOS Chamber, City Hall, Room 250

My Notes
SCS: Teams SFPUC Annual Briefing

Time
2pm - 2:30pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Wed Mar 3, 2021

Description
Microsoft Teams meeting

Join on your computer or mobile app
Click here to join the meeting

Hi Andy, Frankie, Daniel, and Sam,
Hope your week is going well!

I’m writing this morning to see if the SFPUC could please schedule our annual briefing with Supervisor Stefani. We schedule these annual briefings so that our agency’s management can discuss our agency’s priorities for 2021 and learn about the Supervisor's goals for the year.

Does Supervisor Stefani have any openings in the coming weeks for this 30-minute meeting?

Thank you!

Best,

John
SCS: Monthly Call with Carmen Chu

Time
10:30am - 11:30am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Thu Mar 4, 2021

Where
SCS to Call Carmen's Cell

My Notes
Dear Supervisor Stefani,

I am reaching out to you as a member of the SF Food Security Taskforce and an employee in your district to schedule a meeting to discuss the Taskforce’s updated Food Security Priorities and Recommendations. Unfortunately, as you may know, during the Covid-19 pandemic, rates of food insecurity have more than tripled across California. So, we are eager to hear your thoughts and feedback and make recommendations to Mayor Breed and the entire Board of Supervisors as soon as possible.
As you may know, the SF Food Security Taskforce was established in 2005 by the Board of Supervisors to recommend legislative action and city-wide strategies to address hunger and enhance the food security of San Francisco residents. These actions are needed now more than ever. Members of the taskforce meet with supervisors and/or their staff at least annually to discuss food security priorities.

Please let me know some times you or your staff are available to meet after February 24, 2021 to discuss the impacts of Covid-19 on SF Food Security and our updated Food Security Priorities and Recommendations.

Thank you and I look forward to meeting with you soon!

Sincerely,

Emma Steinberg

Emma Steinberg, MD, Chef (she/her)
Pediatric Hospitalist
San Francisco Food Security
Taskforce Member
Pediatric Culinary Medicine Consultant
SCS: Zoom Meeting with Sam Lauter

Time
2pm - 3pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 8, 2021

Description

My Notes
SCS: Board Prep

Time
9am - 10am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Tue Mar 9, 2021

My Notes
SCS: Transportation Authority

Time
10am - 11am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Tue Mar 9, 2021

Description
Microsoft Teams

Join live event
Join as producer or presenter when it's time for the live event.
Do not forward this invite to the attendees.

My Notes
SCS: BOS Meeting

Time
2pm - 6pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Tue Mar 9, 2021

Where
BOS Chamber, City Hall, Room 250

My Notes
SCS: Public Safety and Neighborhood Services Committee

Time
10am - 12pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Thu Mar 11, 2021

My Notes
**Souza, Sarah (BOS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Subject:</strong></th>
<th>Staff Mtg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Start:</strong></td>
<td>Mon 3/1/2021 9:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End:</strong></td>
<td>Mon 3/1/2021 10:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recurrence:</strong></td>
<td>(none)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Topic:** Weekly Staff Meeting

**Location:** Microsoft Teams

**Attendees:** Staff members- Sunny Angulo, Lee Hepner, Calvin Yan, and Sarah Souza

**Details:** We discuss our plans and projects for each week including constituent outreach, legislation, and matters pertaining COVID 19 emergencies.

*Note:* All exempt information in this production is redacted in accordance with CA Government Code 6254(c), 6254(k) and Evidence Code 1040.
### Souza, Sarah (BOS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Subject:</strong></th>
<th>Rules Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Start:</strong></td>
<td>Mon 3/1/2021 10:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End:</strong></td>
<td>Mon 3/1/2021 12:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recurrence:</strong></td>
<td>(none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizer:</strong></td>
<td>Peskin, Aaron (BOS)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agenda can be found here: [https://sfbos.org/meetings/49](https://sfbos.org/meetings/49)

**Location:** Via Microsoft Teams

The Rules Committee shall be referred measures concerning appointments, ballot measures, except revenue measures which will be heard in the Budget and Finance Committee, Charter amendments, amendments to the Administrative Code, and Board Rules of Order.
Souza, Sarah (BOS)

Subject: Land Use Committee

Start: Mon 3/1/2021 1:30 PM
End: Mon 3/1/2021 3:30 PM

Recurrence: (none)

Organizer: Peskin, Aaron (BOS)

Agenda can be found here: https://sfbos.org/meetings/47

Location: Via Microsoft Teams

The Land Use and Transportation Committee shall be referred measures related to housing, land use, zoning, planning, rent control, transportation, the Municipal Transportation Agency, economic development, resident employment, workforce training and placement, homelessness and the environment.
Souza, Sarah (BOS)

**Subject:** Severing BUD Standing Meeting Re: BLA Briefing

**Start:** Tue 3/2/2021 8:30 AM
**End:** Tue 3/2/2021 9:00 AM

**Recurrence:** Weekly
**Recurrence Pattern:** Occurs every Tuesday from 8:30 AM to 9:00 AM effective 1/26/2021.

**Meeting Status:** Accepted

**Organizer:** Menard, Nicolas (BUD)

**Required Attendees:** Campbell, Severin (BUD); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Souza, Sarah (BOS)

**TeamsVtcTenantId:**

**Topic:** Weekly Budget and Legislative Analyst's Briefing

**Location:** Via Microsoft Teams

**Summary:** The Board of Supervisors Budget & Legislative Analyst provides independent fiscal & policy analyses, special studies and management audit reports on City departments and programs to the San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
**Souza, Sarah (BOS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject:</th>
<th>Board of Supervisors Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start:</td>
<td>Tue 3/2/2021 2:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End:</td>
<td>Tue 3/2/2021 6:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurrence:</td>
<td>(none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizer:</td>
<td>Peskin, Aaron (BOS)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Topic:** Weekly meeting

Agenda can be found here: [https://sfbos.org/meetings/42#agendas](https://sfbos.org/meetings/42#agendas)

**Details:** The Board of Supervisors responds to the needs of the people of the City and County of San Francisco, establishes city policies, and adopts ordinances and resolutions.
Souza, Sarah (BOS)

Subject:  Ben Rosenfield Standing Meeting RE: Budget Briefing

Start:  Wed 3/3/2021 4:00 PM
End:  Wed 3/3/2021 4:30 PM

Recurrence:  (none)

Organizer:  Peskin, Aaron (BOS)

Topic: Chief Account Reporting on governance and key aspects of City’s financial operations

Location: Meeting via Microsoft Teams

Attendees: Controller Rosenfield, Chief of Staff Sunny Angulo

Details: key aspects of the City's financial operations, including operating the City's financial systems and issuing its financial procedures, maintaining the City's internal control environment, processing payroll for City employees, managing the City's bonds and debt portfolio, and processing and monitoring the City's budget
Souza, Sarah (BOS)

Subject: Abigail Stewart-Kahn HSH D3 Standing Mtg

Start: Thu 3/4/2021 9:30 AM
End: Thu 3/4/2021 10:00 AM

Recurrence: (none)

Topic: Tay Navigation Center

Location: Microsoft Teams

Attendees: Abigail Stewart-Kahn, Chief of Staff Sunny Angulo

Details: Housing for transitional youth and implementation
Souza, Sarah (BOS)

Subject: Tilly Chang Re: Standing SFCTA Board Briefing
Start: Fri 3/5/2021 11:00 AM
End: Fri 3/5/2021 12:00 PM
Recurrence: (none)
Meeting Status: Accepted
Organizer: britney.milton@sfcta.org

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

Topic: Briefing and setting agenda for the full board meeting
Location: Microsoft Teams
Details: Transportation projects and overall pending items; agenda planning

Going (aaron.peskin@sfgov.org)? Yes - Maybe - No more options »

Invitation from Google Calendar
You are receiving this courtesy email at the account aaron.peskin@sfgov.org because you are an attendee of this event.
To stop receiving future updates for this event, decline this event. Alternatively you can sign up for a Google account at https://calendar.google.com/calendar/ and control your notification settings for your entire calendar.
Forwarding this invitation could allow any recipient to send a response to the organizer and be added to the guest list, or invite others regardless of their own invitation status, or to modify your RSVP. Learn More.
Souza, Sarah (BOS)

Subject: Staff Mtg

Start: Mon 3/8/2021 9:00 AM
End: Mon 3/8/2021 10:00 AM

Recurrence: (none)

Topic: Weekly Staff Meeting

Location: Microsoft Teams

Attendees: Staff members- Sunny Angulo, Lee Hepner, Calvin Yan, and Sarah Souza

Details: We discuss our plans and projects for each week including constituent outreach, legislation, and matters pertaining COVID 19 emergencies.
Souza, Sarah (BOS)

Subject: Rules Committee Meeting

Start: Mon 3/8/2021 10:00 AM
End: Mon 3/8/2021 12:00 PM

Recurrence: (none)

Organizer: Peskin, Aaron (BOS)

Agenda can be found here: https://sfbos.org/meetings/49

Location: Via Microsoft Teams

The Rules Committee shall be referred measures concerning appointments, ballot measures, except revenue measures which will be heard in the Budget and Finance Committee, Charter amendments, amendments to the Administrative Code, and Board Rules of Order.
Souza, Sarah (BOS)

Subject: Land Use Committee

Start: Mon 3/8/2021 1:30 PM
End: Mon 3/8/2021 3:30 PM

Recurrence: (none)

Organizer: Peskin, Aaron (BOS)

Agenda can be found here: https://sfbos.org/meetings/47

Location: Via Microsoft Teams

The Land Use and Transportation Committee shall be referred measures related to housing, land use, zoning, planning, rent control, transportation, the Municipal Transportation Agency, economic development, resident employment, workforce training and placement, homelessness and the environment.
Souza, Sarah (BOS)

Subject: Severing BUD Standing Meeting Re: BLA Briefing

Start: Tue 3/9/2021 8:30 AM
End: Tue 3/9/2021 9:00 AM

Recurrence: (none)

Topic: Weekly Budget and Legislative Analyst's Briefing

Location: Via Microsoft Teams

Summary: The Board of Supervisors Budget & Legislative Analyst provides independent fiscal & policy analyses, special studies and management audit reports on City departments and programs to the San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
Souza, Sarah (BOS)

Subject: SFCTA Board Meeting

Start: Tue 3/9/2021 10:00 AM
End: Tue 3/9/2021 11:00 AM

Recurrence: (none)

Subject: Transportation Authority Board

Location: Microsoft Teams

Attendees: Members of the Board

Details: Oversees project implementation as our partner agencies like SFMTA, SF Public Works, and BART use this funding to improve transportation across the city.
Souza, Sarah (BOS)

**Subject:** Board of Supervisors Meeting

**Start:** Tue 3/9/2021 2:00 PM

**End:** Tue 3/9/2021 6:00 PM

**Recurrence:** (none)

**Topic:** Weekly meeting

Agenda can be found here: [https://sfbos.org/meetings/42#agendas](https://sfbos.org/meetings/42#agendas)

Details: The Board of Supervisors responds to the needs of the people of the City and County of San Francisco, establishes city policies, and adopts ordinances and resolutions.
Souza, Sarah (BOS)

Subject: Standing Meeting with Tom Maguire
Location: Microsoft Teams Meeting

Start: Wed 3/10/2021 10:00 AM
End: Wed 3/10/2021 10:30 AM
Show Time As: Out of Office

Recurrence: (none)

Meeting Status: Accepted
Organizer: Maguire, Tom

Subject: SFMTA
Location: Via Microsoft Teams

Attendees: Tom Maguire

Details: Weekly updates on SFMTA Operations
Souza, Sarah (BOS)

Subject: Standing Meeting w/ City Administrator Carmen Chu

Start: Wed 3/10/2021 1:00 PM
End: Wed 3/10/2021 1:30 PM

Recurrence: (none)

Organizer: Peskin, Aaron (BOS)

Location: Microsoft Teams

Attendees: City Administrator Carmen Chu

Details: Monthly updates

The City Administrator’s Office comprises more than 25 departments and programs that provide a broad range of services to other city departments and the public. Examples of the Agency’s functions include public safety, internal services, civic engagement, capital planning, asset management, code enforcement, disaster mitigation, tourism promotion, and economic development.
Souza, Sarah (BOS)

**Subject:** Eric Shaw - MOHCD monthly meeting

**Start:** Wed 3/10/2021 2:00 PM

**End:** Wed 3/10/2021 3:00 PM

**Recurrence:** Monthly

**Recurrence Pattern:** Occurs every month on the first Wednesday of the month from 12:30 PM to 1:30 PM effective 7/1/2020 until 6/1/2021.

**Meeting Status:** Accepted

**Organizer:** Shaw, Eric (MYR)

**Required Attendees:** Chan, Amy (MYR); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Lee, Jonah (MYR); Ely, Lydia (MYR); Angulo, Sunny (BOS); Yan, Calvin (BOS)

**Optional Attendees:** Souza, Sarah (BOS)

**Topic:** MOHCD monthly updates

**Location:** Via Microsoft Teams
Subject: Ben Rosenfield Standing Meeting RE: Budget Briefing

Start: Wed 3/10/2021 4:00 PM
End: Wed 3/10/2021 4:30 PM

Recurrence: (none)

Topic: Chief Account Reporting on governance and key aspects of City's financial operations

Location: Meeting via Microsoft Teams

Attendees: Controller Rosenfield, Chief of Staff Sunny Angulo

Details: key aspects of the City's financial operations, including operating the City's financial systems and issuing its financial procedures, maintaining the City's internal control environment, processing payroll for City employees, managing the City's bonds and debt portfolio, and processing and monitoring the City's budget
### Souza, Sarah (BOS)

| Subject: | Abigail Stewart-Kahn HSH D3 Standing Meeting |
| Location: | Microsoft Teams Meeting |
| Start: | Thu 3/11/2021 9:30 AM |
| End: | Thu 3/11/2021 10:00 AM |
| Recurrence: | Weekly |
| Recurrence Pattern: | every 2 week(s) on Thursday from 9:30 AM to 10:00 AM |
| Meeting Status: | Accepted |
| Organizer: | Stewart-Kahn, Abigail (HOM) |
| Required Attendees: | Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Angulo, Sunny (BOS); Souza, Sarah (BOS); Emily Cohen; Schneider, Dylan (HOM) |
| Optional Attendees: | Kittler, Sophia (MYR); Keene, Joshua (ADM) |

**Topic:** Project Updates

**Location:** Microsoft Meetings

**Details:** Housing for transitional youth- Agenda to be drafted.

**Attendees:** Abigail Stewart, Chief of Staff Sunny Angulo
Souza, Sarah (BOS)

Subject: Standing meeting with Sally Oerth

Start: Thu 3/11/2021 10:00 AM
End: Thu 3/11/2021 10:30 AM

Recurrence: (none)

Organizer: Peskin, Aaron (BOS)

Topic: Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure

Attendees: Sally Oerth

Location: Microsoft Teams

Details: Monthly Updates; agenda to be prepared
Time
8am - 9am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 1, 2021

Note:
All exempt information in this production is redacted in accordance with CA Government Code 6254(c), 6254(k) and Evidence Code 1040.
Meetings

Time
9am - 9:30am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 1, 2021
Weekly BLA Check In re B&F Agenda (ARM)

Time
10:30am - 11am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 1, 2021

Guests
- Alyssa Faith Scott
- Matt Haney
- Abigail Rivamonte Mesa

Description
Join on your computer or mobile app
Click here to join the meeting

Or call in (audio only)
Weekly Mayor + Controller's Office Budget Meeting (ARM)

Time
11am - 11:30am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 1, 2021

Description
Microsoft Teams meeting

Join on your computer or mobile app

Click here to join the meeting

Or call in (audio only)
Staff Meeting

Time
11:30am - 12pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 1, 2021

My Notes

Matt Haney
Abigail Rivamonte Mesa
Courtney McDonald
Han Zou
Honey Mahogany
Venue Fund Check-in

Time
12pm - 12:30pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 1, 2021

Guests
- manny@welcometomannys.com
- Sharky Laguana
- Benny Blieman
- Matt Haney
SEIU 1021 (45min)

Time
2pm - 2:45pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 1, 2021

Description
HZ scheduled
ARM staff

Theresa, Jason, perhaps one or two other leaders from 1021, and Chema. We would like to go over some of our priorities for the next year, share some exciting updates on our priority campaigns and wrap our heads around the budget process. Requested 45 min b/c lot to cover.

My Notes
IG live (HZ)

Time
4pm - 4:30pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 1, 2021

My Notes
HOLD: 140 S. Van Ness

Time
5:30pm - 6:30pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 1, 2021

My Notes
Hold

Time
8am - 9am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Tue Mar 2, 2021

My Notes
Staff Meeting

Time
9:30am - 10am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Tue Mar 2, 2021

My Notes

Guests

- Zhihan Zou
- Matt Haney
- Abigail Rivamonte Mesa
- Courtney McDonald
Maliha Noamani

Time
10:30am - 11am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Tue Mar 2, 2021

Description
HZ added
HM staff

Join Zoom Meeting

Maliha is part of 2015 and will be in the next meeting at 11 but she wants to meet separately about an initiative that she is working on providing care packages to single/homeless mothers in D6 called Shoebox Project: http://www.shoeboxprojectusa.org/san-francisco.html

My Notes
SEIU 2015

Time
11am - 11:30am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Tue Mar 2, 2021

Description
HZ scheduled

SEIU2015 would like to arrange a meeting with you to discuss our future priorities for our members for the new year
DO NOT MOVE Board Prep

Time
1:30pm - 2pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Tue Mar 2, 2021
Board of Sup Meeting

Time
2pm - 6pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Tue Mar 2, 2021

Where
Teams

My Notes
COW on Parcel F at BOS Mtg

Time
2pm - 3pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Tue Mar 2, 2021

My Notes
Hold

Time
8am - 9am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Wed Mar 3, 2021

My Notes
Abi and Matt Budet Meeting Prep (ARM)

Time
10am - 10:30am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Wed Mar 3, 2021

My Notes
Budget & Finance Comm Mtg

Time
10:30am - 3pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Wed Mar 3, 2021

My Notes

Matt Haney
Abigail Rivamonte Mesa
Budget & Appropriations Comm

Time
1pm - 4pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Wed Mar 3, 2021

My Notes
Hold

Time
8am - 9am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Thu Mar 4, 2021

My Notes
Meetings

Time
9am - 9:30am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Thu Mar 4, 2021

My Notes
HOLD POA MEET AND CONFER

Time
9am - 10am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Thu Mar 4, 2021

Description
Added by Abi re Right to Safely Protest

My Notes
HOLD: 53 Colton groundbreaking

Time
11:30am - 12:30pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Thu Mar 4, 2021

My Notes
San Francisco Conservatory of Music

Time
1pm - 1:30pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Thu Mar 4, 2021

Description
HZ scheduled

**need to set up link**

Attendee: Justin A. Chotikul, Director of Campus Operations

Good afternoon and happy New Year. I reached out to your staff late last year and was told to email this account (to reach you or an Alissa), in the hopes of beginning to establish a relationship between your office and the residents of the Bowes Center (located within District 6, at 200 Van Ness) -- as well as the broader San Francisco Conservatory of Music (SFCM).

In case you weren't aware, SFCM worked closely with your predecessor in the planning for the construction of the Bowes Center, a process that involved temporarily relocating long-time residents at 200 Van Ness until completion of the new building. Though the Bowes Center is still undergoing construction in its basement levels and its uppermost floors, it's had occupants since last October, which include nearly all the original 200 Van Ness inhabitants as well as over 100 SFCM students.
travel time

Time
1:30pm - 2pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Thu Mar 4, 2021

My Notes
**OFFSITE** Adult Probation housing program tour

Time
2pm - 3pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Thu Mar 4, 2021

Description
HZ scheduled

Contact:
Karen.Fletcher@sfgov.org

Tour the Adult Probation housing programs in D6.

Our reentry center, the Community Assessment and Services Center (CASC), became the first behavioral health focused one-stop reentry center in the state. The CASC is managed by UCSF/Citywide, provides clinical and reentry case management, medication management and distribution, one-on-one therapy, and an array of other supportive services to approximately 4,000 justice involved adults each year. To support the work of the CASC we have strategically expanded our housing portfolio to include 14 transitional housing programs, two rental subsidy programs, and are in the final stages of implementing the City’s first mental health transitional housing program. Our housing
programs reduced homelessness by nearly 50,000 bed nights last year.
Hold

Time
8am - 9am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Fri Mar 5, 2021

My Notes
Meetings

Time
9am - 9:30am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Fri Mar 5, 2021

My Notes
OFFSITE

Time
8:45am - 10:45am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Fri Mar 5, 2021

My Notes
Staff Meeting

Time
9:15am - 9:45am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Fri Mar 5, 2021

Guests
- Matt Haney
- Abigail Rivamonte Mesa
- Courtney McDonald
- Honey Mahogany
- Zhihan Zou

My Notes
Planning re: SOMA facilities

Time
10:30am - 11am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date

Matt Haney
Courtney McDonald
HOLD: Sacramento Seminar

Time
12:30pm - 1:45pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Fri Mar 5, 2021

My Notes
HOLD: meetings

Time
9am - 12pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Sat Mar 6, 2021

My Notes
Hold

Time
8am - 9am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 8, 2021

My Notes
Meetings

Time
9am - 9:30am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 8, 2021

My Notes
Weekly check-in with labor

Time
9:30am - 10am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 8, 2021

My Notes

Matt Haney
Abigail Rivamonte Mesa
Weekly BLA Check In re B&F Agenda (ARM)

Time
10:30am - 11am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 8, 2021

Description
Join on your computer or mobile app
Click here to join the meeting

Or call in (audio only)

Guests

Matt Haney
Abigail Rivamonte Mesa
Weekly Mayor + Controller's Office Budget Meeting (ARM)

Time
11am - 11:30am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 8, 2021

Description
Microsoft Teams meeting

Join on your computer or mobile app

Click here to join the meeting

Or call in (audio only)

My Notes
Staff Meeting

Time
11:30am - 12pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 8, 2021

My Notes

Guests

- Zhihan Zou

Matt Haney
Abigail Rivamonte Mesa
Courtney McDonald
Honey Mahogany
Venue Fund Check-in

Time
12pm - 12:30pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 8, 2021

Where

Description

Guests
- manny@welcometomannys.com
- Sharky Laguana

Matt Haney
Benny Bleiman
Honey Mahogany
HOLD: MB pre-school

Time
2pm - 2:30pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 8, 2021

My Notes
Time
3pm - 3:30pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 8, 2021

Description
HZ added

Meeting with you to share a variety of projects and initiatives they are working on, including rent relief.
IG live (HZ)

Time
4pm - 4:30pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 8, 2021

My Notes
Hold

Time
8am - 9am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Tue Mar 9, 2021

My Notes
Staff Meeting

Time
9:30am - 10am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Tue Mar 9, 2021

Guests
Zhihan Zou
Matt Haney
Courtney McDonald
Honey Mahogany
TA Meeting

Time
10am - 1pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Tue Mar 9, 2021

Where
Teams

My Notes
Board of Sup Meeting

Time
2pm - 6pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Tue Mar 9, 2021

Where
Teams

My Notes
Hold

Time
8am - 9am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Wed Mar 10, 2021

My Notes
Abi and Matt Budet Meeting Prep (ARM)

Time
10am - 10:30am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Wed Mar 10, 2021

My Notes
Budget & Finance Comm Mtg

Time
10:30am - 3pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Wed Mar 10, 2021

My Notes

Matt Haney
Abigail Rivamonte Mesa
Budget & Appropriations Comm

Time
1pm - 4pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Wed Mar 10, 2021

My Notes
**OPTIONAL** TIDA Board

Time
1:30pm - 3:30pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Wed Mar 10, 2021

Description
Agenda Notes:

My Notes
Hold

Time
8am - 9am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Thu Mar 11, 2021

My Notes
Meetings

Time
9am - 9:30am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Thu Mar 11, 2021

My Notes
PSNS

Time
10am - 2pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Thu Mar 11, 2021

My Notes
Hold

Time
8am - 9am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Fri Mar 12, 2021

My Notes
Sherry Williams

Time
9am - 10am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Fri Mar 12, 2021

My Notes
Staff Meeting

Time
9:15am - 9:45am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Fri Mar 12, 2021

Guests
Zhihan Zou

Matt Haney
Abigail Rivamonte Mesa
Courtney McDonald
Honey Mahogany
Monday, March 1, 2021

Staff Meeting Weekly
Mon 3/1/2021 9:15 AM - 10:45 AM

Location: Microsoft Teams Meeting
Organizer: Melgar, Myrna (BOS)
Required Attendees: Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <Myrna.Melgar@sfgov.org>; Imperial, Megan (BOS) <megan.imperial@sfgov.org>; Low, Jen (BOS) <jen.low@sfgov.org>; Carrillo, Lila (BOS) <lila.carrillo@sfgov.org>; Fieber, Jennifer (BOS) <jennifer.fieber@sfgov.org>

Agenda stored here:

Microsoft Teams meeting

PLACEHOLDER: Land Use and Transportation Committee
Mon 3/1/2021 1:30 PM - 5:00 PM

Organizer: Fieber, Jennifer (BOS)
Required Attendees: Fieber, Jennifer (BOS) <jennifer.fieber@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>

Microsoft Teams meeting
Staff Check-In
Tue 3/2/2021 9:00 AM - 9:20 AM

Location: Microsoft Teams Meeting
Organizer: Fieber, Jennifer (BOS)

Required Attendees: Fieber, Jennifer (BOS) <jennifer.fieber@sfgov.org>; Low, Jen (BOS) <jen.low@sfgov.org>; Imperial, Megan (BOS) <megan.imperial@sfgov.org>; Carrillo, Lila (BOS) <lila.carrillo@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <Myrna.Melgar@sfgov.org>

Find the agenda in our shared google drive:

Microsoft Teams meeting

DO NOT SCHEDULE: MM in BOS Meetings
Tue 3/2/2021 2:00 PM - 8:00 PM

Wednesday, March 3, 2021

Staff Check-In
Wed 3/3/2021 9:00 AM - 9:20 AM

Location: Microsoft Teams Meeting
Organizer: Fieber, Jennifer (BOS)

Required Attendees: Fieber, Jennifer (BOS) <jennifer.fieber@sfgov.org>; Low, Jen (BOS) <jen.low@sfgov.org>; Imperial, Megan (BOS) <megan.imperial@sfgov.org>; Carrillo, Lila (BOS) <lila.carrillo@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <Myrna.Melgar@sfgov.org>

Find the agenda in our shared google drive:

Microsoft Teams meeting
EOC Briefing - (BOS, DEM, CAT, DPH, MYR, HOM)
Wed 3/3/2021 12:00 PM - 1:00 PM

Location: Microsoft Teams Meeting
Organizer: Calvillo, Angela (BOS)

Required Attendees: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Imperial, Megan (BOS) <megan.imperial@sfgov.org>; Fregosi, Ian (BOS) <ian.fregosi@sfgov.org>; Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org>; Bintliff, Jacob (BOS) <jacob.bintliff@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsa (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Monge, Paul (BOS) <paul.monge@sfgov.org>; Kittler, Sophia (MYR) <sophia.kittler@sfgov.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; PEARSON, ANNE (CAT) <Anne.Pearson@sfcityatty.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Li-D9, Jennifer (BOS) <jennifer.lid9@sfgov.org>; Mcdonald, Courtney (BOS) <courtney.mcdonald@sfgov.org>; Mullan, Andrew (BOS) <andrew.mullan@sfgov.org>; Carroll, Maryellen (DEM) <maryellen.carroll@sfgov.org>; Gee, Natalie (BOS) <natalie.gee@sfgov.org>; Gallardo, Tracy (BOS) <tracy.gallardo@sfgov.org>; Low, Jen (BOS) <jen.low@sfgov.org>; Angulo, Sunny (BOS) <sunny.angulo@sfgov.org>; Snyder, Jen (BOS) <jennifer.snyder@sfgov.org>; Bennett, Samuel (BOS) <samuel.bennett@sfgov.org>; Herzstein, Daniel (BOS) <daniel.herzstein@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Berenson, Samuel (BOS) <sam.berenson@sfgov.org>; Chinchilla, Monica (BOS) <monica.chinchilla@sfgov.org>; Sandoval, Suhagey (BOS) <suhagey.sandoval@sfgov.org>; Hsieh, Frances (BOS) <frances.hsieh@sfgov.org>; Porch, Santiago (BOS) <santiago.porch@sfgov.org>; Qian, Daisy (BOS) <daisy.qian@sfgov.org>; Burch, Percy (BOS) <percy.burch@sfgov.org>; Adkins, Joe (BOS) <joe.adkins@sfgov.org>; Mundy, Erin (BOS) <erin.mundy@sfgov.org>; Temprano, Tom (BOS) <tom.temprano@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Zou, Han (BOS) <han.zou@sfgov.org>; RivamonteMesa, Abigail (BOS) <abigail.rivamontemesa@sfgov.org>; Mahogany, Honey (BOS) <honey.mahogany@sfdph.org>; Haney, Matt (BOS) <matt.haney@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shammon (BOS) <shammon.walton@sfgov.org>; Falcón, Frankie (BOS) <frankie.falcon@sfgov.org>; Kilgore, Preston (BOS) <preston.kilgore@sfgov.org>; Patil, Sneha (DPH) <sneha.patel@sfdph.org>; Lim, Victor (DEM) <victor.lim@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Groth, Kelly (BOS) <kelly.groth@sfgov.org>; Tenner, Andrea (DPH) <andrea.tenner@sfdph.org>; Morris, Geoffrea (BOS) <geoffrea.morris@sfgov.org>; Chung, Lauren (BOS) <lauren.chung@sfgov.org>; Fieber, Jennifer (BOS) <jennifer.fieber@sfgov.org>; Carrillo, Lila (BOS) <lila.carrillo@sfgov.org>; Yu, Angelina (BOS) <angelina.yu@sfgov.org>

Optional Attendees: Tse, John (BOS) <john.tse@sfgov.org>; Lindsay, Claire (DPH) <claire.lindsay@sfdph.org>; Kent, Lani (DEM) <lani.kent@sfgov.org>; Bechelli, Adrienne (DEM) <adrienne.bechelli@sfgov.org>; Merlone, Audrey (CPC) <audrey.merlone@sfgov.org>; Zamora, Francis (DEM) <francis.zamora@sfgov.org>; Fleischer, Arielle (DPH) <arielle.fleischer@sfdph.org>; Hogan, Kristin (DEM) <kristin.hogan@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Schneider, Dylan (HOM) <dylan.schneider@sfgov.org>; Tue, Tyrone (MYR) <tyrone.tue@sfgov.org>

Join Microsoft Teams Meeting

22nd Annual SOR Report
APPENDIX - Page 1580
Supervisor Myrna Melgar / SF Human Services Network
Wed 3/3/2021 4:00 PM - 4:30 PM

Location: ____________________________
Organizer: Debbi Lerman
Required Attendees: Debbi Lerman <debbilerman@sfhsn.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Sherilyn Adams <sadams@larkinstreetyouth.org>; DPH-Brett.Andrews <Brett.Andrews@prcsf.org>

Debbi Lerman, HSN is inviting you to a scheduled Zoom meeting.

Join Zoom Meeting

Thursday, March 4, 2021

Staff Check-In
Thu 3/4/2021 9:00 AM - 9:20 AM

Location: Microsoft Teams Meeting
Organizer: Fieber, Jennifer (BOS)
Required Attendees: Fieber, Jennifer (BOS) <jennifer.fieber@sfgov.org>; Low, Jen (BOS) <jen.low@sfgov.org>; Imperial, Megan (BOS) <megan.imperial@sfgov.org>; Carrillo, Lila (BOS) <lila.carrillo@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <Myrna.Melgar@sfgov.org>

Find the agenda in our shared google drive: ____________________________
Comm. Melgar Standing Board Briefing
Thu 3/4/2021 9:15 AM - 10:00 AM
Organizer: britney.milton@sftca.org
Required Attendees: britney.milton@sftca.org <britney.milton@sftca.org>; Tilly Chang <tilly.chang@sftca.org>; maria.lombardo@sftca.org <maria.lombardo@sftca.org>; anna.laforte@sftca.org <anna.laforte@sftca.org>; Imperial, Megan (BOS) <megan.imperial@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <Myrna.Melgar@sfgov.org>;

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

Zoom Meeting Invitation - Virtual Meeting Sup. Melgar (D7) + SF SAFE
Thu 3/4/2021 10:00 AM - 11:00 AM
Location: Via Zoom (Details Below)
Organizer: info@sfsafe.org
Required Attendees: info@sfsafe.org <info@sfsafe.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <Myrna.Melgar@sfgov.org>;

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

This event has been changed.
Changed: Zoom Meeting Invitation - Virtual Meeting Sup. Melgar (D7) + SF SAFE
SF SAFE is inviting you to a scheduled Zoom meeting.

Join Zoom Meeting

Going (myrna.melgar@sfgov.org)?  Yes  -  Maybe  -  No  more options »

Invitation from Google Calendar
You are receiving this courtesy email at the account myrna.melgar@sfgov.org because you are an attendee of this event.

To stop receiving future updates for this event, decline this event. Alternatively you can sign up for a Google account at https://calendar.google.com/calendar/ and control your notification settings for your entire calendar.

Forwarding this invitation could allow any recipient to send a response to the organizer and be added to the guest list, or invite others regardless of their own invitation status, or to modify your RSVP. Learn More.

Bi-Weekly D7 Meeting
Thu 3/4/2021 1:00 PM - 2:00 PM

Organizer: Low, Jen (BOS)
Required Attendees: Low, Jen (BOS) <jen.low@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <Myrna.Melgar@sfgov.org>; Chion, Miriam (CPC) <miriam.chion@sfgov.org>; Salvadori, Ilaria (CPC) <ilaria.salvadori@sfgov.org>; Ikezoe, Paolo (CPC) <paolo.ikezoe@sfgov.org>
Join Microsoft Teams Meeting

☐ HOLD: Parkmerced (JL)
Thu 3/4/2021 3:00 PM - 4:00 PM

☐ ZOOM: Standing Meeting with Mayor Breed
Thu 3/4/2021 4:30 PM - 5:30 PM

Location:

Hello Jen,

I hope you are doing well. I am emailing to confirm Supervisor Melgar and Mayor Breed's meeting on Thursday, February 18th at 4:30pm. Below is the reoccurring link in case you need it. Thank you!

Sincerely,

Susanna

Topic: Supervisor Melgar + Mayor Breed
Time: This is a recurring meeting

Susanna Conine-Nakano
Scheduling Aide
Office of Mayor London N. Breed
City Hall Room 200
1 Dr Carlton B Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102
415-554-6147
Scheduling Office: 415-554-6601
www.sfgov.org | susanna.conine-nakano@sfgov.org

☐ ZOOM: MPIC Board Remarks
Thu 3/4/2021 7:00 PM - 7:15 PM

Organizer: Melgar, Myrna (BOS)
Required Attendees: Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <Myrna.Melgar@sfgov.org>; Joan Van Rijn <email>

Hello,

My name is Joanie van Rijn and I am the Government Affairs Coordinator for Miraloma Park Improvement Club. I
am confirming that Supervisor Melgar will be attending our monthly board meeting. We have placed her on the agenda under the section: Guests. She is welcome to attend the entire meeting, or if she needs to she can be excused after her remarks.

Could you please confirm. I will send the agenda and the link for the zoom later today.
Thank you,
Joanie van Rijn

Friday, March 5, 2021

☐ TEAMS: Staff Meeting - MM first 30 min
Fri 3/5/2021 9:30 AM - 10:30 AM
Organizer: Fieber, Jennifer (BOS)
Required Attendees: Fieber, Jennifer (BOS) <jennifer.fieber@sfgov.org>; Low, Jen (BOS) <jen.low@sfgov.org>; Carrillo, Lila (BOS) <lila.carrillo@sfgov.org>; Imperial, Megan (BOS) <megan.imperial@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <Myrna.Melgar@sfgov.org>

MM may join at beginning when needed.

Find agenda in shared folder:

Microsoft Teams meeting

☐ HOLD: Stonestown (JL)
Fri 3/5/2021 11:00 AM - 12:00 PM

☐ ZOOM: Assmb Chiu office
Fri 3/5/2021 2:30 PM - 3:00 PM
Location: ZOOM: https://caasm.zoom.us/j/96750719876?pwd=emRXVTIsUkV4SVd0cTIqI05MTCtDUT09
Organizer: Melgar, Myrna (BOS)
Required Attendees: Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <Myrna.Melgar@sfgov.org>; Low, Jen (BOS) <jen.low@sfgov.org>; Imperial, Megan (BOS) <megan.imperial@sfgov.org>; Carrillo, Lila (BOS) <lila.carrillo@sfgov.org>; Fieber, Jennifer (BOS) <jennifer.fieber@sfgov.org>
BLA Briefing: Sup. Melgar’s Office
Fri 3/5/2021 3:30 PM - 4:00 PM

Organizer: Menard, Nicolas (BUD)
Required Attendees: Menard, Nicolas (BUD) <nicolas.menard@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS)
<Myrna.Melgar@sfgov.org>; Campbell, Severin (BUD) <severin.campbell@sfgov.org>; Imperial, Megan (BOS)
<megan.imperial@sfgov.org>;

Microsoft Teams meeting
8:30 Staff Check In

Time
8:30am - 9:30am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 1, 2021

My Notes

Note:
All exempt information in this production is redacted in accordance with CA Government Code 6254(c), 6254(k) and Evidence Code 1040.
9:30 Allyson West; Staff: TT (JA)

Time
9:30am - 10am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 1, 2021

Where
Zoom

Description
Attendees:
- Allyson West

Time: Mar 1, 2021 09:30 AM Pacific Time (US and Canada)

Join Zoom Meeting

[Redacted]
Hello Allyson,

I hope you are well. Supervisor Rafael Mandelman would like to schedule a meeting with you to discuss the important work of the Collaborative Courts. I'm copying my colleague Joe Adkins who can schedule a meeting at a time that works for you and the Supervisor.

Best,

Tom Temprano 譚盼龍

My Notes
10:00 Rules Committee (JA)

Time
10am - 12pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 1, 2021

My Notes
1:00 Water Reuse Ordinance w Local 38 and PUC; Staff: JB (JA)

Time
1pm - 2pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 1, 2021

Where
zoom

Description
Attendees:
- John Scarpulla (PUC)
- Larry Mazzola (Local 38)
- Dave Fahy (Local 38)
- Aaron Stockwell (Calpipes)
- Thomas Enslow

Time: Mar 1, 2021 01:00 PM Pacific Time (US and Canada)

Join Zoom Meeting
Jacob,
Per our conversation, please find mentioned available (All Electric Ordinance) alternate expansion requirements meeting dates:

February 18, 22, 23, 24, 25 also alternate time specific dates, February 8 (Afternoon only) and February 11 (Morning only).

Let me know if any additional date options required.

Thank you,

Dave Fahy

UA Local 38 (J.A.T.C.)
2660 Newhall St.
San Francisco CA 94124
(415) 562-3838
2:00 Monthly Controller briefing; Staff: TT (JA)

Time
2pm - 2:30pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 1, 2021

Where
Teams

Description
Attendees:
- Ben Rosenfield (Controller)

Microsoft Teams meeting
2:30 Chamber of Commerce re: PFA; Staff: EM (EM)

Time
2:30pm - 3:30pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 1, 2021

Description
Attendees:
- Emily Abraham (Chamber of Commerce)

RAFI'S LINK:

Join from a PC, Mac, iPad, iPhone or Android device:
Note: This link should not be shared with others; it is unique to you.

ERIN'S LINK:

My Notes
3:45 Standing TA Briefing; Staff: JB; Contact: Britney Milton (JA)

Time
3:45pm - 4:30pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 1, 2021

Where
Zoom

Description
Topic: Comm. Mandelman Standing Board Briefing
Time: Jan 4, 2021 03:45 PM Pacific Time (US and Canada)

Join Zoom Meeting

Participants:
- Tilly Chang, SFCTA
- Maria Lombardo, SFCTA
- Anna LaForte, SFCTA
- Cynthia Fong, SFCTA
- Jesse Khoeler, SFCTA
GAO Prep; Staff: EM

Time
4:30pm - 6:30pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 1, 2021
7:00 DTNA Land Use meeting Staff: Jacob

Time
7pm - 8:30pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 1, 2021

My Notes
Intro TOD hearing (EM)

Date
Tue Mar 2, 2021 - Tue Mar 2, 2021

My Notes
FYI 8:45 Alvarado Zoom-in with Decreasing the Distance (EM)

Time
8:45am - 11am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Tue Mar 2, 2021

Where
Noe Valley Town Square, 3861 24th St, San Francisco, CA 94114, USA

Description
WHEN: Tuesday March 2, 2021, 9:30 - 11 AM
WHO: Students from SFUSD Alvarado ES
WHERE: Noe Valley Town Square
CONTACT: Cooper Marcus

My Notes
9:30 Staff Check-In

Time
9:30am - 10am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Tue Mar 2, 2021

My Notes
11:30 BLA briefing; Staff: TT (JA)

Time
11:30am - 12pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Tue Mar 2, 2021

Description
Attendees:
- Severin Campbell (BLA)
- Nicolas Menard (BLA)

Microsoft Teams meeting

My Notes
BOS Meeting
Created by: Kyle Smeallie

Time
2pm - 6pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Tue Mar 2, 2021

My Notes
9:00 Staff Check In

Time
9am - 10am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Wed Mar 3, 2021

My Notes
10:00 Castro Camera; Staff: JB (JA)

Time
10am - 10:30am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Wed Mar 3, 2021

Where
zoom

Description
Attendees:
- Elliot Richardson (NPCA)
- Terry Beswick (GLBTQ Historical Society)
- Donna Graves
- Neal Desai
- Ron Sundergill (NPCA)

Time: Mar 3, 2021 10:00 AM Pacific Time (US and Canada)

Join Zoom Meeting
[redacted]
Dear Supervisor Mandelman,

As promised, this email is to introduce you to Ron Sundergill, Elliot Richardson and Neal Desai from the National Parks Conservation Association. Also copying Donna Graves, a historic preservationist I think you may know, who has been working on the project as well.

They would love to connect with you and tell you about this exciting new campaign to gain official national recognition of Harvey Milk's Castro Camera site via the National Park Service.

I'll let them follow-up with you directly to provide more details in hopes of winning your support.

Thanks,

Terry
--
10:30 Michael Theriault; Staff: TT (JA)

Time
10:30am - 11am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Wed Mar 3, 2021

Where
zoom

Description
Time: Mar 3, 2021 10:30 AM Pacific Time (US and Canada)

Join Zoom Meeting
I’ve applied for reappointment to the Board of Directors of the Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District, where I’ve served the City since 2011, lately as First Vice President. The Supervisor knows me, but if he’d like to chat before I come before the Rules Committee, I’m at [redacted]

Michael Thériault
CCC briefing; Staff: EM

Time
12pm - 1pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Wed Mar 3, 2021

Description
Join Microsoft Teams Meeting
12:30 Castro CBD safety cameras (Andrea); Staff: TT (JA)

Time
12:30pm - 1pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Wed Mar 3, 2021

Where
zoom

Description
Attendees:
- Andrea Aiello

Time: Mar 3, 2021 12:30 PM Pacific Time (US and Canada)

Join Zoom Meeting
Hi Joe,
Rafael suggested that the three of us have a video call....soon.. to discuss this topic....the Castro CBD's plans to hold a town hall re: public safety cameras.

Thank you,
Andrea
2:00 Newsha Ajami re: water reuse; Staff: JB (JB)

Time
2pm - 2:30pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Wed Mar 3, 2021

Where

Description
Time: Mar 3, 2021 02:00 PM Pacific Time (US and Canada)

Join Zoom Meeting

Password
Dear Dr. Ajami,

Congratulations on your appointment to the Commission! The Supervisor is interested in pursuing updates to the City's water reuse program this year and asked me to reach out to schedule a time for us to talk about this and learn from your expertise in this area.

Would any of the following times work for a 30-minute virtual meeting?

- Friday 2/12 12:30-1:00
- Wednesday 2/17 2:30 - 3:00
- Thursday 2/18 4:30 - 5:00
- Monday 2/22 4:30 - 5:00

Please let me know if there are other times that work better for you over the next couple of weeks and we can see if anything would work.

Thank you,

Jacob
2:30 Berniecrats Prop K; Staff: JB TT? (JA)

Time
2:30pm - 3pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Wed Mar 3, 2021

Where
zoom

Description
Attendees:
- Laksh Bhasin (Berniecrats SF)

Time: Mar 3, 2021 02:30 PM Pacific Time (US and Canada)

Join Zoom Meeting
Hi Joe, Jacob, and Supervisor Mandelman,

Thank you for getting back to us. I've checked in with our attendees (Simone Manganelli, Pat Koren, and Calvin Quick) and Wednesday 03/03 2:30-3:00 PM works best for us.

Would you be able to send us a meeting link?

We also wanted to meet with your office as Supervisor Mandelman sits on the Rules Committee. We are supporting a few applicants for the Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board, which has to have its first meeting before March 13. At the moment, I don't believe a Rules hearing has been scheduled. We have also been working with Supervisor Preston about this Board.

The SF Berniecrats Housing Committee is currently supporting the following folks (and I have attached our applications):
- Seat 5 or 6:
- John Baranski, Professor of History and author of "Housing the City by the Bay" on the history of the SF Housing Authority
- Seat 7: Shanti Singh, Communications and Legislative Director at Tenants Together
- Seat 8: Alex Lantsberg, IBEW 6 and Building Trades
- Seats 10-11:
- Calvin Quick, District 5 Youth Commissioner
- Myself
Thank you,
Laksh Bhasin
Coordinator, SF Berniecrats Housing Committee

Dear Supervisor Mandelman and staff,

Thank you for supporting last year's Proposition K, to allow the City to produce up to 10,000 units of municipal social housing. Over 73% of SF voters approved Prop K, providing SF a mandate to create a first-in-the-nation Municipal Housing for All program.

The group I represent helped write Prop K. We have recently been meeting with Supervisor Preston's office, and wanted to reach out to you about the next steps of implementing municipal housing. The main thing we are hoping to discuss are your thoughts on what should be priorities in municipal housing pilot program legislation. We were also hoping to discuss the Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board, which could recommend a municipal housing pilot program from Prop I revenues, and ask your support for the Prop I supplemental appropriation proposed by Supervisor Preston.

Two of us (myself and Calvin Quick, CC'd) are applying for the Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board, which we hope will be heard at the Rules Committee in the coming weeks.

Would you or your staff be free to meet about this? I have CC'd some interested attendees, including two constituents. In general, we're free to meet any time except Mondays 10:30-14:00 and Fridays 14:00-15:00, though we prefer meeting after 14:00 on weekdays - if at all possible. If you...
can provide us with a few options, we will get back.

Thank you,
Laksh Bhasin
Coordinator, SF Berniecrats Housing Committee
Neighborhood Walk

Time
3pm - 6pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Wed Mar 3, 2021

My Notes
8:30 Staff Check-In

Time
8:30am - 9am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Thu Mar 4, 2021

My Notes
9:00 Castro Merchants Association Meeting; Staff: TT (JA)
Created by: Kyle Smeallie

Time
9am - 10:30am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Thu Mar 4, 2021

Where
Zoom

My Notes
10:00 Government Audit & Oversight Committee (JA)

Time
10am - 1pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Thu Mar 4, 2021

My Notes
1:00 Dale Milfay follow-up; Staff: EM (JA)

Time
1pm - 1:30pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Thu Mar 4, 2021

Where
zoom

Description
Time: Mar 4, 2021 01:00 PM Pacific Time (US and Canada)
Hi Joe

Let’s try for Thursday March 4 1-1:30 for our 30 min meeting. I just spoke with Ginny and she agrees.

Please take note of both of our cell phone numbers for your records

Dale Milfay [Redacted]
Virginia Spiegel (Ginny) [Redacted]

Ginny was on the Mental Health Board for three terms and is an LSCW and a family member like I am.

Thanks so much for facilitating this so quickly
Dale

My Notes
1:30 List review; Staff: TT, EM, JB, DB (JA)

Time
1:30pm - 2pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Thu Mar 4, 2021

Where
Microsoft Teams

My Notes
Hi Everyone,

We’re looking forward to the tour on March 4th. Here is the agenda:

- 2pm: Meet at 564 6th Street (Community Assessment and Services Center)
  - walk to 226 6th Street (Sharon Hotel) – walk to 235 Eddy Street (Drake Hotel)

Other APD-funded programs in D6:

- CW Hotel: 917 Folsom Street
· Hart Hotel: 93 6th Street
· Shahil Hotel: 664 Larkin Street

My Notes
Budget Priorities; Staff: TT, EM, JB (JA)

Time
5pm - 5:30pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Thu Mar 4, 2021
9:30 Staff Check In

Time
9:30am - 10:30am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Fri Mar 5, 2021

My Notes
Agenda Review / Rules Review + interviews

Time
10:30am - 11am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Fri Mar 5, 2021

Description
Time: Mar 5, 2021 10:30 AM Pacific Time (US and Canada)

Join Zoom Meeting
10:30 - 10:40 - Calvin Quick

My Notes
11:00 Sean Elsbernd + Jeff Gee; Staff: JB (JA)

Time
11am - 11:30am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Fri Mar 5, 2021

Where
zoom

Description
Attendees:
- Sean Elsbernd
- Supervisor Rafael Mandelman
- Councilmember Jeff Gee
Topic: Jeff Gee with Sup. Mandelman & Sean Elsbernd

Time: Mar 5, 2021 11:00 AM Pacific Time (US and Canada)

Join Zoom Meeting

[Zoom Meeting Link]
11:30 Mission Dolores Neighborhood Survey & Context Timeline; Staff: JB (JA)

Time
11:30am - 12pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Fri Mar 5, 2021

Where
zoom

Description
Attendees:
- Peter Lewis (Mission DNA)

Time: Mar 5, 2021 11:30 AM Pacific Time (US and Canada)

Join Zoom Meeting
[Redacted]
Hi Peter,

I hope you've been well. The Supervisor wanted to check in with you about the MD historic district. We got an update from Planning after the community meeting was pushed back, and they have provided the below information about possible timelines for advancing this. We would like to discuss and hear your thoughts about the best way forward.

I'm copying Joe Adkins here who can suggest a few times for a virtual meeting over the next couple of weeks.

Thank you,

Jacob
12:00 Tandem; Staff: TT (JA)

Time
12pm - 12:30pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Fri Mar 5, 2021

Where
zoom

Description
Attendees:
- Margaret Daoud-Gray (Tandem)

Time: Mar 5, 2021 12:00 PM Pacific Time (US and Canada)

Join Zoom Meeting
Dear Supervisor Mandelman

Thank you for everything you and your team are doing to support both public health and education in San Francisco.

I am both a resident of D8 and Director of Development with Tandem, Partners in Early Learning, a nonprofit organization working at the intersection of social justice, early childhood, and family engagement. We have been providing programs and services in San Francisco, and specifically in D8, for over a decade.

I am emailing to discuss critical funding needs. Tandem has historically been funded by the City and County, allowing us to serve every single SFUSD preschool classroom, all of the major childcare agencies, and in-home childcare providers. Due to budgetary constraints, we are facing a loss of public funding. This loss of funding for early education broadly has huge equity implications because it widens the opportunity gap before kids even reach kindergarten and a lack of high-quality childcare strains workforce participation for working parents.

We would also like to get to know you and your staff and find opportunities to partner with your office on Tandem’s work to support children, families, and early childhood educators in your district. Opportunities could include book and activity packet distributions, or to have you join us for a classroom read aloud or parent workshop in the future.

Could you please let me know some 20-30 minute windows over the next few weeks when you are available to meet?
I've included a few additional materials to learn about our work and an invitation to an upcoming author panel. Please feel free to share the invitation with your constituents.

- Annual Impact Report: this gives a good overview of our programming. Since this was released, we've increased the scope and scale of our virtual programming and book giveaways.
- 3-minute video: since we can't offer a site visit during this time, I hope this short video gives you a better sense of Tandem programming.
- Tandem Author Panel: Celebrating Black Voices in Children's Literature, February 24th at 6pm. Join us to hear four favorite Tandem authors talking about why they write, what their books are about, and what they want children and grownups to take away from reading them!

Thank you so much -- I look forward to connecting.

Best,
Margaret

Margaret Daoud-Gray

Director of Development
Pronouns: She, her, hers
Tandem, Partners in Early Learning
Office: (510) 296-5462
12:30 Dir. Remington; Staff: TT (JA)

Time
12:30pm - 1pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Fri Mar 5, 2021

Where
Teams

Description
Microsoft Teams meeting
Hi Joanne,

Thanks for chatting earlier! Per our conversation I’m looping in my colleague Joe Adkins who is currently OOO but can work on scheduling a meeting with the Supervisor and Director Remington once he returns.

Best,

Tom Temprano 譚昐龍

My Notes
1:00 Don Reuter; Staff: TT (JA)

Time
1pm - 1:30pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Fri Mar 5, 2021

Where
zoom

Description
Time: Mar 5, 2021 01:00 PM Pacific Time (US and Canada)

Join Zoom Meeting
Hi, Tom,

Yes, absolutely - let's you and I have a call sometime later this week. But with the understanding that we also maintain the one on Friday, March 5th, with Rafael.
In fact, I appreciate this interaction - in that it could help myself (and others) get a truer and advance awareness of what Rafael (and yes, even Mayor Breed) can - or cannot - do to facilitate this process; and so that that conversation is as meaningful as possible.

Let me know what time works best for you; I am better late mornings or early afternoons!

best

Don

My Notes
3:30 Hummingbird; Staff: EM (JA)

Time
3:30pm - 4pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Fri Mar 5, 2021

Where
Zoom

Description
Attendees:
- Sneha Patil (DPH)
- Dr. Hali Hammer
- Luis Calderon (DPH)
- Kelly Hiramoto (DPH)

Time: Mar 5, 2021 03:30 PM Pacific Time (US and Canada)

Join Zoom Meeting
Hi Joe,

The DPH team can do Friday March 5th from 3:30-4pm. Dr. Hali Hammer, Luis Calederon, Deputy Director of Transitions, and Kelly Hiramoto will attend.

Erin, Dr. Hammer or I can speak regarding SCRT and Street Medicine, if there are specific questions that you have or are hoping to be addressed let us know so we can have that for the meeting. Angelica's schedule very busy and Luis and Kelly will be working closely with her and the team regarding admissions. If you would like HSH to attend that request may be best coming from you, but I can also reach out to Mecca letting her know this is the confirmed time.

Sneha Patil, MPH
Director, Office of Policy and Planning
San Francisco Department of Public Health
sneha.patil@sfdph.org I 415-554-2795
4:00 BLA Briefing; Staff: TT (JA)

Time
4pm - 4:30pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Fri Mar 5, 2021

Where
Teams

Description
Attendees:
- Severin Campbell
- Nicolas Menard

Microsoft Teams meeting
9:00 Staff Check In

Time
9am - 10am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 8, 2021

My Notes
10:00 Rules Committee (JA)

Time
10am - 12pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 8, 2021

My Notes
2:30 Quentin Kopp + David Lee re: Recology; Staff: EM (JA)

Time
2:30pm - 3pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 8, 2021

Where
Conference Call

Description
Quentin Kopp + David Lee

My Notes
3:30 Troy Kashanipour re: 1846 Grove; Staff: JB (JA)

Time
3:30pm - 4pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 8, 2021

Where
zoom

Description
Time: Mar 8, 2021 03:30 PM Pacific Time (US and Canada)

Join Zoom Meeting

[Redacted]
Dear Supervisor Mandelman and Staff,

Thanks for the meeting today. I really appreciate the efforts to incentivize more dwelling units and like the 4-plex corner lot idea. I am currently working with a client on a proposal for a rare empty corner, assuming a lot split is approved. I have tried to push them into more units and presented options for both a single family and two unit town-house concept.

Maybe I do not understand the 2500 sqft threshold and where that would apply. I have clients that are trying to get that space inside the envelope such as behind the garage, in the attic through dormers, or the exempted infill that are permits that do not require 311 notification. The discretionary process DR and CU are indeed a stick. I think the 2500 sqft threshold for the CU is a low but personally am not against the concept if it leads to more units.

I also want to talk to you about the project at 1846 Grove Street and your vote to reverse the approval of Planning Commission. We certainly do not feel that the reversal of 3 years of work and approvals by Planning, Building, and Fire was justified. We are considering where to go from here and would like to have a friendly dialog about this as you are my Supervisor. Please let me know when we can
chat.

Thanks again,

Troy

Troy Kashanipour Architecture. LEED AP
2325 Third Street Suite 401
San Francisco CA, 94107
phone/fax: 415.431.0869
cell: 415.290.8844
e-mail: tk@tkworkshop.com

My Notes
9:00 Staff Check-In

Time
9am - 9:30am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Tue Mar 9, 2021

My Notes
9:30 Captain Jones Intro meeting; Staff: EM (JA)

Time
9:30am - 10am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Tue Mar 9, 2021

Where
zoom

Description
Attendees:
- Captain Nicole Jones (POL)

Time: Mar 9, 2021 09:30 AM Pacific Time (US and Canada)

Join Zoom Meeting
10:00 SFCTA Board Meeting; Staff: JB (JA)

Time
10am - 12pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Tue Mar 9, 2021

Where
Teams

My Notes
BOS Meeting
Created by: Kyle Smeallie

Time
2pm - 6pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Tue Mar 9, 2021

My Notes
9:00 Staff Check In

Time
9am - 10am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Wed Mar 10, 2021
10:00 Detour group; Staff: TT, DB (JA)

Time
10am - 10:30am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Wed Mar 10, 2021

Where
zoom

Description
Attendees:

- Brittney Beck
- Tiffny Chung
- Shawn Vergara
- Andrea Aiello
- Dave Karraker
- Mat Schuster
- Sharky Laguna
- Jorge Rivas (ECN)
- Amy Sawyer (MYR)
Time: Mar 10, 2021 10:00 AM Pacific Time (US and Canada)

Join Zoom Meeting
Hi All,

Thank you for all of your feedback. Supervisor Mandelman would be happy to meet with this group to discuss the City’s response to encampments, his A Place for All legislation and other efforts to make the streets safer for everyone. I’m looping in my colleague Joe Adkins who can help coordinate that meeting if you all are interested.

Best,

Tom Temprano 譚盼龍

My Notes
CCC briefing; Staff: EM

Time
12pm - 1pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Wed Mar 10, 2021

Description
Join Microsoft Teams Meeting

My Notes
2:00 HSN update; Staff: TT (JA)

Time
2pm - 2:30pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Wed Mar 10, 2021

Where
zoom

Description
Attendees:
- Debbi Lerman (HSN)
- Sherilyn Adams (Larkin Street Youth Services)
- Brett Andrews (DPH)

Topic: Sup. Rafael Mandelman and HSN

Time: Mar 10, 2021 02:00 PM Pacific Time (US and Canada)

Join Zoom Meeting
Dear Supervisor Mandelman:

The San Francisco Human Services Network would like to request a meeting to brief you on current issues and priorities for the nonprofit health and human services sector. The meeting would include a
small group of HSN representatives, including our Co-Chairs, Sherilyn Adams (Larkin Street Youth Services) and Brett Andrews (PRC). I am available to work with your staff to schedule a meeting at your convenience.

Thank you for considering this request!

-- Debbi Lerman, HSN

Debbi Lerman
S.F. Human Services Network
187 Golden Gate Ave.
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 668-0444 (office)
(415) 846-4637 (mobile)
Neighborhood Walk

Time
3pm - 6pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Wed Mar 10, 2021

My Notes
Corbett Heights Neighbors Board meeting re: Monster Homes/fourplex; Staff: JB (JB)

Time
7pm - 8pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Wed Mar 10, 2021

Description
Bill Holtzman invited RM to join CHN Board to discuss monster homes and fourplex.

My Notes
8:00 Staff Check-In

Time
8am - 8:30am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Thu Mar 11, 2021

My Notes
19th Annual Arc Breakfast

Time
8:30am - 10:30am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Thu Mar 11, 2021

Description
Dear Supervisor Mandelman,

We invite you to join us as a member of the Honorary Committee at the 19th Annual Arc Breakfast on Thursday, March 11, 2021. This truly challenging year, brought on by the COVID-19 shutdown, forced us to postpone our fall 2020 Annual Arc Breakfast to this coming March. This upcoming event will be a virtual one, an Arc Breakfast like no other!

Since 1951, The Arc San Francisco has supported people with intellectual and developmental disabilities to lead better lives. Together with our business and community partners, The Arc SF helps adults with autism, Down syndrome, cerebral palsy and other intellectual disabilities to realize their
highest potential. Support for The Arc San Francisco means jobs, housing and health care for over 850 clients. More than 300 clients of The Arc are presently employed or in employment training, and their employers report back to us a 90% satisfaction rate!

We count on business partnerships to sustain our work and provide more opportunities for our clients. Our model of partnership and mutual benefit has been tested and proven. The Annual Arc Breakfast attracts more than 250 business, community and non-profit leaders with a client-led program that is informative and inspiring.

We hope you will lend your name as a member of the Honorary Committee. Below, please find Benefits and Expectations of Honorary Committee members. We request your acceptance by February 1, 2021. Invitations will be emailed in mid-February.

We would be honored to list you as an Honorary Committee member this year. Please mark your calendar for the 19th Annual Arc Breakfast. We hope you will join us!

Sincerely,

Marti Sullivan, Senior Director, Development & Communications

Benefits of Acceptance:

1) Inclusion in all pre- and post-event publicity and PR materials, print and online;

2) Direct link to your organization in online components of major marketing campaign

3) Recognition in the event program
Expectations of Honorees - Participation and support of the event by:

1) The use of your name, listed as member of the Honorary Committee, on all PR and marketing material specifically related to the Arc Angel Breakfast.

2) Your attendance at the event and financial support if possible.

3) Your efforts to assist us in securing sponsorships and attendees if possible.

4) Your sharing names of those who you think might enjoy the event so that we can mail them an invitation.
10:00 ABAG RPC: Staff: JB (JA)

Time
10am - 12pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Thu Mar 11, 2021

Where
Zoom
1:00 Kara Chien, conservatorships; Staff: EM (JA)

Time
1pm - 1:30pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Thu Mar 11, 2021

Where
zoom

Description
Time: Mar 11, 2021 01:00 PM Pacific Time (US and Canada)

Join Zoom Meeting
Hi Kara,

I hope your week is off to a good start. Roma Guy suggested that Supervisor Mandelman meet with you to hear about your experience with conservatorships for folks in jail. Joe, copied here, can help us find some potential dates for a Zoom meeting.

Thanks,
Erin

My Notes
3:00 Standing Meeting with Mayor Breed (JA)

Time
3pm - 3:30pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Thu Mar 11, 2021

Description
Topic: Supervisor Mandelman + Mayor Breed
Time: This is a recurring meeting Meet anytime

Join Zoom Meeting
Selina Sun
Director of Scheduling
Office of the Mayor
City and County of San Francisco
415-554-6910
C: 415-530-8011
www.sfgov.org | selina.sun@sfgov.org
My Notes
3:30 14th St DTNA Calming Proposal; Staff: JB (JB)

Time
3:30pm - 4pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Thu Mar 11, 2021

Description
Participants:

- Kevin Riley Jr, DTNA
- Kimyn Braithwaite, DTNA
- Shannon Cairns, DTNA
- Peter Albert, DTNA
- Joel Ramos, SFMTA
- Bryant Woo, SFMTA
- Damon Curtis, SFMTA
- Priyoti Ahmed, SFCTA

My Notes
8:30 SFHAC Regulatory Committee re: monster homes and fourplexes; Staff: JB (JB)

Time
8:30am - 10am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Fri Mar 12, 2021

Where
Jake will follow up with Zoom

Description
Organizers:
- Corey Smith, SFHAC
- Jacob Price, SFHAC
- Todd David, SFHAC
10:00 Staff Check In

Time
10am - 11am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Fri Mar 12, 2021

My Notes
Agenda Review / Rules Review

Time
11am - 12pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Fri Mar 12, 2021
12:00 Civil Stay Away Orders; Staff: TT, EM, DB (JA)

Time
12pm - 12:30pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Fri Mar 12, 2021

Where
teams

Description
+ Megan Ryan
+ Peter Keith

My Notes
3:00 Chris Wright meeting re PFA; Staff: EM (JA)

Time
3pm - 3:30pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Fri Mar 12, 2021

Where
zoom

Description
Hello Joe,

I'm following up on a conversation I believe Sharky Laguna has had with your office about Supervisor Mandelman joining our business group call on March 12 at 3 pm. The call's login information is below.

We look forward to the conversation. Let me know if you have any questions. Thanks.
Chris
4:00 BLA Briefing; Staff: TT (JA)

Time
4pm - 4:30pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Fri Mar 12, 2021

Where
Teams

Description
Attendees:
- Nicolas Menard (BLA)
- Severin Campbell (BLA)

Microsoft Teams meeting
10:00 Virtual Office Hours; Staff: JB (JA)

Time
10am - 1pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Sat Mar 13, 2021

Description
10:00 - 10:10) Jason McCune
10:15 - 10:25) HOLD Gary Naham
10:30 - 10:40) HOLD John Hooper
10:45 - 10:55)
11:00 - 11:10)
11:15 - 11:25)
11:30 - 11:40)
11:45 - 11:55)
12:00 - 12:10)
12:15 - 12:25)
12:30 - 12:40)
12:45 - 12:55)

Join Zoom Meeting
Phone call catch up

Time
9am - 10am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 1, 2021

My Notes

Note
All exempt information in this production is redacted in accordance with CA Government Code 6254, 6254(k) and Evidence Code 1040.
D9 Monday Office Meetings

Created by: jenniferli.d9@gmail.com

Time
10am - 12pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 1, 2021

Description
Jennifer Li is inviting you to a scheduled Zoom meeting.

Join Zoom Meeting

My Notes
TEAMS: Administrator Carmen Chu Monthly Meeting

Created by: jenniferli.d9@gmail.com

Time
2pm - 2:30pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 1, 2021

Description
JL

Microsoft Teams meeting

My Notes
Hold mayor budget

Time
3pm - 4pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 1, 2021

My Notes
COW - Hearing Transbay Parcel F

Created by: jenniferli.d9@gmail.com

Date
Tue Mar 2, 2021 - Tue Mar 2, 2021

Description
JL

COW - Hearing - Consent to Provisions of a Variation Decision - 542-550 Howard Street (Transbay Parcel F) (File No. 210093) (Scheduled pursuant to Motion M21-017, approved on 2/2/21)

My Notes
Hillary 1st on roll call

Date
Tue Mar 2, 2021 - Tue Mar 2, 2021

My Notes
Tentative Map Appeal 424-434 Francisco St

Created by: jenniferli.d9@gmail.com

Date

Tue Mar 2, 2021 - Tue Mar 2, 2021

Description

JL

Tentative Map Appeal
(File Nos. 201379-201382)
424-434 Francisco Street
(District 3)
(Appellant: Scott Emblidge of Moscone Emblidge & Rubens, on behalf of the Owners of 424, 426, 428, 430, 432, and 434 Francisco Street)
(Filed 12/14/20)

My Notes
Phone call catch up

Time
9am - 10am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Tue Mar 2, 2021

My Notes
Board of Supervisors Meeting

Created by: jenniferli.d9@gmail.com

Time
2pm - 6pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Tue Mar 2, 2021

Description
Created by Sheila Chung

My Notes
Phone call catch up

Time
9am - 10am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Wed Mar 3, 2021

My Notes
EOC call every Wed

Time
12pm - 1pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Wed Mar 3, 2021

Description
JL

JoinMicrosoft Teams Meeting

My Notes
Budget Budget and Appropriations Meeting

Created by: jenniferli.d9@gmail.com

Time
1pm - 4pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Wed Mar 3, 2021

Description
JL

My Notes
Portola Community Meeting

Time
6pm - 7pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Wed Mar 3, 2021

Description
JL

My Notes
Phone call catch up

Time
9am - 10am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Thu Mar 4, 2021

My Notes
HOLD: D9 Vaccine Townhall
Created by: jenniferli.d9@gmail.com

Time
12pm - 1pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Thu Mar 4, 2021

Description
JL

My Notes
TA Briefing on TA - call info below

Time
1pm - 1:30pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Thu Mar 4, 2021

Description
AB

Comm Ronen Standing TA
Changed:
Calendar

amy.beinart@sfgov.org

Who

•

jen.shader@sfcta.org - organizer, optional

•

alberto.quintanilla@sfcta.org - creator, optional

•

Tilly Chang

•

amy.beinart@sfgov.org
•

maria.lombardo@sfcta.org

•

cynthia.fong@sfcta.org

•

anna.lafort@sfcta.org

My Notes
Eric Shaw check-in

Time
2:30pm - 3pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Thu Mar 4, 2021

Description
AB

JoinMicrosoft Teams Meeting

Learn more about Teams | Meeting options

Felicia.Gotthelf@sfgov.org

My Notes
HOLD-Domestic Worker Leg

Time
4pm - 5pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Thu Mar 4, 2021

My Notes
Phone call catch up

Time
9am - 10am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Fri Mar 5, 2021

My Notes
Treatment on Demand Coalition MHSF Updates

Time
10am - 10:30am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Fri Mar 5, 2021

Description
Here is the zoom link:
Topic: Treatment On Demand

Time: This is a recurring meeting Meet anytime

Join Zoom Meeting
PHONE Marcos Gutierrez Show
Created by: Carolina Morales A.

Time
10:30am - 11am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Fri Mar 5, 2021

Description
CM

My Notes
D9 Friday Office Meetings

Time
11am - 12pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Fri Mar 5, 2021

Description
Go over Tues Board meeting Agenda
Jennifer Li is inviting you to a scheduled Zoom meeting.

Join Zoom Meeting

My Notes
CPA Shaw Shan Liu and Supervisor Ronen
Created by: jenniferli.d9@gmail.com

Time
12:30pm - 1pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Fri Mar 5, 2021

Where

Description
Jennifer Li she/her is inviting you to a scheduled Zoom meeting.

Join Zoom Meeting


SFMTA monthly check-in
Created by: jenniferli.d9@gmail.com

Time
2pm - 2:30pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Fri Mar 5, 2021

Description
JL

firstFridays at 2pm

Microsoft Teams meeting

[Redacted content]
Hold-Domestic Worker

Time
3pm - 4pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Fri Mar 5, 2021

My Notes
Ingrid Mezquita, OECE Director

Time
4:30pm - 5pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Fri Mar 5, 2021

Description

Apologies for the scheduling conflict last time we tried but I am hoping that we can reschedule a meeting with Supervisor Ronen and Ingrid Mezquita, Director of the SF Office of Early Care and Education.

Ingrid is requesting an opportunity to brief Supervisor Ronen on the vision of OECE for 0-
5 year olds in San Francisco, provide a snapshot of services for young children and families in District 9, highlight trends in early care and education in the city and hear Supervisor Ronen’s priorities for early education in D9.

I am wondering if any of the dates/times below might also work for Supervisor Ronen?

Mon 1 March 10-10:30am or 4:30-5pm
Tues 2 March 4:30-5pm
Friday 5 March 2-2:30pm or 3:30-4pm
Tues 9 March between 9-10am
Wed 10 March between 3:30-5pm
Thurs 11 March between 9-10am

Thank you again for your help,
Graham

Graham Dobson (he/him/his)

Senior Policy Analyst
Phone call catch up

Time
9am - 10am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 8, 2021

My Notes
D9 Monday Office Meetings

Created by: jenniferli.d9@gmail.com

Time
10am - 12pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 8, 2021

Description
Jennifer Li is inviting you to a scheduled Zoom meeting.

Join Zoom Meeting

My Notes
Phone call catch up

Time
9am - 10am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Tue Mar 9, 2021

My Notes
Time
10am - 1pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Tue Mar 9, 2021

Where
Room 250

Description
JL
Board of Supervisors Meeting
Created by: jenniferli.d9@gmail.com

Time
2pm - 6pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Tue Mar 9, 2021

Description
Created by Sheila Chung

My Notes
Phone call catch up

Time
9am - 10am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Wed Mar 10, 2021

My Notes
MTC Committees (BATA Oversight, Admin, Program & Allocations)

Created by: amy beinart

Time
9:30am - 1pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Wed Mar 10, 2021

Description
AB
2nd Wednesdays (except March, and Nov, Dec = 1st Wed, pm)
NEEDS A LINK

My Notes
EOC call every Wed

Time
12pm - 1pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Wed Mar 10, 2021

Description
JL

Join Microsoft Teams Meeting

My Notes
Budget Budget and Appropriations Meeting
Created by: jenniferli.d9@gmail.com

Time
1pm - 4pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Wed Mar 10, 2021

Description
JL

My Notes
Phone call catch up

Time
9am - 10am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Thu Mar 11, 2021

My Notes
The San Francisco Human Services Network would like to request a meeting to brief you on current issues and priorities for the nonprofit health and human services sector. The meeting would include a small group of HSN representatives, including our Co-Chairs, Sherilyn Adams (Larkin Street Youth Services) and Brett Andrews (PRC). I am available to work with your staff to schedule a meeting at your convenience.

Thank you for considering this request!

-- Debbi Lerman, HSN

Debbi Lerman
S.F. Human Services Network
187 Golden Gate Ave.
San Francisco, CA 94102

(415) 668-0444 (office)

(415) 846-4637 (mobile)

My Notes
Phone call catch up

Time
9am - 10am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Fri Mar 12, 2021

My Notes
PHONE Marcos Gutierrez Show
Created by: Carolina Morales A.

Time
10:30am - 11am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Fri Mar 12, 2021

Description
CM

My Notes
D9 Friday Office Meetings

Created by: jenniferli.d9@gmail.com

Time
11am - 12pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Fri Mar 12, 2021

Description
Go over Tues Board meeting Agenda
Jennifer Li is inviting you to a scheduled Zoom meeting.

Join Zoom Meeting

My Notes
CALL MEDA check-in

Time
3pm - 4pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Fri Mar 12, 2021

Description

Discussion items:
1) Mayor's MPN partners budget addition. (Richard)
2) MOHCD SSP Capacity Building awards (Karoleen)
3) SRO hotels update (Karoleen)
4) Coronavirus impact on LI residents - MEDA involvement in eviction legislation, other possible steps needed, CRC webinar (Norma)
5) Restaurant legislation checkin (Peter)
Li-D9, Jennifer (BOS)

Subject: Monthly Meetings with Administrator Chu and Supervisor Ronen

Start: Mon 3/1/2021 2:00 PM
End: Mon 3/1/2021 2:30 PM
Show Time As: Tentative

Recurrence: Monthly
Recurrence Pattern: Occurs every month on the first Monday of the month from 2:00 PM to 2:30 PM effective 3/1/2021.

Meeting Status: Not yet responded

Organizer: Li-D9, Jennifer (BOS)
Required Attendees: Ronen, Hillary; Chu, Carmen (ADM)
Optional Attendees: Beinart, Amy (BOS)

Microsoft Teams meeting
Li-D9, Jennifer (BOS)

Subject: EOC Briefing - (BOS, DEM, CAT, DPH, MYR, HOM)
Location: Microsoft Teams Meeting

Start: Wed 3/3/2021 12:00 PM
End: Wed 3/3/2021 1:00 PM
Show Time As: Tentative

Recurrence: Weekly
Recurrence Pattern: every Wednesday from 12:00 PM to 1:00 PM

Meeting Status: Not yet responded

Organizer: Calvillo, Angela (BOS)
Required Attendees: Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Imperial, Megan (BOS); Fregosi, Ian (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Bintliff, Jacob (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Monge, Paul (BOS); Kittler, Sophia (MYR); Mar, Gordon (BOS); PEARSON, ANNE (CAT); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Li-D9, Jennifer (BOS); Mcdonald, Courtney (BOS); Mullan, Andrew (BOS); Carroll, Maryellen (DEM); Gee, Natalie (BOS); Gallardo, Tracy (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Angulo, Sunny (BOS); Snyder, Jen (BOS); Bennett, Samuel (BOS); Herzstein, Daniel (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Berenson, Samuel (BOS); Chinchilla, Monica (BOS); Sandoval, Suhagey (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); Lerma, Santiago (BOS); Beinart, Amy (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Yu, Avery (BOS); Smealie, Kyle (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Koeppel, Geri (BOS); Yan, Calvin (BOS); Hepner, Lee (BOS); Evans, Abe (BOS); Wright, Edward (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Quan, Daisy (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Adkins, Joe (BOS); Mundy, Erin (BOS); Temprano, Tom (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Zou, Han (BOS); RivaMontoMesa, Abigail (BOS); Mahogany, Honey (BOS); Haney, Matt (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Falzon, Frankie (BOS); Kilgore, Preston (BOS); Patil, Sneha (DPH); Lim, Victor (DEM); Chan, Connie (BOS); Groth, Kelly (BOS); Tenner, Andrea (DPH); Morris, Geofrrea (BOS); Chung, Lauren (BOS); Fieber, Jennifer (BOS); Carrillo, Lila (BOS); Yu, Angelina (BOS)

Optional Attendees: Tse, John (BOS); Lindsay, Claire (DPH); Kent, Lani (DEM); Bechelli, Adrienne (DEM); Merlone, Audrey (CPC); Zamora, Francis (DEM); Fleisher, Arielle (DPH); Hogan, Kristin (DEM); MelgarStaff (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Schneider, Dylan (HOM); Jue, Tyrone (MYR); Jones, Ernest (BOS)

TeamsVtcTenantId: [redacted]

---

Join Microsoft Teams Meeting

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]
Li-D9, Jennifer (BOS)

Subject: Eric Shaw/Supervisor Ronen monthly check-in
Location: Microsoft Teams Meeting

Start: Thu 3/4/2021 2:30 PM
End: Thu 3/4/2021 3:30 PM
Show Time As: Tentative

Recurrence: Monthly
Recurrence Pattern: Occurs every month on the third Thursday of the month from 2:00 PM to 3:00 PM effective 6/18/2020. (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada)

Meeting Status: Not yet responded

Organizer: Gotthelf, Felicia (MYR)
Required Attendees: Shaw, Eric (MYR); Chan, Amy (MYR); Ronen, Hillary; Beinart, Amy (BOS)

Join Microsoft Teams Meeting
Learn more about Teams | Meeting options
Li-D9, Jennifer (BOS)

Subject: Comm. Ronen Standing Board Briefing

Start: Thu 3/4/2021 1:00 PM
End: Thu 3/4/2021 1:30 PM
Show Time As: Tentative

Recurrence: (none)

Meeting Status: Not yet responded

Organizer: jen.shader@sfcta.org

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.
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Li-D9, Jennifer (BOS)

Subject:  Child care and early education in D9
Location:  Microsoft Teams Meeting
Start:  Fri 3/5/2021 4:30 PM
End:  Fri 3/5/2021 5:00 PM
Show Time As:  Tentative
Recurrence:  (none)
Meeting Status:  Not yet responded
Organizer:  Dobson, Graham (HSA)
Required Attendees: Mezquita, Ingrid (HSA); Ronen, Hillary; Li-D9, Jennifer (BOS); Monge, Paul (BOS)

Microsoft Teams meeting
Li-D9, Jennifer (BOS)

Subject: D9 Supv Ronen/SFMTA DOT monthly check-in
Location: Microsoft Teams Meeting
Start: Fri 3/5/2021 2:00 PM
End: Fri 3/5/2021 2:30 PM
Show Time As: Tentative
Recurrence: (none)
Meeting Status: Not yet responded
Organizer: Tumlin, Jeffrey

Microsoft Teams meeting
Li-D9, Jennifer (BOS)

Subject: CPC meeting
Location: Details to come

Start: Mon 3/8/2021 12:00 PM
End: Mon 3/8/2021 2:00 PM
Show Time As: Tentative

Recurrence: (none)
Meeting Status: Not yet responded

Organizer: Capital Planning Program (ADM)

Required Attendees: Kelly, Naomi (ADM); Strong, Brian (ADM); Bukowski, Kenneth (ADM); Degrafenried, Alaric (DPW); Breed, Mayor London (MYR); Maybaum, Erica (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Bruss, Andrea (MYR); Kirpatrick, Kelly (MYR); Groffenberger, Ashley (MYR); ROUX, KENNETH (CAT); Rosenfield, Ben (CON); Van Degna, Anna (CON); Sesay, Nadia (CLI); Stevenson, Peg (CON); Conrad, Theodore (ECN); Ivar Satero (AIR); Geoff Neumayr (AIR); Kevin Kone (AIR); Tumlin, Jeffrey (MTA); Rosemoore, Jesse (MTA); Ito, Darton (MTA); Rewers, Jonathan (MTA); Forbes, Elaine (PRT); Benson, Brad (PT); Kelly, Jr, Harlan (PUC); McPartland, Frank (PUC); Jacobo, Carlos (PUC); Carlin, Michael (PUC); How, Kathryn (PUC); Ginsburg, Phil (REC); Ajike, Toks (REC); Hillis, Rich (CPC); DiSanto, Thomas (CPC); Safai, Ahsha (BOS)

Optional Attendees: decline@asianart.org; Christian, Jody (AAM); Mieler, Danielle (ADM); Higbee, Melissa (ADM); Rivoire, Heidi (ADM); Joshi, Nishad (ADM); Faust, Kate (ADM); Alburati, Hemiar (ADM); Gorham, Claudia (ADM); Green, Heather (ADM); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); Johnston, Jennifer (ADM); Khaw, Lynn (ADM); Lane, Rohan (ADM); McMahon, Trisha; Noguchi, John (ADM); Takashima, David (ADM); Penick, Andrico; Ybarra, Memo (ADM); Bohn, Nicole (ADM); Nguyen, Adam (ADM); Anna Lam (AIR); Claudia Guerra (AIR); donna.vong@flysfo.com; Joe Nuriasso (AIR); Krell, Rebekah (ART); Lee, Joanne (ART); Quan, Kevin (ART); Angulo, Sunny (BOS); Goossen, Carolyn (PDR); Chinchilla, Monica (BOS); Kelly, Margaux (ECN); Ronen, Hillary; mark.blake@sfgov.org; kenneth.roux@sfgov.org; Con, Con305 (CON); Lacy, Damien (CON); Lane, Maura (CON); Katz, Bridget (CON); Brewer, Luke (CON); Rydstrom, Todd (CON); Trivedi, Vishal (CON); Varat, Adam (CPC); Rodgers, AnMarie (CPC); Clandinen, Eugene (DAT); O’Riordan, Patrick (DBI); Strawn, William (DBI); Greene, Matthew (DBI); Donnelly, Edward (DBI); Carroll, Maryellen (DEM); Tyson, Pamela (DEM); Jung, Kathy (DPH); Primeau, Mark (DPH); Zayas-Chien, Lisa (DPH); Higuera, Charles (DPW); Alameida, Ronald (DPW); Alonso, Rachel (DPW); Spitz, Jeremy (DPW); Chin, Joe (DPW); Chui, Samuel (DPW); Wong, Joseph (DPW); Dawson, Julia (DPW); Fernandez, Marisa (DPW); Gordon, Rachel (DPW); Kempf, Tim (DPW); Laue, Julia (DPW); Thomas, John (DPW); Lui, Raymond (DPW); Mebrahtu, Brook (DPW); Robertson, Bruce (DPW); ‘juan.cerda@sfdpw.org’; Walsh, Robert (HSA); Wong, Tiffany (REC); Kaplan, Daniel (HSA); Geddes, Michelle (DEM); Lee, William (DEM); vallie.brown@sfgov.org; ‘debbie.raphael@sfgov.org’; ‘placson@famsf.org’; Seifer, Jason (FAM); Corso, Mark; Scanlon, Olivia (FIR); Whitley, Gigi (HOM); Miller, Katherine (JUV); Cowan, Sheryl (JUV); Nordyke, Linda (JUV); Arcelona, Steve (JUV); Hernandez, Paula (JUV); Murdoch, Christine (LIB); Singleton, Maureen (LIB); Castillo, Almer (LIB); Lambert, Michael (LIB); ‘roberto.lombardi@sfgov.org’; Simpliciano, Sophia (MTA); Webster, Monique (MTA); dan.adams@sfgov.org; Power, Andres (MYR); McCloskey, Benjamin (MYR); Patil, Lillian (MYR); Leung, Patrick (POL); McGuire, Catherine (POL); Yee, Greg (POL); O’Sullivan, Robert (POL); Greggo, Vivian (POL); Tave, Anthony (POL); O’Brien, Alexa (POL); Dunham, Daley (PRT); katharine.petrucione@sfgov.org; Borrormeo, Gigi (PUC); Navarro, Carmelita (PUC); Perl, Charles (PUC); Sandler, Eric (PUC); Bradley, Stacy (REC); Chu, Derek (REC); Emerson, Taylor (REC); Garcia, Cristina (ADM); White, Staci (REC); CON - Samantha Delucci; McGee, Mike (SCI); mathew.lau@calacademy.org; vicki.hennessy@sfgov.org; McConnell, Kevin (SHF); Fisher, Michele
Optional Attendees: (SHF); Hollings, Crispin (SHF); Benvenuti, Elaine (TIS); Roberts, Brian (TIS); Caldon, John (WAR); Kelly, Kevin (WAR); Shah, Tajel; Shaw, Bob (TTX); White III, Hubert (TTX); Jaime, Matthias (adm)

Heidi Rivoire, Office Manager
Office of Resilience and Capital Planning
Office of the City Administrator
City and County of San Francisco
415.554.4925
heidi.rivoire@sfgov.org
Hello. I’m not sure why I received this invitation. Can someone please call me so I can better understand the meeting objectives? I’m asking because I noticed some people from my department invited who are not in the communications staff. Thanks!

-----Original Appointment-----
From: CCSF Communicators <DT-SocialMedia@sfgov.org>
Sent: Friday, October 2, 2020 9:25 AM
To: CCGS Communicators; Barlow, Timothy (DPW); Pressas, William L. (DPW); Chan, Sandy (DEM); Martin, Anthony (DEM); Santos, Vivina (DEM); Desai, Payal (TIS); Lee, William (DEM)
Cc: DEM EOC-Community; Kremenak, Charles (TIS); Andrew, Brent (DPH); O'Connor, Siobhan (HSS); Patterson, Kate (LIB); Smith, Pearl (DBI); Leong, Cathy (HSA); Auyong, Angela (PDR); Leon Jhong, Alicia (DPH); Cline, Scott (ADM); Grindy, Scott (REC); Eoin Manering (AIR); Wu, Kelvin Y. (MYR) (ADM); Morales, Roxana (HSA); Ostrom, Lucas (TIS); Fields, Marcella (DBI); Vafaee, Masoud (ADM); Hogan, Kristin (DEM); Tillery, Roy (LIB); Hogains, Mark (ECN); Baxter, Jonathan (FIR); Byrd, Catherine (DBI); Bischoff, Dorothy (PDR); Dzikunu, Selormey (ADM); Laue, Julia (DPW); Johnson, Tramina (LIB); Pinzon, Bibiana (DPH); Burch, Percy (BOS); Ta, Melissa (DPH); Elam, Margaret (DPH); Lim, Jane (TIS); La, Tony (HSA); DPH, Phepr (DPH); Shumake, Sabrina (ADM); Thibodeau, Martin (CPC); Rodriguez, Elisa (TTX); Otto, Bekah (ADM); Eng, David (WAR); Gibbs, Jason (LIB); Dong Wook Lee (AIR); Kwong, John (DPW); Malcolm Kew (AIR); Woo, Nicole (DPW); Bogdan, Alexandra (ENV); Gee, Natalie (BOS); Drygas-Andryszewski, Agata (ADM); Westbrook, Victoria (ADM); Ketcham, Dana (REC); Piastunovich, Arielle (DPH); Moore, Kathryn (CPC); Coleman, Valerie (HSA); Lee, George (DPH); Reed, Natasha (DPW); Andrews, Renee (HSA); Yeager, Andrea (LIB); Winchester, Tamra (ADM); Chin, Joe (DPW); Sweeny, Joseph (ENV); Osipal, Joseph (ADM); O’Riordan, Patrick (DBI); Tyler, Diane (DPH); Dewitt, Brian (REC); Sweet, Alexandra C. (MYR);
Subject: DEM/BBR
When: Occurs every 2 week(s) on Tuesday effective 10/6/2020 from 12:30 PM to 1:30 PM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada).
Where: Teams/phone conference
Li-D9, Jennifer (BOS)

Subject: SFCTA Board Meeting

Start: Tue 3/9/2021 10:00 AM
End: Tue 3/9/2021 11:00 AM
Show Time As: Tentative

Recurrence: (none)

Meeting Status: Not yet responded

Organizer: britney.milton@sftca.org

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

---

You have been invited to the following event.

SFCTA Board Meeting

date: Mar 9, 2021 10am 11am

Calendar:

- hitney.milton sftca.org
- hillary.ronen sfgov.org
- matt haney
- steven reston
- joe adkins
- courtney mc onald
- catherine tefani
- afael mandelman
- jennifer
- hillary onen
- angela.tsao sftca.org
- gordon mar
- hamann alton
- chung auren
- reston kilgore

---
- Natalie Gee
- maria.lom ardo sfcta.org
- Ahsha afa(   )
- einart, Amy (   )
-   
- Calvin  an (   )
- Edward right (   )
- aniel Her stein

more details »
Going (hillary.ronen sfgov.org)  Yes  Maybe  No  more options

Invitation from Google Calendar

You are receiving this courtesy email at the account hillary.ronen sfgov.org because you are an attendee of this event.

To stop receiving future updates for this event, decline this event. Alternatively you can sign up for a Google account at https://calendar.google.com calendar and control your notification settings for your entire calendar.

Forwarding this invitation could allow any recipient to send a response to the organizer and be added to the guest list, or invite others regardless of their own invitation status, or to modify your... earn More
Optional Attendees: Paula (JUV); Tolou-Shams, Marina (UCSF); Keresoma Laa; Lynn Peleseuma; Tino Felise; Sam Veu; Maloloto Tea; patsy.tito@scdcسف.org; Iesha Ena; Kevine Boggess; Shervon Hunter; Kendahl Starling; sheila@sfcchildrenslaw.com; lisa.dewberry@dewberrylaw.com; martha.mike.ivey@gmail.com; ivan@irodlaw.com; diana@irodlaw.com; Cuevas, Celina (JUV); Levene, Gary (JUV) (gary.levene@sf.gov.org); pbaraza@ymcasf.org; William Corpuz

You are invited to a Zoom meeting. This meeting is reoccurring on the 2nd Wednesday of the Month through December 31, 2021.

Join Zoom Meeting
Li-D9, Jennifer (BOS)

Subject: EOC Briefing - (BOS, DEM, CAT, DPH, MYR, HOM)
Location: Microsoft Teams Meeting
Start: Wed 3/10/2021 12:00 PM
End: Wed 3/10/2021 1:00 PM
Show Time As: Tentative
Recurrence: Weekly
Recurrence Pattern: every Wednesday from 12:00 PM to 1:00 PM
Meeting Status: Not yet responded
Organizer: Calvillo, Angela (BOS)
Required Attendees: Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Imperial, Megan (BOS); Fregosi, Ian (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Bintliff, Jacob (BOS); Safai, Alisha (BOS); Monge, Paul (BOS); Kittler, Sophia (MYR); Mar, Gordon (BOS); PEARSON, ANNE (CAT); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Li-D9, Jennifer (BOS); Mcdonald, CourtneY (BOS); Mullan, Andrew (BOS); Carroll, Maryellen (DEM); Gee, Natalie (BOS); Gallardo, Tracy (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Angulo, Sunny (BOS); Snyder, Jen (BOS); Bennett, Samuel (BOS); Herzstein, Daniel (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Berenson, Samuel (BOS); Chinchilla, Monica (BOS); Sandoval, Suhagey (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); Lerma, Santiago (BOS); Beinart, Amy (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Yu, Avery (BOS); Smealie, Kyle (BOS); McHugh, Eileen (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Koeppel, Geri (BOS); Yan, Calvin (BOS); Hepner, Lee (BOS); Evans, Abe (BOS); Wright, Edward (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Quan, Daisy (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Adkins, Joe (BOS); Mundy, Erin (BOS); Temprano, Tom (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Zou, Han (BOS); RivamonteMesa, Abigail (BOS); Mahogany, Honey (BOS); Haney, Matt (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Falzon, Frankie (BOS); Kilgore, Preston (BOS); Patil, Sneha (DPH); Lim, Victor (DEM); Chan, Connie (BOS); Groth, Kelly (BOS); Tenner, Andrea (DPH); Morris, Geoffrea (BOS); Chung, Lauren (BOS); Fieber, Jennifer (BOS); Carrillo, Lila (BOS); Yu, Angelina (BOS)
Optional Attendees: Tse, John (BOS); Lindsay, Claire (DPH); Kent, Lani (DEM); Bechelli, Adrienne (DEM); Merlone, Audrey (CPC); Zamora, Francis (DEM); Fleisher, Arielle (DPH); Hogan, Kristin (DEM); MelgarStaff (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Schneider, Dylan (HOM); Jue, Tyrone (MYR); Jones, Ernest (BOS)

TeamsVtcTenantId: 

---

Join Microsoft Teams Meeting

---

22nd Annual SOR Report
APPENDIX - Page 1760
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Subject:</strong></th>
<th>Sup. Hillary Ronen / HSN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
<td>Zoom info to follow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Start:</strong></td>
<td>Thu 3/11/2021 11:30 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End:</strong></td>
<td>Thu 3/11/2021 12:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Show Time As:</strong></td>
<td>Tentative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recurrence:</strong></td>
<td>(none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meeting Status:</strong></td>
<td>Not yet responded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizer:</strong></td>
<td>Debbi Lerman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Li-D9, Jennifer (BOS)
COVID Data Check
Created by: shamannwalton10@gmail.com

Note:
All exempt information in this production is redacted in accordance with CA Government Code 6254(c), 6254(k) and Evidence Code 1040.

Time
7am - 8am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 1, 2021

My Notes
Monthly Check-In: Tonia Lediju SFHA
Created by: nataliegeed10@gmail.com

Time
9am - 9:30am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 1, 2021

Where
Tonia will call you

My Notes
Mtg Gabriel Goffman
Created by: nataliegeed10@gmail.com

Time
9:30am - 10am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 1, 2021

Where

Description
NG 2/1 Confirmed

Gabriel Goffman re: BAAOMD Advisory Council

____________________

From: Gabriel Goffman

Sent: Wednesday, January 27, 2021 8:11:28 PM
To: Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.
Hi President Walton,

What do you mean by other city? All cities in the bay are in it. The 350 Bay area comments are bellow:

350 Bay Area proposals to reduce particulate matter (which is responsible for 3,000 deaths in the Bay Area every year) caused BAAQMD's Advisory Council to do an 18-month study of the subject that finished last month. On 12/16, they presented a huge report full of strong findings and recommendations to the Board. Now BAAQMD needs to finish the job and take action to reduce this deadly pollution, starting in overburdened communities.

1. Do What the Advisory Council Told You on PM!

- The Advisory Council was clear: "The Air District should move as quickly as possible to take maximal feasible action within its authority," including by setting and meeting a tighter PM target for the region of 8 μg/m3 (the federal limit that still kills over 100,000 Americans every year is 12) and prioritizing disproportionately exposed communities.
- Taking these steps will result in rules and incentives being developed over time to reduce PM from a ton of different pollution sources, from refinery smokestacks to your home chimney, bringing every part of the Bay Area closer to Sebastopol's air quality.
- Pass a resolution establishing the regional
PM target of 8, setting out a timeline to achieve it that is "as quickly as possible," laying out precisely what "maximal feasible action within its authority" entails, and committing to regular reporting and accountability metrics.

2. Adopt the Tightest Standard on Refinery PM!

- FCCUs, or "cat crackers," are a central part of most refineries, including 4 of the 5 we have in the East Bay. Cat crackers are the largest source of PM pollution at refineries and the largest single source of PM under BAAQMD's jurisdiction. PM pollution from refinery cat crackers affects the health and lives of at least a million Bay Area residents, disproportionately Latinx and Black.

- BAAQMD will pass a rule this spring to lower this pollution. The debate is between a tighter pollution standard that community groups support, which is already in use all around the country and will save more lives, versus a looser pollution standard that refineries are supporting because it is cheaper for them.

- Match your walk to your talk and pass the strongest possible rule on refinery PM to save lives, improve health, and conserve the jobs of those impacted by deadly pollution. A majority of refineries in the country are already using the same equipment — we are behind.

Reducing Methane to Give Us a Fighting Chance on Climate

350 Bay Area drove BAAQMD for years to super-size their climate program, and in 2017 we won a comprehensive regional plan to reduce CO2 and methane from all kinds of
sources, complete with a vision for a fossil-
free Bay Area by 2050. Big Oil, having been
defeated, promptly called in a favor in
Sacramento and colluded with the governor
and legislators to pre-empt much of what we
had just won on CO2. Methane remains in
BAAQMD's purview, but four years later they
have yet to pass a single promised rule to
control this severe climate pollutant — they
need to take action!

1. Pick Up the Pace!

- The Air District passed a Regional Methane
  Reduction Strategy in 2017 and promised a
  number of rules to reduce this very serious
  climate pollution. All have been curtailed,
dropped, or delayed so far.
- BAAQMD has repeatedly blown past its
deadlines for passing rules to do anything
about reducing climate pollution. The climate
literally doesn't have time to waste. Increase
staff time or whatever it takes to pick up the
pace and actually get these rules
implemented for the people.

2. Adopt the Tightest Standard on Refinery
Methane!

- BAAQMD's inventory of what pollution exists
in the region is largely given to them by the
polluters themselves — they largely just take
their word for it. Our big win in 2017 caused
the agency to actually take some of their own
measurements, and they found refineries are
emitting 4-5 times more methane than they
said they were. Surprise!
- The polluters are simply venting this
methane to the atmosphere, where it is ~30
times worse for climate change than CO2! A
promised rule to control this is long overdue.
- Pass the strongest possible rule this year on
refinery methane to give us a fighting chance
to meet our climate goals.
My Notes
Interview Madison Holland re: Juv Hall Closure
Created by: nataliegeed10@gmail.com

Time
10am - 10:30am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 1, 2021

Where

Description
NG 2/1 Confirmed

______________________

Madison Holland

My Notes
Mtg SSB update w/ Abe + Nat
Created by: nataliegeed10@gmail.com

Time
10:30am - 11am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 1, 2021

Where

Description
NG 2/23

My Notes
Resilient D10 Weekly Calls
Created by: nataliegeed10@gmail.com

Time
11am - 12pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 1, 2021

Where

Description

My Notes
JPB Briefings Call In
Created by: natalieged10@gmail.com

Time
11am - 12pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 1, 2021

Where

My Notes
Hi Natalie,

My name is Nicole Jones and I am the new Captain at Ingleside Station. I would love to schedule a meeting or phone call with Supervisor Walton in the next few weeks to introduce myself. I was hoping you could help me coordinate this. Thank you so much.

Captain Nicole Jones #339
Mtg Sheriff Oversight

Created by: nataliegedd10@gmail.com

Time
1pm - 1:30pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 1, 2021

Where

Description
NG 2/22 Confirmed

Dan Siegal
Chan Kim

__________________________

From: Gallardo, Tracy (BOS) <tracy.gallardo@sfgov.org>
Date: Thursday, February 18, 2021 at 7:35 AM
To: Li-D9, Jennifer (BOS) <jennifer.li-d9@sfgov.org>
Cc: Chan Kim
Dan
chankim@siegelyee.com, Gee, Natalie (BOS) <natalie.tee@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: Meeting with Dan Siegel and Chan Kim on Sheriff’s Department Oversight Board

Thank you for the introduction.

Natalie can schedule a meeting with President Walton.

I will be out next week but we can try for the following week.

Tracy
Meeting w/ Rick Swig?
Created by: shamannwaltond10@gmail.com

Time
2pm - 3pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 1, 2021

My Notes
Mtg Cynthia Nagendra - UCSF
Created by: natalieged10@gmail.com

Time
3pm - 3:30pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 1, 2021

Where

Description
2/16 Rescheduled due to accident in D10
Mtg: Berniecrats - Prop K

Created by: nataliegeed10@gmail.com

Time
3:30pm - 4pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 1, 2021

Where

Description
NG 2/11 Confirmed

Hi Laksh,

Thank you for reaching out to our office. Would Monday, March 1 at 3:30pm or Thursday, March 4 at 3pm work?

Thank you,
Natalie

----

From: Walton, Shamann (BOS)

Thank you for your email Laksh.
Natalie will set up a time for us to meet for 30 minutes to discuss Prop K. All other requests in your email should be discussed with Percy and Tracy.

Sent from my mobile device. Please excuse typos.

From: Laksh Bhasin

Sent: Thursday, February 11, 2021 8:18 AM
To: Waltonstaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Cc: Harlo Pippenger; Simone Manganelli; Jonanthan Mead
Subject: Meeting on implementing Prop K municipal housing

Dear Supervisor Walton and staff,

Thank you for supporting last year's Proposition K, to allow the City to produce up to 10,000 units of municipal social housing. Over 73% of SF voters approved Prop K, providing SF a mandate to create a first-in-the-nation Municipal Housing for All program.

The group I represent helped write Prop K. We have recently been meeting with Supervisor Preston's office, and wanted to reach out to you about the next steps of implementing municipal housing. The main thing we are hoping to discuss are your thoughts on what should be priorities in municipal housing pilot program legislation. We were also hoping to discuss the Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board, which could recommend a municipal housing pilot program from Prop I revenues, and ask your support for the Prop I supplemental appropriation proposed by Supervisor Preston.
A few of us are also applying for the Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board, which we hope will be heard at the Rules Committee in the coming weeks.

Would you or your staff be free to meet about this? I have CC'd some interested attendees. In general, we're free to meet any time except Mondays 10:30-14:00 and Fridays 14:00-15:00, though we prefer meeting after 14:00 on weekdays – if at all possible. If you can provide us with a few options, we will get back.

Thank you,
Laksh Bhasin
Coordinator, SF Berniecrats Housing Committee
HOLD Mtg 800 Indiana Dog Park Permit
Created by: nataliegeed10@gmail.com

Time
4pm - 4:30pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 1, 2021

Description
NG 2/24 HOLD via Abe

Anna Baruch
Joe Kirchofer

My Notes
Mtg Joey Toboni re: Workforce Housing
Created by: nataliegeed10@gmail.com

Time
4:30pm - 5pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 1, 2021

Where

Description
NG 1/20 Confirmed, add Percy
2/25 Rescheduled, Confirmed.

From: Joey Toboni <joey@tobonigroup.com>
Board President Walton,

Congrats on your recent election to BOS president. As Asha said, I’ve created a 501C3 that will be constructing work force housing in SF (and some low income). Our goal is give mid income families a shot at staying in the City.

Website is: https://affordabilityproject.com/

Our first project is in your district and has been submitted to the planning dept. The project will have 72 work force and low income units. When you have time, I would love the opportunity to tell you more. I have also copied my alternate email address.

Best regards,

Joey
Check-In: Sean Elsbernd, Mary Ellen Carroll
Created by: nataliegeed10@gmail.com

Time
5:30pm - 6pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 1, 2021

Where
Teams

My Notes
Bayview Hill Neighborhood Association Meeting
Created by: shamannwaltond10@gmail.com

Time
6pm - 7pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 1, 2021

Where

My Notes
COVID Data Check
Created by: shamannwaltond10@gmail.com

Time
7am - 8am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Tue Mar 2, 2021

My Notes
Time
8am - 9am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Tue Mar 2, 2021
CALL Monthly Mtg: OCII Sally Oerth
Created by: nataliegeed10@gmail.com

Time
9am - 9:30am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Tue Mar 2, 2021

Where

Description
NG 12/14/2020
New interim Director - Sally Oerth

Confirmed: Yes on 1/12 NG
Entered by: NG 1/17/19
Main Contact: Lucinda Nguyen
Organization: OCII
Mtg Cruise Update
Created by: nataliegeed10@gmail.com

Time
9:30am - 10am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Tue Mar 2, 2021

Where

Description
NG 2/25 Confirmed

From: Jacqueline Piccini <jacqueline@npgsf.com>
Date: Tuesday, February 2, 2021 at 9:28 AM
To: Burch, Percy (BOS) <percy.burch@sfgov.org>,
Gee, Natalie (BOS) <natalie.gee@sfgov.org>
Subject: Cruise
This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Percy and Natalie-

I hope you are both hanging in there and Happy Black History month!

I connected with Supervisor Walton about a project that Cruise will be undertaking in D10 and he said to reach out to you both to get some time on the calendar.

Please let me know when there is time in the schedule for a briefing.

Thank you,

--

Jacqueline Piccini

Noyola Piccini Group

jacqueline@npgsf.com
Hello Natalie

I wanted to send a formal request to meet with Supervisor Walton and our coalition of labor about the Amazon project. We would be with UFCW, SF CLC, SF BTC. We are available on 2/17 and 2/18 at 2pm. If those times don’t work, could you send other times in late February/early March.
Thank you!

James Araby
Director of Strategic Campaigns
UFCW 5
[C] (510) 599-0488
[O} (925) 269-2419

My Notes
HOLD Mtg DSA re: EEO Investigation
Created by: nataliegeed10@gmail.com

Time
11:30am - 12pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Tue Mar 2, 2021

Description
NG 2/24 HOLD via Ken Lomba

________________

DSA - EEO Investigation Update

My Notes
Staff Meeting
Created by: abeevansd10@gmail.com

Time
12pm - 2pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Tue Mar 2, 2021

Where

My Notes
Board Meeting
Created by: shamannwaltond10@gmail.com

Time
2pm - 8pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Tue Mar 2, 2021

My Notes
COVID Data Check
Created by: shamannwaltond10@gmail.com

Time
7am - 8am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Wed Mar 3, 2021

My Notes
BAAQMD Meeting
Created by: nataliegeed10@gmail.com

Time
9:30am - 1:30pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Wed Mar 3, 2021

My Notes
Conversation w/ the Common Wealth Club, Mayor and Fred
Created by: shamannwaltond10@gmail.com

Time
12pm - 1pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Wed Mar 3, 2021

Where

Description
From: George Dobbins
<gdobbins@commonwealthclub.org>
Date: Monday, February 22, 2021 at 8:33 AM
To: Gee, Natalie (BOS) <natalie.gee@sfgov.org>, Burch, Percy (BOS) <percy.burch@sfgov.org>
Subject: Commonwealth Club Reconfirming Friday Zoom Test for March 3 Program

Dear Natalie,

Many thanks once again. I'm reconfirming this Friday, February 26 at 9:30am for the zoom test.

Here is the zoom link, which is the same link for the March 3rd program:
After he joins zoom, we'll also ask President Walton to join Zencastr, an audio backup, using this link, which is also the same for the March 3 program:

Zencastr

Sincerely,

George

George Dobbins
Vice President of Programs
The Commonwealth Club
110 The Embarcadero, San Francisco, CA 94105
415 597-6724
gdobbins@commonwealthclub.org
commonwealthclub.org
My Notes
EOC Meetings
Created by: shamannwaltond10@gmail.com

Time
12pm - 1pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Wed Mar 3, 2021

My Notes
Budget and Appropriations

Created by: tracydistrict10@gmail.com · Your response: Yes, I'm going

Time
1pm - 5pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Wed Mar 3, 2021

Description
Budget Hearings on Specified Departments TBD

Guests
✓ Shamann Walton
✓ tracydistrict10@gmail.com

My Notes
Hi Natalie,

3:30pm will work. Yes these will be virtual meetings until further notice. Here is the zoom link below for all meetings going forward:

Topic: Supervisor Walton + Mayor Breed

Time: This is a recurring meeting Meet anytime

Join Zoom Meeting
Check In: Sean Elsbernd
Created by: natalieged10@gmail.com

Time
5:30pm - 6pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Wed Mar 3, 2021

My Notes
COVID Data Check
Created by: shamannwaltond10@gmail.com

Time
7am - 8am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Thu Mar 4, 2021

My Notes
Meeting w/ DJ
Created by: shamannwaltond10@gmail.com

Time
8am - 9:30am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Thu Mar 4, 2021

My Notes
Caltrain Joint Powers Board Meeting

Created by: nataliegeed10@gmail.com

Time
9am - 12pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Thu Mar 4, 2021

Where

Description
NG 2/27 - First Thursday's every month in San Carlos/Online

Agenda: https://www.caltrain.com/Assets/2021-03-04+JPB+Agenda+Packet.pdf
Government Audit + Oversight Cmte - Hazard Pay
Created by: nataliegeed10@gmail.com

Time
10am - 12pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Thu Mar 4, 2021

My Notes
Time
12pm - 12:30pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Thu Mar 4, 2021

Where

Description
NG 2/10 Confirmed via Debbi Lerman
Sherilyn Adams, HSN Co-Chair (Larkin Street Youth Services)
Brett Andrews, HSN Co-Chair (PRC)
Debbi Lerman, HSN Director
Others to be determined

From: Debbi Lerman <debbilerman@sfhsn.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 9, 2021 6:40 PM
To: Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Cc: Gee, Natalie (BOS)
Subject: Request for a meeting

Dear President Walton:

The San Francisco Human Services Network would like to request a meeting to brief you on current issues and priorities for the nonprofit health and
human services sector. The meeting would include a small group of HSN representatives, including our Co-Chairs, Sherilyn Adams (Larkin Street Youth Services) and Brett Andrews (PRC). I am available to work with your staff to schedule a meeting at your convenience.

Thank you for considering this request!

-- Debbi Lerman, HSN

Debbi Lerman

S.F. Human Services Network

187 Golden Gate Ave.

San Francisco, CA 94102

(415) 668-0444 (office)

(415) 846-4637 (mobile)
On Feb 4, 2021, at 2:13 PM, Carr, Rowena (POL) wrote:

Hello Everyone,

Chief Scott asked that I reach out to Pres. Walton and staff to schedule a meeting for us to share SFPD's Violence Reduction Initiative and the Problem Analysis Summary. The presentation will be provided by California Partnership who has been working with SFPD regarding gun violence reduction strategies.

Can you please provide us some dates/times that Pres. Walton is available? We will need 45 minutes, if possible.

Thank you for your assistance
Sincerely,
Rowena

Rowena V. Carr
Office of the Chief of Police
SF Police Headquarters

1245 3rd Street, Room 6171

San Francisco, CA 94158

415-837-7003

My Notes
Mtg Baylands Update
Created by: nataliegeed10@gmail.com

Time
2:30pm - 3pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Thu Mar 4, 2021

Where

Description
NG 2/7 confirmed

From: Galli, Morgan(PB)@HSR <Morgan.Galli@hsr.ca.gov>
Date: Monday, February 1, 2021 at 3:50 PM
To: Gee, Natalie (BOS) <natalie.gee@sfgov.org>
Cc: Burch, Percy (BOS) <percy.burch@sfgov.org>
Subject: RE: Friday Brisbane Site Visit

Hi Natalie,
Sounds like it is best all around to postpone. Our availability for March 4 or 5 is:

March 4: 11:30 – 1 or 2:30-4

March 5: 3-4 PM

I do want to mention that the public review for the Revised Draft 2020 Business Plan will be 30 days starting on Feb. 9 so the close will likely be March 11.

Best,

My Notes
Meeting w 798 and Chief?
Created by: shamannwaltond10@gmail.com

Time
4pm - 5pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Thu Mar 4, 2021

Where
Newhall

My Notes
Eastern Democratic Club Panel
Created by: shamannwaltond10@gmail.com

Time
9pm - 10:30pm (Eastern Time - New York)

Date
Thu Mar 4, 2021

My Notes
COVID Data Check
Created by: shamannwaltond10@gmail.com

Time
7am - 8am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Fri Mar 5, 2021

My Notes
Hi Natalie,

I would like to schedule some time next week to provide Supervisor Walton with an update on the 990 7th street project. We plan to submit a PPA late next week.
Many thanks,

Stephen

Stephen Maduli-Williams | Amazon.com
Manager, Economic Development

188 Spear Street 5th Floor | San Francisco, CA 94105

e-mail: maduliwi@amazon.com
Hi Joshua

President Walton would like to schedule a meeting with you regarding the Life Science overlay in Dogpatch and Laboratory uses being disguised as true PDR.

Do you have some time on Friday, March 5 at 11am to meet?

Thank you,

Natalie

From: Walton, Shamann (BOS)

Please set up a meeting with planning about the Life Science overlay in Dogpatch and Laboratory uses.
being disguised as true PDR. Thank you.
Meeting w/ Game?
Created by: shamannwaltond10@gmail.com

Time
12pm - 6pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Fri Mar 5, 2021

My Notes
COVID Data Check
Created by: shamannwaltond10@gmail.com

Time
7am - 8am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Sat Mar 6, 2021

My Notes
Londi’s Funeral
Created by: shamannwaltond10@gmail.com

Time
11am - 2pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Sat Mar 6, 2021

Where
3rd Baptist

My Notes
COVID Data Check
Created by: shamannwaltond10@gmail.com

Time
7am - 8am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Sun Mar 7, 2021

My Notes
COVID Data Check
Created by: shamannwaltond10@gmail.com

Time
7am - 8am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 8, 2021

My Notes
Mtg SEIU 2015
Created by: nataliegeed10@gmail.com

Time
9am - 9:30am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 8, 2021

Where

Description
NG 2/7 Confirmed

From: Maliha Noamani <malihan@seiu2015.org>
Date: Sunday, February 7, 2021 at 4:04 PM
To: Gee, Natalie (BOS) <natalie.gee@sfgov.org>
Subject: Meeting Request!

Hello Natalie,

Hope this email finds you well! My name is Maliha Noamani and I am the new senior political organizer for SEIU2015’s SF office. I was emailing, because we would like to arrange a meeting with Supervisor Walton to discuss our future priorities with our members at SEIU2015 for the new year. Can you please help me arrange something? Thank you and hope to hear from you soon!

Kindest regards,

Maliha Noamani
SEIU Local 2015
333 Hegenberger Road #400
Oakland, CA 94621

seiu2015.org| Facebook| Twitter | Medium

Join our union | Become a Justice Warrior
Mtg OEWD, D10 Grocery Store

Created by: natalieged10@gmail.com

Time
9:30am - 10:30am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 8, 2021

Where

Description
NG 2/22 Confirmed via Erin Black/Deirdre Cahalane

Lou Giraudo
Chris McGarry
Larry McClendon
Add Percy

From: Erin Black <Erin.Black@SaveMart.com>
Good evening Ms. Gee,

Thank you for coordinating the scheduling of this meeting. March 8th at 9:30 am works best for Mr. McGarry and Mr. Giraudo’s schedules. Our team will be attending in-person, wearing masks, and observing social distancing.

Please let us know if any changes or if additional information is needed. We will wait for an invite, though would be happy to send from our end.

Best regards,

Erin Black
Executive Assistant to the Chief Executive Officer
Resilient D10 Weekly Calls
Created by: nataliegeed10@gmail.com

Time
11am - 12pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 8, 2021

Where

Description

My Notes
Capital Planning Cmte
Created by: nataliegeed10@gmail.com

Time
12pm - 2pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 8, 2021

My Notes
Board Agenda Review
Created by: shamannwaltond10@gmail.com

Time
12:30pm - 1pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 8, 2021

Where
Teams

My Notes
Monthly Check-In HSH Abigail Steward-Kahn
Created by: nataliegeed10@gmail.com

Time
2pm - 2:45pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 8, 2021

Where
Teams

Description
NG 1/13/21 Confirmed with Julie HSH

My Notes
Monthly w/ Carmen Chu City Admin

Created by: natalieged10@gmail.com

Time
3pm - 3:30pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 8, 2021

Where
call

Description
NG 2/17 Confirmed via Kay Phan

Phone

Please ask President Walton to call Carmen's cell phone

My Notes
Mtg/Teams Controller Check-In
Created by: nataliegeed10@gmail.com

Time
3:30pm - 4pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 8, 2021

Where
Teams

My Notes
Mtg Bi-Weekly D10 Testing - HOPE SF
Created by: nataliegeed10@gmail.com

Time
4pm - 4:30pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 8, 2021

Where
Teams

Description
NG 9/14

From: Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>
Sent: Monday, September 14, 2020 11:32 AM
To: Miller, Theodore (MYR) <Theodore.Miller@sfgov.org>; Morris, Geoffrea (ADP)
<geoffrea.morris@sfgov.org>; Davis, Sheryl (HRC) <sheryl.davis@sfgov.org>
Cc: Gee, Natalie (BOS) <natalie.gee@sfgov.org>
Subject: RE: Potrero testing Connecticut (Team Meeting?)

Thank you Theo.

I would like for us to try and meet bi-weekly at this pivotal time. Does that work for everyone?

Natalie can help set that up.
Supervisor Shamann Walton

From: Miller, Theodore (MYR) <Theodore.Miller@sfgov.org>
Sent: Monday, September 14, 2020 11:29 AM
To: Morris, Geoffrea (ADP) <geoffrea.morris@sfgov.org>; Davis, Sheryl (HRC) <sheryl.davis@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: Potrero testing Connecticut (Team Meeting?)

Thanks for all of your wonderful work and relentless advocacy, Geoffrea. The revised structure has some ups and downs for us. Thinking it would be good for the 3 of us + Supervisor Walton to have a briefing monthly just so we can all be in perfect communication alignment. The HOPE SF communities have tremendous passion and organizing and I want us to fully leverage that in support of your leadership. There are some fires I can help put out. Let me know when might be good for us all to connect this month as I know we often talk separately. I'm thinking 30 minutes tightly organized should do it. Best, Theo

My Notes
From: Walton, Shamann (BOS)  
Date: Saturday, February 13, 2021 at 8:21 AM  
To: Fonda Davidson  
Cc: Burch, Percy (BOS) , Gallardo, Tracy (BOS) , Gee, Natalie (BOS)  
Subject: Re: Infant Toddler Center on Turner Terrace

Thank you so much for your quick response Director Davidson.

I would love to meet to discuss further. Natalie will reach out for a time for us to meet in March.

I would say at first glance we should honor her legacy at 85 Turner Terrace and do something even bigger at the new site. I would love to get your thoughts on that.

I think even a letter from you to the family about the
commitment (especially during Black History Month) would be huge. Please let me know what you think.

Have a great weekend!

My Notes
Check-In: Sean Elsbernd, Mary Ellen Carroll
Created by: nataliegeed10@gmail.com

Time
5:30pm - 6pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Mon Mar 8, 2021

Where
Teams

My Notes
COVID Data Check
Created by: shamannwaltond10@gmail.com

Time
7am - 8am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Tue Mar 9, 2021

My Notes
Bi-Weekly MTA Update - Jeff Tumlin (Teams)
Created by: nataliegeed10@gmail.com

Time
9am - 9:30am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Tue Mar 9, 2021

Description
NG 5/22 Confirmed
2nd + 4th Tuesdays

My Notes
Mtg Dr. Colfax
Created by: shamannwaltond10@gmail.com

Time
9:30am - 10am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Tue Mar 9, 2021

Where
Teams

My Notes
SFCTA Meeting
Created by: nataliegeed10@gmail.com

Time
10am - 12pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Tue Mar 9, 2021
Staff Meeting
Created by: abeevansd10@gmail.com

Time
12pm - 2pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Tue Mar 9, 2021

Where

My Notes
board prep
Created by: tracydistrict10@gmail.com

Time
1pm - 2pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Tue Mar 9, 2021

My Notes
Board Meeting
Created by: shamannwaltond10@gmail.com

Time
2pm - 8pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Tue Mar 9, 2021

My Notes
COVID Data Check
Created by: shamannwaltond10@gmail.com

Time
7am - 8am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Wed Mar 10, 2021
Mtg JR Check In on Potrero Yard
Created by: nataliegeed10@gmail.com

Time
9am - 9:30am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Wed Mar 10, 2021

Where

Description
NG Confirmed

My Notes
Mtg Poverty Tows
Created by: nataliegeed10@gmail.com

Time
10:30am - 11am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Wed Mar 10, 2021

Where

Description
NG 2/22 Confirmed

Samantha Lew

From: Samantha Lew <slew@lccrsf.org>
Sent: Friday, February 19, 2021 6:42:05 PM
To: Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Gee, Natalie (BOS) <natalie.gee@sfgov.org>
Cc: Burch, Percy (BOS) <percy.burch@sfgov.org>; Evans, Abe (BOS) <abe.evans@sfgov.org>
Gallardo, Tracy (BOS) <tracy.gallardo@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: Poverty Tows Meeting Follow Up
Hi President Walton, Percy, Tracy, Natalie, and Abe,

We would love to schedule a follow up meeting with you and your office around poverty towing. Thank you, Abe, for attending the meeting we had with SFTMA.

When are some dates that you all would be available?

Thanks!

Sam

My Notes
Mtg Catherine Stefani
Created by: nataliegeed10@gmail.com

Time
11am - 12pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Wed Mar 10, 2021

Where
Teams

Description
NG 2/24 Confirmed via Sam B.

My Notes
EOC Meetings
Created by: shamannwaltond10@gmail.com

Time
12pm - 1pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Wed Mar 10, 2021

My Notes
Budget and appropriations

Created by: tracydistrict10@gmail.com · Your response: Yes, I'm going

Time
1pm - 5pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Wed Mar 10, 2021

Guests
✔ Shamann Walton
✔ tracydistrict10@gmail.com

My Notes
f.y.i: Close YGC work area 3
Created by: tracydistrict10@gmail.com

Time
4pm - 6pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Wed Mar 10, 2021

My Notes
Check In: Sean Elsbernd
Created by: nataliegeed10@gmail.com

Time
5:30pm - 6pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Wed Mar 10, 2021

My Notes
COVID Data Check
Created by: shamannwaltond10@gmail.com

Time
7am - 8am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Thu Mar 11, 2021

My Notes
Meeting w/ DJ
Created by: shamannwaltond10@gmail.com

Time
8am - 9:30am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Thu Mar 11, 2021

My Notes
Mtg Myrna Melgar Check-In
Created by: nataliegeed10@gmail.com

Time
9:30am - 10am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Thu Mar 11, 2021

Where
Teams

Description
NG 2/23 Confirmed via Jen Low

My Notes
Time
10:30am - 12:30pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Thu Mar 11, 2021

My Notes
Mtg Additional COP Opportunities for Residential and Commercial
Created by: nataliegeed10@gmail.com

Time
1pm - 2pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Thu Mar 11, 2021

Where
TBD

Description
NG 2/23 Confirmed

Bivett Brackett
Mara Rosales
Sally Oerth (OCII) - Lucinda Nguyen
Eric Shaw (MOHCD) - Amy Chan

From: Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>
Date: Monday, February 15, 2021 at 1:59 PM
To: Bivett Brackett <sally.oerth@sfgov.org>, Burch, Percy (BOS) <percy.burch@sfgov.org>, Shaw, Eric (MYR) <eric.shaw@sfgov.org>, Alexandra.Barrett-Shorter@asm.ca.gov
Cc: Gee, Natalie (BOS) <natalie.gee@sfgov.org>, Alexandra.Barrett-Shorter@asm.ca.gov <Alexandra.Barrett-Shorter@asm.ca.gov>
Subject: Meeting to Discuss Additional COP
Opportunities for Residential and Commercial
Commissioner Bracket,

Good afternoon.

I wanted to thank you so much for working on expanding the qualifications for certificate of preference holders, to include additional family members of people who have been pushed out of San Francisco. I have also spoken with Director Oerth and Assemblymember Chiu on making this a reality.

I am excited that we are also working to include COPs for businesses that were forced out or forced to close in redevelopment areas. This is all in line with reparations for Black people in San Francisco.

I would love to meet with you, Commissioner Rosales, Directors Oerth and Shaw to discuss progress and next steps.

Natalie from our Team will reach out to set up a meeting. Thank you.
HOLD D10 Public Safety Town Hall
Created by: nataliegeed10@gmail.com

Time
6pm - 7pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Thu Mar 11, 2021

Description
NG 2/10 via Kyra

My Notes
COVID Data Check
Created by: shamannwaltond10@gmail.com

Time
7am - 8am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Fri Mar 12, 2021

My Notes
Sacramento Seminar Event- Alex Clemens
Created by: shamannwaltond10@gmail.com

Time
12pm - 1:30pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Fri Mar 12, 2021

My Notes
Dear All - please accept this calendar meeting invite for the March JPB Governance Process Ad Hoc Committee Meeting via Zoom:
My Notes
Anti-Violence Conversation at Mendell Plaza
Created by: shamannwalton10@gmail.com

Time
6pm - 8pm (Eastern Time - New York)

Date
Fri Mar 12, 2021

My Notes
COVID Data Check
Created by: shamannwaldon10@gmail.com

Time
7am - 8am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Sat Mar 13, 2021

My Notes
Chapter Meeting
Created by: shamannwaltond10@gmail.com

Time
10am - 12pm (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Sat Mar 13, 2021

My Notes
APACC Fundraiser w/ Martin Yan
Created by: shamannwaltond10@gmail.com

Time
6pm - 7:30pm (Eastern Time - New York)

Date
Sat Mar 13, 2021

Where
Zoom

My Notes
COVID Data Check
Created by: shamannwaltond10@gmail.com

Time
7am - 8am (Pacific Time - Los Angeles)

Date
Sun Mar 14, 2021

My Notes
Berenson, Samuel (BOS)

Subject: Budget Briefing with Severin Campbell and Nicolas Menard
Location: Microsoft Teams Meeting

Start: Mon 12/14/2020 11:15 AM
End: Mon 12/14/2020 11:45 AM

Recurrence: Weekly
Recurrence Pattern: every Monday from 11:15 AM to 11:45 AM

Meeting Status: Meeting organizer
Organizer: Safai, Ahsha (BOS)
Required Attendees: Chung, Lauren (BOS); Campbell, Severin (BUD); Menard, Nicolas (BUD); Morris, Geoffrea (BOS)

Microsoft Teams meeting

[Redacted text]

Note:
All exempt information in this production is redacted in accordance with CA Government Code 6254(c), 6254(k) and Evidence Code 1040.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Subject:</strong></th>
<th>SF Christian Center food pantry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
<td>5845 Mission street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Start:</strong></td>
<td>Wed 12/9/2020 11:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End:</strong></td>
<td>Wed 12/9/2020 1:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recurrence:</strong></td>
<td>Weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recurrence Pattern:</strong></td>
<td>every Wednesday from 11:00 AM to 1:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meeting Status:</strong></td>
<td>Meeting organizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizer:</strong></td>
<td>Safai, Ahsha (BOS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Required Attendees:</strong></td>
<td>Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Ho, Tim (BOS); Berenson, Samuel (BOS); Chung, Lauren (BOS); Morris, Geoffrea (ADP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Berenson, Samuel (BOS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject:</th>
<th>Sup. Safai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Need Link from Jessica Wong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start:</td>
<td>Mon 1/25/2021 2:30 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End:</td>
<td>Mon 1/25/2021 3:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurrence:</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurrence Pattern:</td>
<td>every Monday from 2:30 PM to 3:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Status:</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizer:</td>
<td>Groffenberger, Ashley (MYR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Attendees</td>
<td>Groffenberger, Ashley (MYR); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Morris, Geoffrea (BOS); Berenson, Samuel (BOS); Rosenfield, Ben (CON); Sandler, Risa (CON); Kittler, Sophia (MYR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optional Attendees</td>
<td>Lane, Maura (CON); Chung, Lauren (BOS)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Microsoft Teams meeting
Berenson, Samuel (BOS)

Subject: Workforce housing and density bonus
Location: Microsoft Teams Meeting

Start: Mon 3/1/2021 4:30 PM
End: Mon 3/1/2021 5:00 PM

Recurrence: (none)

Meeting Status: Meeting organizer

Organizer: Safai, Ahsha (BOS)

Required Attendees: Sider, Dan (CPC); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Jones, Ernest (BOS); Berenson, Samuel (BOS);
kate.conner@sfgov.org

Microsoft Teams meeting
Hi Samuel; we will take the earliest which is the 19th @ 1pm time slot but open to anything else since we need to get both Jaoquin’s and Carmen’s availability. Thank you!

With best regards,
Gorretti

Sent from my IPhone

CONFIDENTIALITY

This message (and any attachments) is intended for the sole use of the addressee(s). The information may contain privileged or otherwise confidential information and is protected from disclosure by law. If you received this message in error, or have reason to believe you are not authorized to receive it, please promptly delete or destroy this message (and attachments) and notify the sender by e-mail. Thank you.

On Jan 27, 2021, at 2:21 PM, Berenson, Samuel (BOS) <sam.berenson@sfgov.org> wrote:

Hello All,

Here are some available times for Supervisor Safai to meet...

2/19 at 1pm
2/25 at 2:30pm
2/25 at 3pm
2/26 at 1pm
2/26 at 1:30pm

Please let me know if any of these times will work and I will be happy to send out a link.

Respectfully,
Sam

Sam Berenson, Administrative Aide
Office of District 11 Supervisor Ahsha Safai
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl, San Francisco | Room 256
Direct: 415.554.6976 | Office: 415.554.6975

From: Chung, Lauren (BOS) <lauren.l.chung@sfgov.org>
Sent: Wednesday, January 27, 2021 2:07 PM
To: Vaughan, J'Wel (ECN) <jwel.vaughan@sfgov.org>; Ma, Annie (ASR) <annie.ma@sfgov.org>;
Cc: Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Berenson, Samuel (BOS) <sam.berenson@sfgov.org>
Subject: Meeting re: Chinese Historical Society of America Museum

Hello,

I’m reaching out for availability on City Administrator Carmen Chu and Assessor Recorder Joaquin Torres’ respective schedules for a meeting with Supervisor Safai regarding the Chinese Historical Society of America Museum and the potential Bruce Lee Exhibit.

I have also included Goretti Lui for her input on her availability for this meeting as well. Sam Berenson from our team will help advise on Supervisor Safai’s schedule with a few potential dates/times that might work for this meeting.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you,

Lauren

Lauren Chung | Legislative Aide
Office of District 11 Supervisor Ahsha Safai
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl, San Francisco | Room 256
Direct: 415-554-7910 | Office: 415-554-6975

Hello All,

All the dates/times work for Camen. Please send over an invite.

Thank you.

Kay Phan | Pronouns: She, Her, Hers
Office of the City Administrator
City and County of San Francisco
City Hall, RM 362, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
Hello Annie and Kay,

Here are some other days and times Supervisor Safai is available...

2/26 at 2:30pm
2/26 at 3pm
3/1 at 1pm
3/8 at 4pm

Please let me know if these dates will work for all.

Respectfully,

Sam

Hello all-

Thank you for reaching out in regards to scheduling a meeting with Carmen. Unfortunately, those dates does not work for her.

Sam, can you please provide a few more dates that Supervisor Safai is available?

Lastly, I’ve cc’ed Kay Phan on this email. Kay will be assisting with scheduling for Carmen moving forward.

Best regards,
Annie

From: Berenson, Samuel (BOS) <sam.berenson@sfgov.org>
Sent: Wednesday, February 3, 2021 11:37 AM
To: Gorretti Lui
Cc: Chung, Lauren (BOS) <lauren.l.chung@sfgov.org>; Vaughan, J’Wel (ECN) <jwel.vaughan@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Jane Chin Phan, Kay (ADM) <kay.phan@sfgov.org>
Subject: RE: Meeting re: Chinese Historical Society of America Museum
Hello Gorretti,

I have sent out the Team invite and we are able to make it. I will let others answer on their availability. The Supervisors team can make it.

Respectfully,

Sam

From: Gorretti Lui
Sent: Wednesday, February 03, 2021 10:40 AM
To: Berenson, Samuel (BOS) <sam.berenson@sfgov.org>
Cc: Chung, Lauren (BOS) <lauren.l.chung@sfgov.org>; Vaughan, J’Wel (ECN) <jwel.vaughan@sfgov.org>; Ma, Annie (ASR) <annie.ma@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Jane Chin
Subject: Re: Meeting re: Chinese Historical Society of America Museum

Hello all
Just circling back if we get a date for zoom with CAO+OEWD+Supervisor Safai....CHSA will make it whenever the arrangement is made; thank you!

With best regards,
Gorretti

Sent from my IPhone

CONFIDENTIALITY

This message (and any attachments) is intended for the sole use of the addressee(s). The information may contain privileged or otherwise confidential information and is protected from disclosure by law. If you received this message in error, or have reason to believe you are not authorized to receive it, please promptly delete or destroy this message (and attachments) and notify the sender by e-mail. Thank you.

On Jan 28, 2021, at 9:14 AM, Berenson, Samuel (BOS) <sam.berenson@sfgov.org> wrote:

Hello All,

Sounds good. I will send out a hold for everyone but I understand that it may move around as we wait to hear back from others.

Respectfully,

Sam

Sam Berenson, Administrative Aide
Office of District 11 Supervisor Ahsha Safai
From: Gorretti Lui <blackacted>
Sent: Wednesday, January 27, 2021 5:05 PM
To: Berenson, Samuel (BOS) <sam.berenson@sfgov.org>; Vaughan, J'Wel (ECN) <jwel.vaughan@sfgov.org>; Ma, Annie (ASR) <annie.ma@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Jane Chin <janeacted>
Cc: Chung, Lauren (BOS) <lauren.l.chung@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: Meeting re: Chinese Historical Society of America Museum

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

Hi Samuel; we will take the earliest which is the 19th @ 1pm time slot but open to anything else since we need to get both Jaoquin’s and Carmen’s availability. Thank you!

With best regards,
Gorretti

Sent from my IPhone

CONFIDENTIALITY

This message (and any attachments) is intended for the sole use of the addressee(s). The information may contain privileged or otherwise confidential information and is protected from disclosure by law. If you received this message in error, or have reason to believe you are not authorized to receive it, please promptly delete or destroy this message (and attachments) and notify the sender by e-mail. Thank you.

On Jan 27, 2021, at 2:21 PM, Berenson, Samuel (BOS) <sam.berenson@sfgov.org> wrote:

Hello All,

Here are some available times for Supervisor Safai to meet...

2/19 at 1pm
2/25 at 2:30pm
2/25 at 3pm
2/26 at 1pm
2/26 at 1:30pm

Please let me know if any of these times will work and I will be happy to send out a link.

Respectfully,

Sam
From: Chung, Lauren (BOS) <lauren.l.chung@sfgov.org>
Sent: Wednesday, January 27, 2021 2:07 PM
To: Vaughan, J'Wel (ECN) <jwel.vaughan@sfgov.org>; Ma, Annie (ASR) <annie.ma@sfgov.org>
Cc: Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Berenson, Samuel (BOS) <sam.berenson@sfgov.org>
Subject: Meeting re: Chinese Historical Society of America Museum

Hello,

I'm reaching out for availability on City Administrator Carmen Chu and Assessor Recorder Joaquin Torres' respective schedules for a meeting with Supervisor Safai regarding the Chinese Historical Society of America Museum and the potential Bruce Lee Exhibit.

I have also included Goretti Lui for her input on her availability for this meeting as well. Sam Berenson from our team will help advise on Supervisor Safai's schedule with a few potential dates/times that might work for this meeting.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you,

Lauren

Lauren Chung 鍾洛藍 | Legislative Aide
Office of District 11 Supervisor Ahsha Safai
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl, San Francisco | Room 256
Direct: 415-554-7910 | Office: 415-554-6975

Microsoft Teams meeting
Berenson, Samuel (BOS)

Subject: Monthly Meeting with Carla Short
Location: room 256

Start: Thu 3/5/2020 2:00 PM
End: Thu 3/5/2020 2:45 PM
Show Time As: Tentative

Recurrence: Monthly
Recurrence Pattern: Occurs every month on the first Thursday of the month from 2:00 PM to 2:45 PM effective 3/5/2020 until 3/5/2021. (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada)

Meeting Status: Tentatively accepted

Organizer: Ho, Tim (BOS)

Required Attendees: Short, Carla (DPW); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Sandoval, Suhagey (BOS); Chinchilla, Monica (BOS); Spitz, Jeremy (DPW)

Optional Attendees: Chung, Lauren (BOS); Berenson, Samuel (BOS)

-----Original Appointment-----
From: Ho, Tim (BOS) <tim.h.ho@sfgov.org>
Sent: Thursday, January 23, 2020 2:34 PM
To: Ho, Tim (BOS); Short, Carla (DPW); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Sandoval, Suhagey (BOS); Chinchilla, Monica (BOS); Spitz, Jeremy (DPW)
Subject: Monthly Meeting with Carla Short
When: Occurs the first Thursday of every 1 month(s) effective 3/5/2020 until 3/5/2021 from 2:00 PM to 2:45 PM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada).
Where: room 256

---

Join Microsoft Teams Meeting


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject:</th>
<th>RE: SF labor and delivery policy with Jim Araby</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Microsoft Teams Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start:</td>
<td>Fri 3/5/2021 1:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End:</td>
<td>Fri 3/5/2021 1:30 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurrence:</td>
<td>(none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Status:</td>
<td>Meeting organizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizer:</td>
<td>Safai, Ahsha (BOS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Attendees</td>
<td>Jim Araby, Chung, Lauren (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Morris, Geoffrea (BOS); Jones, Ernest (BOS); Berenson, Samuel (BOS)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Microsoft Teams meeting**

---

Let’s do 3/5 at 1pm

Can you send a calendar invite?

From: Berenson, Samuel (BOS) <sam.berenson@sfgov.org>
Sent: Wednesday, February 24, 2021 9:45 AM
To: Jones, Ernest (BOS) <ernest.e.jones@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Jim Araby <jaraby@ufcw5.org>
Subject: RE: SF labor and delivery policy

Hello Mr. Araby,

Here are some times to meet with Supervisor Safai...

3/5 at 1pm
3/5 at 1:30pm
3/12 at 1:30pm

If one of these times work, I will send a link.

Respectfully,

Sam

From: Jones, Ernest (BOS) <ernest.e.jones@sfgov.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 23, 2021 6:12 PM
To: Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Jim Araby <jaraby@ufcw5.org>; Berenson, Samuel (BOS) <sam.berenson@sfgov.org>
Subject: RE: SF labor and delivery policy

Mr. Araby,

Thank you for sending over the document. I have included Sam Berenson who manages the Supervisor’s calendar. He will provide available dates for a follow-up.

Best,

Ernest Jones (he/him) | Legislative Aide
Office of District 11 Supervisor Ahsha Safai
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl, San Francisco | Room 256
Direct: 415-554-7897 | Office: 415-554-6975

From: Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 23, 2021 5:52 PM
To: Jones, Ernest (BOS) <ernest.e.jones@sfgov.org>
Cc: Jim Araby <jaraby@ufcw5.org>
Subject: Fwd: SF labor and delivery policy

Please review and let’s discuss.

Ahsha

Ahsha Safai, M.C.P.
District 11 Supervisor
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Begin forwarded message:

From: Jim Araby <jaraby@ufcw5.org>
Date: February 23, 2021 at 4:14:25 PM PST
To: “Safai, Ahsha (BOS)” <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>
Subject: FW: SF labor and delivery policy

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

Sorry it has taken me a minute to send this to you. Let’s talk after you look this over.

Jim Araby
UFCW 5
Director of Strategic Campaigns
(510) 599-0488
Berenson, Samuel (BOS)

Subject: Lunch

Start: Mon 12/14/2020 12:00 PM
End: Mon 12/14/2020 1:00 PM

Recurrence: Weekly
Recurrence Pattern: every Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday from 12:00 PM to 1:00 PM

Meeting Status: Meeting organizer

Organizer: Safai, Ahsha (BOS)
Required Attendees: Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Ho, Tim (BOS); Chung, Lauren (BOS); Morris, Geoffrea (ADP); Berenson, Samuel (BOS)
Berenson, Samuel (BOS)

Subject: Monthly Meeting with Supervisor Safai and Director Degrafinried and Jada
Location: Microsoft Teams Meeting
Start: Mon 3/1/2021 9:30 AM
End: Mon 3/1/2021 10:00 AM
Recurrence: Monthly
Recurrence Pattern: the first Monday of every 1 month(s) from 9:30 AM to 10:00 AM
Meeting Status: Meeting organizer
Organizer: Safai, Ahsha (BOS)
Required Attendees: Hervey, Myisha (DPW); Wong, Anna (DPW); Degrafinried, Alaric (DPW); Durden, DiJaida (DPW); Berenson, Samuel (BOS); Chung, Lauren (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS)

That works for Alaric too.

Thanks,
Myisha

From: Wong, Anna (DPW) <anna.wong@sfdpw.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 09, 2021 4:27 PM
To: Berenson, Samuel (BOS) <sam.berenson@sfgov.org>; Hervey, Myisha (DPW) <myisha.hervey@sfdpw.org>
Cc: Spitz, Jeremy (DPW) <jeremy.spitz@sfdpw.org>
Subject: RE: Monthly Meeting Request

Hi Sam,

Jada is only available on The first Monday of every month at 9:30am.

Thanks,

Anna
Berenson, Samuel (BOS)

Subject: D11 Supervisor Safai and Director Tumlin and Maguire
Location: Microsoft Teams Meeting
Start: Mon 3/1/2021 3:30 PM
End: Mon 3/1/2021 4:00 PM
Recurrence: Monthly
Recurrence Pattern: the first Monday of every 1 month(s) from 3:30 PM to 4:00 PM
Meeting Status: Meeting organizer
Organizer: Safai, Ahsha (BOS)
Required Attendees: Chung, Lauren (BOS); Morris, Geoffrea (BOS); Berenson, Samuel (BOS); Jones, Ernest (BOS); Tumlin, Jeffrey (MTA); Maguire, Tom (MTA); Ramos, Joel (MTA); Martinsen, Janet (MTA); Tabak, Steven (MTA); Simpliciano, Sophia M

Microsoft Teams meeting
Berenson, Samuel (BOS)

Subject: CBO
Location: Microsoft Teams Meeting

Start: Thu 1/7/2021 1:00 PM
End: Thu 1/7/2021 2:00 PM

Recurrence: Weekly
Recurrence Pattern: every Thursday from 1:00 PM to 2:00 PM

Meeting Status: Meeting organizer

Organizer: Safai, Ahsha (BOS)
Required Attendees: Chung, Lauren (BOS); Ho, Tim (BOS); Morris, Geoffrea (BOS); Berenson, Samuel (BOS)

Microsoft Teams meeting
Berenson, Samuel (BOS)

Subject: Zoom Meeting Invitation Re: SF SafeCity Camera Program - Sup. Safai (D11)
Location: Via Zoom (Details Below)
Start: Mon 3/8/2021 4:00 PM
End: Mon 3/8/2021 5:00 PM
Show Time As: Tentative
Recurrence: (none)
Meeting Status: Not yet responded
Organizer: info@sfsafe.org

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

You have been invited to the following event.

Zoom Meeting Invitation Re: SF SafeCity Camera Program - Sup. Safai (D11)
  Mon Mar 8, 2021 4pm 5pm Pacific Time Los Angeles
  ia oom (etailselow) (map)
  Calendar ahsha.safai sfgov.org
  ho (Guest list has been hidden at organizer request)

more details »

F AFE is inviting you to a scheduled oom meeting.

Join oom Meeting
o stop receiving future updates for this event, decline this event. Alternatively you can sign up for a Google account at https://calendar.google.com/calendar and control your notification settings for your entire calendar.

Forwarding this invitation could allow any recipient to respond to the organizer and be added to the guest list, or invite others regardless of their own invitation status, or modify your

Learn More
Hi Kay,

The 1st Friday of every month starting 3/5 works for The Supervisor.

Respectfully,

Sam

From: Chung, Lauren (BOS) <lauren.l.chung@sfgov.org>
Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2021 2:08 PM
To: Phan, Kay (ADM) <kay.phan@sfgov.org>
Cc: Berenson, Samuel (BOS) <sam.berenson@sfgov.org>
Subject: RE: Monthly meeting: Supervisor Safai & Administrator Chu

Hi Kay,

Thank you for reaching out. I’m looping in my colleague Sam Berenson who can advise on Supervisor Safai’s availability for a monthly meeting with Administrator Chu.

Best,

Lauren

Lauren Chung 鍾洛藍 | Legislative Aide
Office of District 11 Supervisor Ahsha Safai
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl, San Francisco | Room 256
Direct: 415-554-7910 | Office: 415-554-6975

From: Phan, Kay (ADM) <kay.phan@sfgov.org>
Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2021 2:04 PM
To: Chung, Lauren (BOS) <lauren.l.chung@sfgov.org>
Hi Lauren,

Administrator Chu would like to set a 30-minute monthly meeting with Supervisor Safai starting in March, please. If Supervisor Safai has an urgent topic that needs to discuss with Carmen in Feb, please let me know. I’m happy to help schedule.

Would you give me a few choices if the following days/times will work?

- 1st or 2nd Mon of the month @ 2pm
- 1st Wed of the month @ 2:30pm
- 1st or 3rd Thurs @ 10:30am
- 1st, 3rd, or 4th Fri @ 2:30pm

Thank you.

Kay Phan  | Pronouns: She, Her, Hers  
Office of the City Administrator  
City and County of San Francisco  
City Hall, RM 362, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, CA  94102  
kay.phan@sfgov.org
Berenson, Samuel (BOS)

Subject: Staff Meeting
Location: Microsoft Teams Meeting
Start: Fri 12/18/2020 9:30 AM
End: Fri 12/18/2020 10:00 AM
Recurrence: Weekly
Recurrence Pattern: every Friday from 9:30 AM to 10:00 AM
Meeting Status: Meeting organizer
Organizer: Safai, Ahsha (BOS)
Required Attendees: Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Ho, Tim (BOS); Chung, Lauren (BOS); Berenson, Samuel (BOS); Morris, Geoffrea (BOS)

Microsoft Teams meeting
March 5 at 11:30 a.m. works for us. Will you please send us a zoom or conference call link?

Yours,
Asit Panwala

From: Chung, Lauren (BOS) <lauren.l.chung@sfgov.org>
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2021 2:39 PM
To: Panwala, Asit (DAT) <asit.panwala@sfgov.org>
Cc: Amador, Daniel (DAT) <daniel.amador@sfgov.org>; Souza, Lissette (DAT) <lissette.souza@sfgov.org>; Morris, Geoffrea (BOS) <geoffrea.morris@sfgov.org>
Subject: RE: Meeting with District Attorney Neighborhood Liaisons

Hello All,

Here are some times to meet with Supervisor Safai...

3/5 at 11:30am
3/8 at 1pm

Please let me know if one of these times will work.

Respectfully,

Sam
Hi Asit, Daniel and Lissette,

It would be great to meet regarding concerns of residents in District 11. I’m looping in Sam Berenson from our team who can help find a date and time that works for Supervisor Safai.

Thank you,

Lauren

From: Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2021 2:35 PM
To: Panwala, Asit (DAT) <asit.panwala@sfgov.org>; Chung, Lauren (BOS) <lauren.l.chung@sfgov.org>
Cc: Amador, Daniel (DAT) <daniel.amador@sfgov.org>; Souza, Lissette (DAT) <lissette.souza@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: Meeting with District Attorney Neighborhood Liaisons

Thank you.

Please connect with Lauren from my team.

Thank you,

Ahsha

Ahsha Safai, M.C.P.
District 11 Supervisor
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

On Fe 10, 2021, at 1:31 PM, Panwala, Asit (DAT) <asit.panwala@sfgov.org> wrote:

Dear Supervisor Safai,

Daniel, Lissette and I volunteered from the District Attorney’s office to hear the concerns of residents in District 11. We are hoping to have a meeting with you to hear your concerns as well. I am hoping we can schedule a zoom meeting so that we may introduce ourselves to you and learn more about your district.

Yours,

Asit Panwala
San Francisco District Attorney’s Office
350 Rhode Island Street
North Building, Suite 400N
San Francisco, CA 94103
(628) 652-4146

The information contained in this electronic message may be confidential. It is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this electronic message in error, please delete the original message from your e-mail system. Thank you.
Microsoft Teams meeting
Berenson, Samuel (BOS)

Subject: Comm. Safai Standing Board Briefing

Start: Thu 2/4/2021 10:00 AM
End: Thu 2/4/2021 10:30 AM
Show Time As: Tentative

Recurrence: (none)

Meeting Status: Tentatively accepted

Organizer: britney.milton@sfcta.org

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

You have been invited to the following event.

Comm. Safai Standing Board Briefing

hen Monthly from 10am to 10:30am on the first hursday acific ime os Angeles

Calendar ahsha.safai sfgov.org
ho
- ritney.milton sfcta.org organizer
- lauren.l.chung sfgov.org
- illy chang
- maria.lom ardo sfcta.org
- ahsha.safai sfgov.org
- anna.lafort sfcta.org
- sam. erenson sfgov.org

more details »
Going (ahsha.safai sfgov.org) All events in this series: Yes Maybe No more options

Invitation from Google Calendar

You are receiving this courtesy email at the account ahsha.safai sfgov.org because you are an attendee of this event.

If you are receiving future updates for this event, decline this event. Alternatively you can sign up for a Google account at https://calendar.google.com calendar and control your notification settings for your entire calendar.

Forwarding this invitation could allow any recipient to send a response to the organizer and be added to the guest list, or invite others regardless of their own invitation status, or to modify your

Learn More
Berenson, Samuel (BOS)

Subject: CPC meeting
Location: Details to come

Start: Mon 3/8/2021 12:00 PM
End: Mon 3/8/2021 2:00 PM
Show Time As: Tentative

Recurrence: (none)

Meeting Status: Not yet responded

Organizer: Capital Planning Program (ADM)

Required Attendees: Kelly, Naomi (ADM); Strong, Brian (ADM); Bukowski, Kenneth (ADM); Degrafinried, Alaric (DPW); Breed, Mayor London (MYR); Maybaum, Erica (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Bruss, Andrea (MYR); Kirkpatrick, Kelly (MYR); Groffenberger, Ashley (MYR); ROUX, KENNETH (CAT); Rosenfield, Ben (CON); Van Degna, Anna (CON); Sesay, Nadia (CII); Stevenson, Peg (CON); Conrad, Theodore (ECN); Ivar Satero (AIR); Geoff Neumayr (AIR); Kevin Kone (AIR); Tumlin, Jeffrey (MTA); Rosemoore, Jesse (MTA); Ito, Darton (MTA); Rewers, Jonathan (MTA); Forbes, Elaine (PRT); Benson, Brad (PRT); Kelly, Jr, Harlan (PUC); McPartland, Frank (PUC); Jacobo, Carlos (PUC); Carlin, Michael (PUC); How, Kathryn (PUC); Ginsburg, Phil (REC); Ajike, Toks (REC); Hillis, Rich (CPC); DiSanto, Thomas (CPC); Safai, Ahsha (BOS)

Optional Attendees: ecline@asianart.org; Christian, Jody (AAM); Mieler, Danielle (ADM); Higbee, Melissa (ADM); Rivoire, Heidi (ADM); Joshi, Nishad (ADM); Faust, Kate (ADM); Alburati, Hemiar (ADM); Gorham, Claudia (ADM); Green, Heather (ADM); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); Johnston, Jennifer (ADM); Khaw, Lynn (ADM); Lane, Rohan (ADM); McMahon, Trisha; Noguchi, John (ADM); Takashima, David (ADM); Penick, Andrico; Ybarra, Memo (ADM); Bohn, Nicole (ADM); Nguyen, Adam (ADM); Anna Lam (AIR); Claudia Guerra (AIR); donna.vong@flysf.com; Joe Nurisso (AIR); Krell, Rebekah (ART); Lee, Joanne (ART); Quan, Kevin (ART); Angulo, Sunny (BOS); Goossen, Carolyn (PDR); Chinchilla, Monica (BOS); Kelly, Margaux (ECN); Ronen, Hillary; mark.blake@sfgov.org; kenneth.roux@sfgov.org; Con, Conf305 (CON); Lacy, Damien (CON); Lane, Maura (CON); Katz, Bridget (CON); Brewer, Luke (CON); Rydstrom, Todd (CON); Trivedi, Vishal (CON); Varat, Adam (CPC); Rodgers, AnMarie (CPC); Clendinen, Eugene (DAT); O'Riordan, Patrick (DBI); Strawn, William (DBI); Greene, Matthew (DBI); Donnelly, Edward (DBI); Carroll, Maryellen (DEM); Tyson, Pamela (DEM); Jung, Kathy (DPH); Primeau, Mark (DPH); Zayas-Chien, Lisa (DPH); Higueras, Charles (DPW); Alameida, Ronald (DPW); Alonso, Rachel (DPW); Spitz, Jeremy (DPW); Chin, Joe (DPW); Chui, Samuel (DPW); Wong, Joseph (DPW); Dawson, Julia (DPW); Fernandez, Marisa (DPW); Gordon, Rachel (DPW); Kempf, Tim (DPW); Laue, Julia (DPW); Thomas, John (DPW); Lui, Raymond (DPW); Mebrahtu, Brook (DPW); Robertson, Bruce (DPW); ‘juan.cerda@sfdpw.org’; Walsh, Robert (HSA); Wong, Tiffany (REC); Kaplan, Daniel (HSA); Geddes, Michelle (DEM); ‘vallie.brown@sfgov.org’; ‘debbie.raphael@sfgov.org’; ‘placson@famsf.org’; Seifer, Jason (FAM); Corso, Mark; Scanlon, Olivia (FIR); Whiteley, Gigi (HOM); Miller, Katherine (JUV); Cowan, Sheryl (JUV); Nordyke, Linda (JUV); Arcelona, Steve (JUV); Hernandez, Paula (JUV); Murdoch, Christine (LIB); Singleton, Maureen (LIB); Castillo, Almer (LIB); Lambert, Michael (LIB); ‘roberto.lombardi@sfgov.org’; Simpliciano, Sophia (MTA); Webster, Monique (MTA); dan.adams@sfgov.org; Power, Andres (MYR); McCloskey, Benjamin (MYR); Patil, Lillian (MYR); Leung, Patrick (POL); McGuire, Catherine (POL); Yee, Greg (POL); O’Sullivan, Robert (POL); Gregg, Vivian (POL); Tave, Anthony (POL); O’Brien, Alexa (POL); Dunham, Daley (PRT); katherine.petrucione@sfgov.org; Borromeo, Gigi (PUC); Navarro, Carmelita (PUC); Perl, Charles (PUC); Sandler, Eric (PUC); Bradley, Stacy (REC); Chu, Derek (REC); Emerson, Taylor (REC); Garcia, Cristina (ADM); White, Staci (REC); CON - Samantha Delucchi; McGee, Mike (SCI); mathew.lau@calacademy.org; vicki.hennessy@sfgov.org; McConnell, Kevin (SHF); Fisher, Michele
### Berenson, Samuel (BOS)

**Subject:** Monthly Meeting with Mayor Breed  
**Location:** room 200  
**Start:** Thu 2/14/2019 4:00 PM  
**End:** Thu 2/14/2019 4:30 PM  
**Show Time As:** Tentative  
**Recurrence:** Monthly  
**Recurrence Pattern:** Occurs every month on the second Thursday of the month from 4:00 PM to 4:30 PM effective 2/14/2019.  
**Meeting Status:** Tentatively accepted  
**Organizer:** Ho, Tim (BOS)  
**Required Attendees:** Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Sandoval, Suhagey (BOS); Meyer, Catherine (BOS)
Berenson, Samuel (BOS)

Subject: Budget Briefing with Severin Campbell and Nicolas Menard
Location: Microsoft Teams Meeting

Start: Mon 12/14/2020 11:15 AM
End: Mon 12/14/2020 11:45 AM

Recurrence: Weekly
Recurrence Pattern: every Monday from 11:15 AM to 11:45 AM

Meeting Status: Meeting organizer

Organizer: Safai, Ahsha (BOS)
Required Attendees: Chung, Lauren (BOS); Campbell, Severin (BUD); Menard, Nicolas (BUD); Morris, Geoffrea (BOS)

Microsoft Teams meeting
Hi Samuel and Ernest,

Good e-meeting both of you.

Thank you for providing me several meeting dates and times. We would like to meet with Supervisor Safai on Tuesday, March 2nd at 11:30 AM. Please let me know if you have any questions. Thanks.

--
Anabel Ibáñez
Political Director
United Educators of San Francisco

From: "Berenson, Samuel (BOS)" <sam.berenson@sfgov.org>
Date: Thursday, February 11, 2021 at 3:38 PM
To: "Jones, Ernest (BOS)" <ernest.e.jones@sfgov.org>, aibanez <aibanez@uesf.org>
Cc: "Safai, Ahsha (BOS)" <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>
Subject: RE: UESF x D11 Meeting

Hello All,

Here are some times for a virtual meeting...

2/26 at 11:30am
3/2 at 11:30am
3/5 at 1pm

Please let me know if one of these times will work and I will send a Teams link to you all.

Respectfully,

Sam
From: Jones, Ernest (BOS) <ernest.e.jones@sfgov.org>
Sent: Thursday, February 11, 2021 3:31 PM
To: aibanez@uesf.org; Berenson, Samuel (BOS) <sam.berenson@sfgov.org>
Cc: Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>
Subject: UESF x D11 Meeting

Hi Ms. Ibanez,

My name is Ernest and I am reaching out on behalf of Supervisor Safai. He asked me and you to work with Sam to find time for a meeting. Sam, can you suggest some times that may work for the Supervisor and I to connect with Ms. Ibanez?

Best,

Ernest Jones | Legislative Aide
Office of District 11 Supervisor Ahsha Safai
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl, San Francisco | Room 256
Direct: 415-554-7897 | Office: 415-554-6975

Microsoft Teams meeting
Subject: VTC site visit with Supervisor David Canepa
Location: Balboa Upper Yard Parking Lot, 482 Geneva Ave, SF, CA 94112-enter from the San Jose side.

Start: Thu 3/4/2021 9:30 AM
End: Thu 3/4/2021 10:30 AM

Recurrence: (none)

Meeting Status: Meeting organizer

Organizer: Safai, Ahsha (BOS)

Required Attendees: Chung, Lauren (BOS); Morris, Geoffrea (BOS); Berenson, Samuel (BOS); Jones, Ernest (BOS); dcanepa@smcgov.org; mrichardson@smcgov.org
Berenson, Samuel (BOS)

Subject: Cally Wong
Location: 3/2 Zoom

Start: Tue 3/2/2021 10:30 AM
End: Tue 3/2/2021 11:00 AM

Recurrence: (none)

Meeting Status: Meeting organizer

Organizer: Safai, Ahsha (BOS)
Required Attendees: Chung, Lauren (BOS); Morris, Geoffrea (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Berenson, Samuel (BOS); Jones, Ernest (BOS); Cally Wong

Here is the zoom invite for the 26:

Join Zoom Meeting

URL: [Redacted]
Universe: [Redacted]
Meeting ID: [Redacted]
Passcode: [Redacted]

Cally Wong
Director, API Council
415-254-3628
www.apicouncil.org

22nd Annual SOR Report
APPENDIX - Page 1919
Berenson, Samuel (BOS)

Subject: Hold RE: Meeting with Supervisor Safai and Peskin
Location: Microsoft Teams Meeting
Start: Thu 3/11/2021 2:30 PM
End: Thu 3/11/2021 3:00 PM
Recurrence: (none)
Meeting Status: Meeting organizer
Organizer: Safai, Ahsha (BOS)
Required Attendees: Souza, Sarah (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Hepner, Lee (BOS); Chung, Lauren (BOS); Berenson, Samuel (BOS); SFERS, Brian (RET)

Microsoft Teams meeting

Good afternoon,

I wanted to follow up regarding the proposed date for the Divestment meeting. Does February 26th at 11:30am work for everyone? Do you want to meet this week instead?

Best,

Sarah

From: SFERS, Brian (RET)
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2021 12:16 PM
To: Berenson, Samuel (BOS) <sam.berenson@sfgov.org>
Cc: Souza, Sarah (BOS) <sarah.s.souza@sfgov.org>; Chung, Lauren (BOS) <lauren.l.chung@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Hepner, Lee (BOS) <lee.hepner@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: Meeting with Supervisor Safai and Peskin
Thanks for sending dates. I will touch base next week.

On Feb 10, 2021, at 12:13, Berenson, Samuel (BOS) <sam.berenson@sfgov.org> wrote:

Hi Sarah,

Thank you!

Brian,

Will 2/26 at 11:30am work for you? I will send out a hold to all so we can save the time as we hear back from Brian.

Respectfully,

Sam

Sam Berenson, Administrative Aide
Office of District 11 Supervisor Ahsha Safai
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl, San Francisco | Room 256
Direct: 415.554.6976 | Office: 415.554.6975

From: Souza, Sarah (BOS) <sarah.s.souza@sfgov.org>
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2021 12:02 PM
To: Berenson, Samuel (BOS) <sam.berenson@sfgov.org>; SFERS, Brian (RET) <brian.sfers@sfgov.org>; Chung, Lauren (BOS) <lauren.l.chung@sfgov.org>
Cc: Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Hepner, Lee (BOS) <lee.hepner@sfgov.org>
Subject: RE: Meeting with Supervisor Safai and Peskin

Supervisor Peskin and Lee Hepner are available on February 26 at 11:30am.

Thanks.

From: Berenson, Samuel (BOS)
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2021 11:32 AM
To: SFERS, Brian (RET) <brian.sfers@sfgov.org>; Chung, Lauren (BOS) <lauren.l.chung@sfgov.org>
Cc: Souza, Sarah (BOS) <sarah.s.souza@sfgov.org>
Subject: RE: Meeting with Supervisor Safai and Peskin

Hi Brian,

Here are some times Supervisor Safai is available...

2/26 at 11:30am
3/4 at 3:30pm
3/5 at 11:30am

Respectfully,
Hi Lauren. Hi Sam. My schedule is in flux until next week. Let’s circle back then.

On Feb 9, 2021, at 16:33, Chung, Lauren (BOS) wrote:

Hello,

Supervisor Safai asked me to reach out and schedule a time for a meeting with Supervisors Safai and Peskin and Commissioner Stanbury regarding divestment from fossil fuels.

My colleague Sam Berenson (cc’d) will provide a few dates and times that might work for Supervisor Safai.

Thank you,

Lauren

Lauren Chung 鍾洛藍 | Legislative Aide
Office of District 11 Supervisor Ahsha Safai
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl, San Francisco | Room 256
Direct: 415-554-7910 | Office: 415-554-6975
Berenson, Samuel (BOS)

Subject: EOC Briefing - (BOS, DEM, CAT, DPH, MYR, HOM)
Location: Microsoft Teams Meeting

Start: Wed 4/22/2020 12:00 PM
End: Wed 4/22/2020 1:00 PM
Show Time As: Tentative

Recurrence: Weekly
Recurrence Pattern: every Wednesday from 12:00 PM to 1:00 PM

Meeting Status: Tentatively accepted

Organizer: Calvillo, Angela (BOS)
Required Attendees: Imperial, Megan (BOS); Fregosi, Ian (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Bintliff, Jacob (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Monge, Paul (BOS); Kittler, Sophia (MYR); Mar, Gordon (BOS); PEARSON, ANNE (CAT); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Li-D9, Jennifer (BOS); Mcdonald, Courtney (BOS); Mullan, Andrew (BOS); Carroll, Maryellen (DEM); Gee, Natalie (BOS); Gallardo, Tracy (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Angulo, Sunny (BOS); Snyder, Jen (BOS); Bennett, Samuel (BOS); Herzstein, Daniel (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Berenson, Samuel (BOS); Chinchilla, Monica (BOS); Sandoval, Suhagey (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); Lerma, Santiago (BOS); Beinart, Amy (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Yu, Avery (BOS); Smeallie, Kyle (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Koeppel, Geri (BOS); Yan, Calvin (BOS); Hepner, Lee (BOS); Evans, Abe (BOS); Wright, Edward (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Quan, Daisy (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Adkins, Joe (BOS); Mundy, Erin (BOS); Temprano, Tom (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Zou, Han (BOS); RivamonteMesa, Abigail (BOS); Mahogany, Honey (BOS); Haney, Matt (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Falzon, Frankie (BOS); Kilgore, Preston (BOS); Patil, Sneha (DPH); Lim, Victor (DEM); Chan, Connie (BOS); Groth, Kelly (BOS); Tenner, Andrea (DPH); Morris, Geoffrea (BOS); Chung, Lauren (BOS); Fieber, Jennifer (BOS); Carrillo, Lila (BOS); Yu, Angelina (BOS)

Optional Attendees: Tse, John (BOS); Lindsay, Claire (DPH); Kent, Lani (DEM); Bechelli, Adrienne (DEM); Merlone, Audrey (CPC); Zamora, Francis (DEM); Fleisher, Arielle (DPH); Hogan, Kristin (DEM); MelgarStaff (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Schneider, Dylan (HOM); Jue, Tyrone (MYR); Jones, Ernest (BOS)

---

Join Microsoft Teams Meeting

[JOIN MEETING LINK]

[JOIN MEETING LINK]

[JOIN MEETING LINK]
Berenson, Samuel (BOS)

Subject: CBO
Location: Microsoft Teams Meeting
Start: Thu 1/7/2021 1:00 PM
End: Thu 1/7/2021 2:00 PM
Recurrence: Weekly
Recurrence Pattern: every Thursday from 1:00 PM to 2:00 PM
Meeting Status: Meeting organizer
Organizer: Safai, Ahsha (BOS)
Required Attendees: Chung, Lauren (BOS); Ho, Tim (BOS); Morris, Geoffrey (BOS); Berenson, Samuel (BOS)

Microsoft Teams meeting
Berenson, Samuel (BOS)

Subject: EOC Briefing - (BOS, DEM, CAT, DPH, MYR, HOM)
Location: Microsoft Teams Meeting

Start: Wed 4/22/2020 12:00 PM
End: Wed 4/22/2020 1:00 PM
Show Time As: Tentative

Recurrence: Weekly
Recurrence Pattern: every Wednesday from 12:00 PM to 1:00 PM

Meeting Status: Tentatively accepted

Organizer: Calvillo, Angela (BOS)
Required Attendees: Imperial, Megan (BOS); Fregosi, Ian (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Bintliff, Jacob (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Monge, Paul (BOS); Kittler, Sophia (MYR); Mar, Gordon (BOS); PEARSON, ANNE (CAT); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Li-D9, Jennifer (BOS); Mcdonald, Courtney (BOS); Mullan, Andrew (BOS); Carroll, Maryellen (DEM); Gee, Natalie (BOS); Gallardo, Tracy (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Angulo, Sunny (BOS); Snyder, Jen (BOS); Bennett, Samuel (BOS); Herzstein, Daniel (BOS); Stefan, Catherine (BOS); Berenson, Samuel (BOS); Chinchilla, Monica (BOS); Sandoval, Suhagey (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); Lerma, Santiago (BOS); Beinart, Amy (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Yu, Avery (BOS); Smeallie, Kyle (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Koeppel, Geri (BOS); Yan, Calvin (BOS); Hepner, Lee (BOS); Evans, Abe (BOS); Wright, Edward (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Quan, Daisy (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Adkins, Joe (BOS); Mundy, Erin (BOS); Temprano, Tom (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Zou, Han (BOS); RivamonteMesa, Abigail (BOS); Mahogany, Honey (BOS); Haney, Matt (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Falzon, Frankie (BOS); Kilgore, Preston (BOS); Patil, Sneha (DPH); Lim, Victor (DEM); Chan, Connie (BOS); Groth, Kelly (BOS); Tenner, Andrea (DPH); Morris, Geoffrea (BOS); Chung, Lauren (BOS); Fieber, Jennifer (BOS); Carrillo, Lila (BOS); Yu, Angelina (BOS)

Optional Attendees: Tse, John (BOS); Lindsay, Claire (DPH); Kent, Lani (DEM); Bechelli, Adrienne (DEM); Merlone, Audrey (CPC); Zamora, Francis (DEM); Fleisher, Arielle (DPH); Hogan, Kristin (DEM); MelgarStaff (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Schneider, Dylan (HOM); Jue, Tyrone (MYR); Jones, Ernest (BOS)

Join Microsoft Teams Meeting

[Redacted]
Berenson, Samuel (BOS)

Subject: 0 Guttenberg - Planning Commission
Location: Virtual

Start: Thu 3/11/2021 1:00 PM
End: Thu 3/11/2021 4:00 PM

Recurrence: (none)

Meeting Status: Accepted

Organizer: Jones, Ernest (BOS)
Required Attendees: Safai, Ahsha (BOS)
Subject: Hold SF Safe and Cameras.

Start: Mon 3/8/2021 4:00 PM
End: Mon 3/8/2021 4:30 PM

Recurrence: (none)

Meeting Status: Meeting organizer

Organizer: Safai, Ahsha (BOS)

Required Attendees: Chung, Lauren (BOS); Morris, Geoffrea (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Berenson, Samuel (BOS); Jones, Ernest (BOS)

What is the purpose of all listed being on the call?

Kyra Worthy
Executive Director
San Francisco SAFE

On Tue, Feb 23, 2021, 11:29 AM Berenson, Samuel (BOS) <sam.berenson@sfgov.org> wrote:

Hi Jeremy,

Sounds good. Please add all that are on this email chain from our team for the invite.

Respectfully,

Sam

From: Jeremy Wallenberg <jeremy@gfpublicaffairs.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 23, 2021 11:20 AM
To: Berenson, Samuel (BOS) <sam.berenson@sfgov.org>
Cc: Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Chinchilla, Monica (BOS) <monica.chinchilla@sfgov.org>; Chung, Lauren (BOS) <lauren.l.chung@sfgov.org>; Jones, Ernest (BOS) <ernest.e.jones@sfgov.org>; kyra@sfsafe.org
Subject: Re: SafeCity cameras in Ingleside

Thank you kindly for providing Samuel. 3/8 @ 4pm would work well from our side.
SAFE will send an invite momentarily with the zoom link enclosed. Looking forward to it.

Jeremy

On Tue, Feb 23, 2021 at 10:40 AM Berenson, Samuel (BOS) <sam.berenson@sfgov.org> wrote:

Hi Jeremy,

Here are some times to meet with Supervisor Safai and the team...

3/8 at 4pm
3/12 at 1pm
3/19 at 1pm

Respectfully,

Sam

From: Jeremy Wallenberg <jeremy@gfpublicaffairs.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 23, 2021 10:30 AM
To: Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>
Cc: Berenson, Samuel (BOS) <sam.berenson@sfgov.org>; Chinchilla, Monica (BOS) <monica.chinchilla@sfgov.org>; Chung, Lauren (BOS) <lauren.l.chung@sfgov.org>; Jones, Ernest (BOS) <ernest.e.jones@sfgov.org>; kyra@sfsafe.org
Subject: Re: SafeCity cameras in Ingleside
Thank you kindly Sam and pleasure to meet you both, Laura and Ernest. Please let us know yours and the Supervisor’s availability in the coming days / weeks, even if just 15mins, and I can help confirm on behalf of Kyra and SAFE and provide a virtual meeting invite.

Appreciate it.

Jeremy

On Tue, Feb 23, 2021 at 10:27 AM Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org> wrote:

Hi Jeremy,

Looping in Lauren Chung and Ernest Jones from our team. Monica is on family leave.

Respectfully,

Sam

Sam Berenson, Administrative Aide
Office of District 11 Supervisor Ahsha Safai
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl, San Francisco | Room 256
Direct: 415.554.6976 | Office: 415.554.6975
From: Jeremy Wallenberg <jeremy@gfpublicaffairs.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 23, 2021 10:15 AM
To: Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>
Cc: kyra@sfsafe.org; Chinchilla, Monica (BOS) <monica.chinchilla@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: SafeCity cameras in Ingleside

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

Supervisor Safai and Monica, we trust you and yours are staying healthy and well this week.

We simply wanted to follow up on our initial outreach briefly and see if you might have availability sometime next week to discuss the SafeCity camera program in Ingleside. Thank you as always for your engagement.

Jeremy

On Wed, Feb 17, 2021 at 7:35 AM Jeremy Wallenberg <jeremy@gfpublicaffairs.com> wrote:

Supervisor Safai,

Good morning and hope all is well with you and yours this week.

As you know, Kyra and San Francisco SAFE Inc. implement and administer the SafeCity community camera program in diverse neighborhoods citywide and we would like to connect with you and your office to ensure that we are aligned moving forward with respect to potential coverage for residents in Ingleside and making it sustainable.

Please let us know if you would like to set up some time in the coming week or so to discuss. Appreciate your time and consideration in advance as always.

Thank you.
Subject: Digital Divide Resolution and Hearing and Class of 2020 PSNS

Start: Thu 3/11/2021 10:00 AM
End: Thu 3/11/2021 2:00 PM

Recurrence: (none)

Meeting Status: Meeting organizer

Organizer: Safai, Ahsha (BOS)

Required Attendees: Chung, Lauren (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Morris, Geoffrea (BOS); Ho, Tim (BOS); Berenson, Samuel (BOS)
Berenson, Samuel (BOS)

Subject: Sup. Safai
Location: Need Link from Jessica Wong

Start: Mon 1/25/2021 2:30 PM
End: Mon 1/25/2021 3:00 PM

Recurrence: Weekly
Recurrence Pattern: every Monday from 2:30 PM to 3:00 PM

Meeting Status: Accepted

Organizer: Groffenberger, Ashley (MYR)
Required Attendees: Groffenberger, Ashley (MYR); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Morris, Geoffrea (BOS); Berenson, Samuel (BOS); Rosenfield, Ben (CON); Sandler, Risa (CON); Kittler, Sophia (MYR)
Optional Attendees: Lane, Maura (CON); Chung, Lauren (BOS)

Microsoft Teams meeting
Subject: Re: Digital Divide
Location: Microsoft Teams Meeting

Start: Thu 3/4/2021 3:30 PM
End: Thu 3/4/2021 4:00 PM

Recurrence: (none)

Meeting Status: Meeting organizer

Organizer: Safai, Ahsha (BOS)

Required Attendees: Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Chung, Lauren (BOS); Morris, Geoffrea (BOS); Berenson, Samuel (BOS); Jones, Ernest (BOS); Zak Franet; Reyes JR, Rudolph M (Rudy); Alex Tourk; Joanne Pagan

Optional Attendees: david@npgsf.com

Thank you Sam, we appreciate the time and would like to confirm Thursday, 3/4 at 3:30pm.

We will hold the time and look forward to you sending link information.

Have a great rest of your week.

Joanne

Joanne Pagan
Ground Floor Public Affairs
Executive Assistant to Alex Tourk, Principal

| p. 415-291-9501
| e. joanne@gfpublicaffairs.com
| a. 58 2nd Street, San Francisco 94105

On Thu, Feb 18, 2021 at 10:45 AM Berenson, Samuel (BOS) <sam.berenson@sfgov.org> wrote:

Hello Joanne,

Here are some available times to meet with Supervisor Safai...

3/2 at 9:30am
3/3 at 9:30am
3/4 at 3:30pm

Please let me know if one of these times will work for a virtual meeting?

Respectfully,

Sam

Sam Berenson, Administrative Aide
Office of District 11 Supervisor Ahsha Safai
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl, San Francisco | Room 256
Direct: 415.554.6976 | Office: 415.554.6975

From: Alex Tourk <tourk@gfpublicaffairs.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 18, 2021 10:15 AM
To: Joanne Pagan <joanne@gfpublicaffairs.com>
Cc: Morris, Geoffrea (BOS) <geoffrea.morris@sfgov.org>; Berenson, Samuel (BOS) <sam.berenson@sfgov.org>; Reyes JR, Rudolph M (Rudy) <rudy.reyes@verizon.com>; Zak Franet <zak@gfpublicaffairs.com>
Subject: Re: Digital Divide
Thank you Joanne. Geoffrea, I spoke with the Supervisor last night and we look forward to scheduling this conversation. Thank you for your assistance.

Alex

On Thu, Feb 18, 2021 at 9:52 AM Joanne Pagan <joanne@gfpublicaffairs.com> wrote:

Good Morning Geoffrea,

We would be more than happy to coordinate around the Supervisor's schedule, and if you would be willing to provide a few times which work, I can assist with coordinating on our end.

Looking forward to hearing from you.

Thank you,

Joanne

Joanne Pagan
Ground Floor Public Affairs
Executive Assistant to Alex Tourk, Principal

| p. 415-291-9501 |
| e. joanne@gfpublicaffairs.com |
On Fri, Feb 12, 2021 at 9:55 AM Alex Tourk <tourk@gfpublicaffairs.com> wrote:

Good Morning Supervisor,

Thank you for your willingness to connect with the Verizon team and we look forward to the opportunity to meet with you office.

I wanted to take this opportunity to introduce Rudy Reyes, who is the Vice-President for the Western Region at Verizon and will be taking the meeting on behalf of the company. I have also included Joanne and Zak from my team who can help coordinate scheduling on our end. Geoffra, we look forward to hearing back from you on scheduling this meeting, and any information you could provide us with regarding the upcoming hearing would be immensely helpful so that we can be prepared to discuss the issues most relevant and important to your office.

Please let us know if you need anything from us to help facilitate this process and we appreciate your willingness to engage with our client on these important issues.
Thank you.

Alex

On Wed, Feb 10, 2021 at 1:06 PM <geoffrea@yoursite.com> wrote:

Geoffrea,

Please send Alex Tourk the information about our upcoming hearing on the Digital Divide and work with him to find a time before that to talk with a Verizon Executive that is his client.

Thank you,

Ahsha

Ahsha Safai, M.C.P.

District 11 Supervisor

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

--

Alex Tourk, Principal

Ground Floor Public Affairs

5 2nd t. 4th Floor F, CA 4105
Microsoft Teams meeting
### Berenson, Samuel (BOS)

**Subject:** SFCTA Board Meeting  
**Start:** Tue 3/9/2021 10:00 AM  
**End:** Tue 3/9/2021 11:00 AM  
**Show Time As:** Tentative  
**Recurrence:** (none)  
**Meeting Status:** Not yet responded  
**Organizer:** britney.milton@sfcta.org

---

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

---

**You have been invited to the following event.**

**SFCTA Board Meeting**  
Hen, 2021 10am 11am acific ime os Angeles  
Calendar ahsha.safai sfgov.org  
ho  
- ritney.milton sfcta.org  
-  
- Aaron eskin( )  
- urch, ercy ( )  
- Angulo,unny ( )  
- erson, amuel ( )  
- Fal on, Frankie ( )  
- connie conniechansf.com  
- Jaco lintiff  
- Matt Haney  
- ean reston  
- Joe Adkins  
- Courtney Mc onald  
- atherine tefani  
- afael Mandelman ( )  
- i, Jennifer ( )  
- Hillary onen  
- angela.tsao sfcta.org  
- Gordon Mar  
- hamann alton  
- Chung, auren ( )  
- reston Kilgore
- Natalie Gee
- maria.lom ardo sfcta.org
- Ahsha aafai( )
- einart, Amy ( )
- Calvin an ( )
- Edward right ( )
- aniel Her stein

more details »
Going (ahsha.safai sfgov.org) Yes Maybe No more options

invitation from Google Calendar

You are receiving this courtesy email at the account ahsha.safai sfgov.org because you are an attendee of this event.

To stop receiving future updates for this event, decline this event. Alternatively you can sign up for a Google account at https://calendar.google.com and control your notification settings for your entire calendar.

Forwarding this invitation could allow any recipient to send a response to the organizer and be added to the guest list, or invite others regardless of their own invitation status, or to modify your... earn More
Berenson, Samuel (BOS)

Subject: SF Christian Center food pantry
Location: 5845 Mission street
Start: Wed 12/9/2020 11:00 AM
End: Wed 12/9/2020 1:00 PM
Recurrence: Weekly
Recurrence Pattern: every Wednesday from 11:00 AM to 1:00 PM
Meeting Status: Meeting organizer
Organizer: Safai, Ahsha (BOS)
Required Attendees: Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Ho, Tim (BOS); Berenson, Samuel (BOS); Chung, Lauren (BOS); Morris, Geoffrea (ADP)
Subject: Retirement Board Commission
Location: 1145 Market St 6th Floor

Start: Wed 8/8/2018 1:00 PM
End: Wed 8/8/2018 4:00 PM
Show Time As: Tentative

Recurrence: Monthly
Recurrence Pattern: the second Wednesday of every 1 month(s) from 1:00 PM to 4:00 PM

Meeting Status: Tentatively accepted

Organizer: Ho, Tim (BOS)

Required Attendees: Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Sandoval, Suhagey (BOS); Meyer, Catherine (BOS)
Berenson, Samuel (BOS)

Subject: Staff Meeting
Location: Microsoft Teams Meeting

Start: Fri 12/18/2020 9:30 AM
End: Fri 12/18/2020 10:00 AM

Recurrence: Weekly
Recurrence Pattern: every Friday from 9:30 AM to 10:00 AM

Meeting Status: Meeting organizer

Organizer: Safai, Ahsha (BOS)

Required Attendees: Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Ho, Tim (BOS); Chung, Lauren (BOS); Berenson, Samuel (BOS); Morris, Geoffrea (BOS)

Microsoft Teams meeting
Berenson, Samuel (BOS)

Subject: Lunch

Start: Mon 12/14/2020 12:00 PM
End: Mon 12/14/2020 1:00 PM

Recurrence: Weekly
Recurrence Pattern: every Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday from 12:00 PM to 1:00 PM

Meeting Status: Meeting organizer

Organizer: Safai, Ahsha (BOS)

Required Attendees: Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Ho, Tim (BOS); Chung, Lauren (BOS); Morris, Geoffrea (ADP); Berenson, Samuel (BOS)
Berenson, Samuel (BOS)

Subject: Staff Meeting
Location: Microsoft Teams Meeting
Start: Mon 12/14/2020 10:00 AM
End: Mon 12/14/2020 11:00 AM
Recurrence: Weekly
Recurrence Pattern: every Monday from 10:00 AM to 11:00 AM
Meeting Status: Meeting organizer
Organizer: Safai, Ahsha (BOS)
Required Attendees: Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Ho, Tim (BOS); Chung, Lauren (BOS); Berenson, Samuel (BOS); Morris, Geoffrea (BOS)

Microsoft Teams meeting
Thank you Sam! March 8th will work well.

Best!
Laura

On Tue, Feb 23, 2021 at 9:52 AM Berenson, Samuel (BOS) <sam.berenson@sfgov.org> wrote:

Hi Laura,

Here are some times to meet with Supervisor Safai...

3/8 at 3:30pm
3/12 at 1pm
3/19 at 1pm

Please let me know if one of those times will work and I will send you a link.

Respectfully,

Sam
No worries thank you Lauren! Sam, I’ll look for your email with possible times.

Thank you both!

Laura

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 22, 2021, at 18:32, Chung, Lauren (BOS) <lauren.l.chung@sfgov.org> wrote:

Hi Laura,

Looks like this email got stuck in my outbox for several weeks! Apologies for the delayed response.

Thanks for reaching out. I’m looping in Sam Berenson from our team who can provide a few dates and times that might work for Supervisor Safai.
Best,

Lauren

Lauren Chung 鍾洛蕊 | Legislative Aide

Office of District 11 Supervisor Ahsha Safai

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl, San Francisco | Room 256

Direct: 415-554-7910 | Office: 415-554-6975

From: Laura Hilgart <laura@newdealadvisers.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 04, 2021 3:10 PM
To: Chung, Lauren (BOS) <lauren.l.chung@sfgov.org>
Subject: Meeting Request

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

Hi Lauren,

I hope you are well! I am hoping to find a time with the Supervisor for late February or early March with the Hotel Council. This would be to reintroduce the Supervisor to some of the policy leaders on their Board and go over some of their priorities. Please let me know if there are any openings.

Best!
Laura

--

Laura Hilgart
Microsoft Teams meeting
Subject: Hold Merced Heights

Start: Mon 3/1/2021 5:30 PM
End: Mon 3/1/2021 7:00 PM

Recurrence: (none)

Organizer: Safai, Ahsha (BOS)
Hi Sam,

Alaric is available on Monday, 3/1 at 8:30am.

Thanks,
Myisha

From: Berenson, Samuel (BOS) <sam.berenson@sfgov.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 9, 2021 11:08 AM
To: Hervey, Myisha (DPW) <myisha.hervey@sfdpw.org>; Degrafinried, Alaric (DPW) <alaric.degrafinried@sfdpw.org>; Short, Carla (DPW) <Carla.Short@sfdpw.org>; Durden, DiJaida (DPW) <DiJaida.Durden@sfdpw.org>; Spitz, Jeremy (DPW) <Jeremy.Spitz@sfdpw.org>
Subject: Reschedule....

Hi Myisha,

I hope this message finds you well. We need to reschedule this Friday’s meeting at Delong street (2/12 at 3:30) Here are some times that’s Supervisor Safai is available for the reschedule.

2/18 at 8:30am
2/19 at 8:30am
2/22 at 8:30am
2/25 at 8:30am
3/1 at 8:30am

Respectfully,

Sam
Hi Sam,

Unfortunately, Alaric has conflicts for those times. Is the Supervisor available on Friday, 2/12 at 3:30pm instead?

Thanks,
Myisha

---

From: Berenson, Samuel (BOS) <sam.berenson@sfgov.org>
Sent: Monday, January 25, 2021 1:09 PM
To: Ho, Tim (BOS) <tim.h.ho@sfgov.org>; Spitz, Jeremy (DPW) <Jeremy.Spitz@sfdpw.org>; Hervey, Myisha (DPW) <myisha.hervey@sfdpw.org>
Cc: Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Short, Carla (DPW) <Carla.Short@sfdpw.org>
Subject: RE: Delong St Site Visit

Hello Myisha, Carla, and Jeremy,

Here are some available times to meet with Supervisor Safai....

2/11 at 10am
2/11 at 10:30am
2/11 at 11am
2/12 at 11am
2/12 at 2pm
2/12 at 2:30pm
2/12 at 3pm

Please let me know if any of those times work for you and your team or if you need more times. This will be an onsite visit at Delong street for your commuting purposes.

Respectfully,

Sam
Hi Jeremy & Myisha,

Hope you’re both doing well and staying safe!

The Supervisor wants to schedule a site visit with Director Degrafinried to Delong St. It should be a quick visit, 30 minutes, to see the conditions of the area and also work on a plan/strategy to improve the street. I’ve included Sam from our office to help schedule the date and times.

Thanks all,
Tim

Tim H. Ho | Legislative Aide
Supervisor Ahsha Safai, District 11
San Francisco City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Place, Room 256
San Francisco, CA 94102
t 415.554.7897 | f 415.554.6979

Sign up to receive our newsletters here.
Berenson, Samuel (BOS)

Subject: Staff Meeting
Location: Microsoft Teams Meeting
Start: Mon 12/14/2020 10:00 AM
End: Mon 12/14/2020 11:00 AM
Recurrence: Weekly
Recurrence Pattern: every Monday from 10:00 AM to 11:00 AM
Meeting Status: Meeting organizer
Organizer: Safai, Ahsha (BOS)
Required Attendees: Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Ho, Tim (BOS); Chung, Lauren (BOS); Berenson, Samuel (BOS); Morris, Geoffrea (BOS)

Microsoft Teams meeting
Hi Sam,

Hope you had a restful weekend. Thursday 3/4 at 5:30pm works for us. Please let us know if the Supervisor's office will be sending out invites and/or call-in information.

All the best,
Mandy

---

On Thu, Feb 18, 2021 at 5:00 PM Mandy Leung <mleung@sfgov.org> wrote:

Hi Neighbors,

For the sake of everyone's inbox, please respond just to me with your availability from the dates that Sam listed. I would appreciate getting your response by this Sunday at the latest.

All the best,
Mandy

---

On Thu, Feb 18, 2021, 4:53 PM Berenson, Samuel (BOS) <sam.berenson@sfgov.org> wrote:

Hello All,

Here are some times for a virtual meeting with our office....

2/25 at 5:30pm
3/4 at 5:30pm
3/8 at 5:30pm
3/11 at 5:30pm

Please let me know if one of those times will work for your group and I will send out a link.

Respectfully,

Sam

Sam Berenson, Administrative Aide
Office of District 11 Supervisor Ahsha Safai
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl, San Francisco | Room 256

Direct: 415.554.6976 | Office: 415.554.6975
Hi all,

Thank you for your comprehensive list of concerns for the OMI. Our office certainly takes your concerns seriously and is looking for ways to address each issue.

We would like to set up a time to meet virtually with all of you to further discuss the actions we have already taken to address the concerns in the list and new ideas.

Sam Berenson (cc’d) will help us find a time that works for everyone. My colleague Ernest Jones (also cc’d) will be working with me on this.

Please let me know if you have any questions in the meantime.

Thank you again,

Lauren Chung

Lauren Chung  |  Legislative Aide
Office of District 11  |  Supervisor Ahsha Safai
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl, San Francisco | Room 256
Direct: 415-554-7910  |  Office: 415-554-6975
Dear Supervisor Safai and Captain Rainsford,

We are a group of OMI residents who are increasingly concerned with a number of troubling issues that have plagued this neighborhood for years. You will find that many of these issues are not new, but they have either grown in frequency and/or becoming more egregious. On the list below, we have identified five (5) issues/general areas of concern that we would like to work with your offices on.

- **Reckless Driving**
  - Along Randolph St.
  - Illegal sideshow activities

- **Gun Violence/Incidents** (links to Taraval Station reports provided)
  - 01/27/2021 incident
  - 01/16/2021 incident
  - 01/02/2021 incident
  - 07/24/2020 incident

- **Illegal Parking & Other Illegal Activities**
  - 200 Randolph Street (SFHA Building)
  - 18/20 Randolph Street
- Illegal Dumping & Graffiti
  - iStorage on 19th and Monticello
  - Donation Box at 19th and Junipero Serra
  - Various known "hot spots" around the neighborhood

- Homeless Encampments
  - Randolph/Bright Mini Park
  - Brotherhood/Alemany near freeway entrance
  - Various locations along San Jose Avenue

We understand that some of these issues may be exacerbated by the pandemic, however, as previously stated, many of these are not new issues and should not be treated as temporary conditions induced by COVID-19 that merely require our patience to resolve. In fact, many of these issues have been reported extensively (via 311 and/or other means). At this time, we are asking for active collaboration from your offices to bring about real and long lasting changes to our community.

In the attached document, you will find a more detailed description of the issues that we have identified as a group along with ideas for solutions. We hope this document will act as a springboard for further discussions. After your careful review of the document, we would love to meet with you virtually to discuss the next steps to bring about positive changes to this neighborhood. Our group is generally available on weekdays at 5:30PM. Please provide us with your availability for a meeting.

Respectfully,

Mandy Leung
Alan Chin
Johanna Lopez Miyaki
Shawn Miyaki
Joyce Arpon
Edward Arpon
Clifford Wong
Microsoft Teams meeting
Sup of Records: Please see attached petition.

SOTF: Please file this email and attachments as a new complaint, Anonymous (83876-31149286@requests.muckrock.com) v Department of Police Accountability, Paul Henderson, Sara Maunder. The allegation is Admin Code 67.26 - non-minimal withholding/improper redaction justification. The complaint incorporates by reference the attached Sup of Records petition (except for the "Note to Herrera" at the end), requests that SOTF order the info disclosed, and to find a violation of 67.26.

NOTE: 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. I am not an attorney. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous
March 12, 2021

Sent via email to 83876-31149286@requests.muckrock.com

Anonymous
83876-31149286@requests.muckrock.com

Re: California Public Records Act Request: SB1421 Records

Dear Anonymous Requestor:

The Department of Police Accountability (“DPA”) is producing records to you in response to your public records request.

After a reasonably diligent search, the DPA has located responsive records that qualify for production under California Penal Code § 832.7. Enclosed are the following case files:

1. SF DPA Case No. 0367-96, BATES STAMP 000001-000080
   The case files are available to view or download on https://sfdpa.nextrequest.com/requests/20-3 in a folder labeled “0367-96.”

   Please note that these records are being produced in response to requests made by multiple parties. The DPA will produce records in response to your February 26, 2021 request for audio and video files separately and on a rolling basis.

   Preparing these files for production has involved multiple DPA employees. The undersigned has reviewed and approved the production, including each redaction. If you have any questions or concerns, please contact the undersigned in writing.

Sincerely,

/s/ Sara Maunder
Staff Attorney
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: DPA SB 1421 Police Misconduct Records - Immediate Disclosure Request and 67.21(c) request

Date: Thursday, November 28, 2019 at 1:52:50 AM Pacific Standard Time

From: 83876-31149286@requests.muckrock.com
To: paul.henderson@sfgov.org

Department Of Police Accountability
PRA Office
Suite 700
25 Van Ness Ave.,
San Francisco, CA 94102

November 28, 2019

This is a follow up to a previous request:

Paul Henderson and DPA,

** Note that all of your responses (including disclosed records) may be automatically and instantly available to the public on the MuckRock.com FOIA web service used to issue this request (though I am not a MuckRock representative). Redact your responses correctly - once you send them to us there is no going back. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be public records.**

This is a new Immediate Disclosure Request under the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance and the CPRA, made on November 27, 2019, to Paul Henderson as an individual custodian of public records and to the Department of Police Accountability as a public agency.

This is also an SFAC 67.21(c) request for statements of quantity, nature, existence, and form (even if content is exempt) of records responsive to each of 1 and 2 -- you must provide these statements within 7 days without any form extension.

All records must be provided in a rolling fashion (SFAC 67.25). If you use a web portal, you must publish all records openly without login or terms and conditions; or you may provide records as attachments to emails. You may not impose any conditions on me beyond than those of the CPRA (including any conditions that I must use a private entity's website which imposes terms and conditions).

A warning: every record you release to this publicly viewable email mailbox may become automatically visible to the public via the Muckrock.com FOIA service, and via other journalistic services that publish FOIA and public records documents for searching and indexing online. Please be absolutely certain you have correctly redacted all records prior to transmitting them to us, because there is no going back.

Please read carefully the exact wording of my request. Please follow the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA precisely as I am auditing your agency's public records regimen. As the City is aware, every violation of the Sunshine Ordinance or CPRA will be appealed immediately, including:
- any untimely or incomplete response, failure to provide records in a rolling fashion as soon as they are available, or failing to indicate whether you have responsive records or not for each request and whether you withheld any records for each request (SFAC 67.21, 67.25, Gov Code 6253(c)),
- withholding more than the minimum exempt portion of any record (SFAC 67.26),
- failure to justify with "clear reference" to an exemption statute or case law for each and every redaction or
withholding, including any so-called 'metadata' (SFAC 67.26, 67.27),
- failure to provide "exact copies" of records (Gov Code 6253(b)),
- failure to provide the "electronic format in which [you] hold[] the information" (Gov Code 6253.9),
- failure to provide any "easily generated" format that we requested (SFAC 67.21(l)),
- refusing to provide the quantity of exempt records (SFAC 67.21(c)),
- unlawful use of the exemptions prohibited by SFAC 67.24, including but not limited to GC 6255, any public interest balancing test,
- redacting or withholding information whose exemption you have already waived by producing it to the public before (Gov Code 6254.5).

Please provide:

1) IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE: all responsive records DPA has already provided under SB 1421 to any other requestor. Since you should not redact more information for me than you have provided any other member of the public (Gov Code 6254.5), you should be able to immediately provide these.

2) REGULAR DISCLOSURE: every record retained, owned, prepared, or used by DPA of: all records of officer’s discharge of a firearm at a person, all records of an officer’s use of force that results in death or great bodily injury, sustained findings of officer’s sexual assault of a member of the public, sustained findings of officer’s dishonesty that are disclosable under DB 1421. This is of course a very large request, and you may provide rolling responses. You stated in a letter (https://sfgov.org/sunshine/sites/default/files/sotf_120419_item12.pdf, page 12) that others have made similar expansive requests and I expect you to treat me with no less priority than anyone else. Please note, I expect you to redact these records in accordance with the Sunshine Ordinance - and you must justify each and every redaction or withholding with a clear reference, such as a footnote (SFAC 67.26), to a statute or case law (SFAC 67.27). If you provide only a general list of justifications, I will appeal, and you will eventually have to do all of the redaction work again as other City agencies have had to do. (For example, consider the functionality of Adobe Acrobat that allows you to put a redaction code in every redaction.) Please do not destroy any records during the pendency of my request or appeals. All records must be provided in their original electronic record, or .EML/.MSG formats, and with all metadata and headers. Please perform record production correctly the first time, as appeals and Orders from Court, SOTF, or Sup. of Records, will be quite time-consuming to have to re do.

For the sake of building a good record for any appeals I would ask that you issue formal letters detailing your expected timelines and a notice if you would like to negotiate any part of this request, if you need to.

Please provide only those copies of records available without any fees. If you determine certain records would require fees, please instead provide the required notice of which of those records are available and non-exempt for inspection in-person if we so choose.

I look forward to your immediate disclosure.

Sincerely,
Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 83876-31149286@requests.muckrock.com

Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 83876  
411A Highland Ave  
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester’s name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.

---

On Nov. 27, 2019:
Subject:
Paul Henderson and DPA,

** Note that all of your responses (including disclosed records) may be automatically and instantly available to the public on the MuckRock.com FOIA web service used to issue this request (though I am not a MuckRock representative). Redact your responses correctly - once you send them to us there is no going back. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be public records.**

This is a new Immediate Disclosure Request under the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance and the CPRA, made on November 27, 2019, to Paul Henderson as an individual custodian of public records and to the Department of Police Accountability as a public agency.

This is also an SFAC 67.21(c) request for statements of quantity, nature, existence, and form (even if content is exempt) of records responsive to each of 1 and 2 -- you must provide these statements within 7 days without any form extension.

All records must be provided in a rolling fashion (SFAC 67.25). If you use a web portal, you must publish all records openly without login or terms and conditions; or you may provide records as attachments to emails. You may not impose any conditions on me beyond than those of the CPRA (including any conditions that I must use a private entity's website which imposes terms and conditions).

A warning: every record you release to this publicly viewable email mailbox may become automatically visible to the public via the Muckrock.com FOIA service, and via other journalistic services that publish FOIA and public records documents for searching and indexing online. Please be absolutely certain you have correctly redacted all records prior to transmitting them to us, because there is no going back.

Please read carefully the exact wording of my request. Please follow the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA precisely as I am auditing your agency's public records regimen. As the City is aware, every violation of the Sunshine Ordinance or CPRA will be appealed immediately, including:
- any untimely or incomplete response, failure to provide records in a rolling fashion as soon as they are available, or failing to indicate whether you have responsive records or not for each request and whether you withheld any records for each request (SFAC 67.21, 67.25, Gov Code 6253(c)),
- withholding more than the minimum exempt portion of any record (SFAC 67.26),
- failure to justify with "clear reference" to an exemption statute or case law for each and every redaction or withholding, including any so-called 'metadata' (SFAC 67.26, 67.27),
- failure to provide "exact copies" of records (Gov Code 6253(b)),
- failure to provide the "electronic format in which [you] hold[] the information" (Gov Code 6253.9),
- failure to provide any "easily generated" format that we requested (SFAC 67.21(l)),
- refusing to provide the quantity of exempt records (SFAC 67.21(c)),
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- unlawful use of the exemptions prohibited by SFAC 67.24, including but not limited to GC 6255, any public interest balancing test,
- redacting or withholding information whose exemption you have already waived by producing it to the public before (Gov Code 6254.5).

Please provide:

1) IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE: all responsive records DPA has already provided under SB 1421 to any other requestor. Since you should not redact more information for me than you have provided any other member of the public (Gov Code 6254.5), you should be able to immediately provide these.

2) REGULAR DISCLOSURE: every record retained, owned, prepared, or used by DPA of: all records of officer’s discharge of a firearm at a person, all records of an officer’s use of force that results in death or great bodily injury, sustained findings of officer’s sexual assault of a member of the public, sustained findings of officer’s dishonesty that are disclosable under DB 1421. This is of course a very large request, and you may provide rolling responses. You stated in a letter (https://sfgov.org/sunshine/sites/default/files/sotf_120419_item12.pdf, page 12) that others have made similar expansive requests and I expect you to treat me with no less priority than anyone else. Please note, I expect you to redact these records in accordance with the Sunshine Ordinance - and you must justify each and every redaction or withholding with a clear reference, such as a footnote (SFAC 67.26), to a statute or case law (SFAC 67.27). If you provide only a general list of justifications, I will appeal, and you will eventually have to do all of the redaction work again as other City agencies have had to do. (For example, consider the functionality of Adobe Acrobat that allows you to put a redaction code in every redaction.) Please do not destroy any records during the pendency of my request or appeals. All records must be provided in their original electronic record, or .EML/.MSG formats, and with all metadata and headers. Please perform record production correctly the first time, as appeals and Orders from Court, SOTF, or Sup. of Records, will be quite time-consuming to have to re do.

For the sake of building a good record for any appeals I would ask that you issue formal letters detailing your expected timelines and a notice if you would like to negotiate any part of this request, if you need to.

Please provide only those copies of records available without any fees. If you determine certain records would require fees, please instead provide the required notice of which of those records are available and non-exempt for inspection in-person if we so choose.

I look forward to your immediate disclosure.

Sincerely,
Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 83876-31149286@requests.muckrock.com
t%2Flogin%2F%3Fnext%3D%252Fdepartment-of-police-accountability-19228%252Fdpa-sb-1421-police-misconduct-records-immediate-disclosure-request-and-6721c-request-83876%252Femail%2523Dpaul.henderson%252540sfgov.org%2526url_auth_token%3AAbpX9CHFQiXiGUvd8n13YUYh
%3AiaGTh%3ATIMOnMyc8P67N785zaay1n9io
Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 83876
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e.,
with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.
Petition under SF Admin Code § 67.21(d)

Supervisor of Records Dennis Herrera:

This is a petition under SF Admin Code 67.21(d) to determine in writing that the following portions of records are public and order DPA to disclose them.

As background, on Nov 28, 2019 the petitioner issued an omnibus SB1421 request to the DPA via 83876-31149286@requests.muckrock.com, joining many other persons and media groups in getting all of DPA’s police misconduct records. The records discussed here were released in rolling response to my request (and presumably to many others’ similar requests).

All examples are illustrative and non-exhaustive and use one DPA file 0367-96 to demonstrate that DPA is failing to or incompletely complying with the request by redacting disclosable portions of public records; see https://www.documentcloud.org/documents/20512997-production20-200367-96 (“Exhibit A”). All Bates numbers refer to Exhibit A.

DPA is redacting portions of non-personnel and non-complaint records (such as the original incident reports (against the civilian suspect, not investigating a police officer), office memoranda, etc.) under the “POBRA” redaction key. However it is impossible for such redactions to be so justified. According to DPA’s key, “POBRA” redactions are for Penal Code 832.7(a). Thus “POBRA” redactions may solely exempt personnel files of police officers (i.e. PC 832.8) and complaint files against police officers...
Anonymous Petition under SF Admin Code § 67.21(d)

(i.e. PC 832.5), and only when they are not otherwise disclosable due to PC 832.7(b).

However, DPA is using these redactions for files completely unrelated to personnel files and complaint files.

A record created in some non-personnel, non-complaint process being merely physically located in DPA's complaint file does not make that other file exempt under PC 832.7(a). In City of San Jose v. Superior Court of Santa Clara Cnty., 2 Cal.5th 608, 624 (Cal. 2017) the Supreme Court stated:

In Commission on Peace Officer Standards, supra, 42 Cal.4th at pages 289 to 290, 64 Cal.Rptr.3d 661, 165 P.3d 462, a state agency argued certain employment information was exempt from disclosure under CPRA because it had been placed in confidential personnel files. In considering a Penal Code provision that deems peace officer personnel records confidential, we rejected an interpretation that made confidentiality turn on the type of file in which records are located, finding it "unlikely the Legislature intended to render documents confidential based on their location, rather than their content." (Commission, at p. 291, 64 Cal.Rptr.3d 661, 165 P.3d 462.) Although we made this observation in analyzing the scope of a CPRA exemption, the same logic applies to the Act’s definition of what constitutes a public record in the first place. We found it unlikely "the Legislature intended that a public agency be able to shield information from public disclosure simply by placing it in" a certain type of file. (Commission, at p. 291, 64 Cal.Rptr.3d 661, 165 P.3d 462.)

Courts have repeatedly held that only the records generated in connection with the personnel (hiring, firing, promotion, appraisal, discipline) or
complaint process are exempt under POBRA. In *Long Beach Police Officers Ass’n v. City of Long Beach*, 172 Cal. Rptr. 3d 56, 64 (Cal. 2014):

For example, the information contained in the initial incident reports of an on-duty shooting are typically not “personnel records” as that term is defined in Penal Code section 832.8. It may be true that such shootings are routinely investigated by the employing agency, resulting eventually in some sort of officer appraisal or discipline. But only the records generated in connection with that appraisal or discipline would come within the statutory definition of personnel records (Pen.Code, § 832.8, subd. (d)). We do not read the phrase “records relating to ... [employee ... employee ... appraisal] or discipline” (ibid.) so broadly as to include every record that might be considered for purposes of an officer’s appraisal or discipline, for such a broad reading of the statute would sweep virtually all law enforcement records into the protected category of “personnel records” (id., § 832.8).


Here as in LBPOA, the City has not demonstrated the arrest video was “generated in connection” with Sergeant Laird’s appraisal or discipline. The video is simply a visual record of the minor’s arrest. (LBPOA, supra,59 Cal.4th at p. 72, 172 Cal.Rptr.3d 56, 325 P.3d 460.) Adopting the City’s broad reading of section 832.8, subdivision (d) would improperly “sweep virtually all [MAV recordings] into the protected category of ‘personnel records’ [citation].” (LBPOA, supra,59 Cal.4th at p. 71, 172 Cal.Rptr.3d 56, 325 P.3d 460.) We conclude the arrest video is akin to “information contained in the initial incident reports” of an arrest, which “are typically not ‘personnel
records’ as that term is defined in ... section 832.8." (Ibid. )

Therefore, all POBRA redactions and withholdings in DPA’s SB 1421 releases for records not generated in connection with personnel or complaint processes must be disclosed. It is also unclear how these constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of officers’ personal privacy. Non-exhaustive examples from Exhibit A include:

1. Bates 43 - general memorandum from unknown captain to all platoon commanders re: documentation of incidents

2. Bates 13 - incident report signature. Signatures of police officers are routinely distributed to the public, since they sign tickets and certificates - it is unclear why this is considered a personnel file when on non-personnel file records.

3. Bates 21 - lists of officers on duty and signatures of their commanding officers on a particular day

4. Bates 23 - officer assignments on a particular day and which vehicles they drove

5. Bates 31 and 54 - signed certificate of release from the original incident (the detention of the civilian)

6. Bates 49 - officer who is apparently a witness to the incident and providing some sort of incident diagram. This is non-exempt under Penal Code 832.7(b)(4) as a “statement[s] of an officer about an incident” (covered by 832.7(b))

7. Bates 55 - unknown record that appears to be a computerized dispatch log
NOTE TO HERRERA:

If you refuse to review the records and issue a determination and order if needed, you will be violating Admin Code 67.21(d) yourself and potentially aiding your City clients in violating the law as a direct result of willfully refusing to perform your own legally-mandated duties.

As long as the City continues to violate the law, no ethical option exists other than to continue to petition and appeal for complete, timely, and lawful disclosure, without exception.

Sincerely,

An Anonymous Independent Journalist
Supervisor of Records / SOTF,

DPW released the following record: https://www.documentcloud.org/documents/20514317-re20public20records20request202320-4927-redactedhtml201

A portion of a sentence between Heckel and Steinberg is redacted as attorney-client privileged.

Evid Code 954 - the a/c privilege - protects "a confidential communication between client and lawyer". Therefore in order to be privileged the redaction must be a communication, must be confidential, and must be between client and lawyer.

This redaction fails because neither Heckel nor Steinberg are each other’s lawyer or client. Employees merely discussing sensitive topics (in this case how to respond, or not to respond, to my other records requests) - without communicating confidentially with their DCAs - is not attorney-client privileged. Note that while Heckel is an attorney, he has previously stated he does not act as the lawyer for DPW.

Please order this redaction disclosed and determine it in writing to be public. SOTF, please find a 67.26 violation as well.

NOTE: 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. I am not an attorney. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

Sent from ProtonMail Mobile
--- Forwarded message ---

From: Anonymous Records Requester <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Date: On Thu, Mar 18, 2021 at 7:53 AM
Subject: Fwd: Immediate disclosure request - Where are the Scott-Breed messages? And 67.21(d) petition
To: Hank Heckel (Compliance Officer, Mayor Office, SF) <hank.heckel@sfgov.org>, Elsbernd, Sean (MYR) <sean.elsbernd@sfgov.org>, Bruss, Andrea (MYR) <andrea.bruss@sfgov.org>, mayorspressoffice@sfgov.org <mayorspressoffice@sfgov.org>, Cox, Andrew (POL) <r.andrew.cox@sfgov.org>, Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>
Cc: Lt. Cox and Chief Scott:

Over 3 months ago I made a request to SFPD for messages between Scott and the Mayor's Office. I've gotten nothing so far. This is contrary to SFPD's usually prompt response for such requests. https://www.muckrock.com/foi/san-francisco-141/text-and-chat-messages-immediate-disclosure-request-san-francisco-universal-search-sfpd-105574/ Audit trail.

Attached is a communication between Hank Heckel and Sean Elsbernd regarding the Mayor's Office desire to somehow review SFPD's productions before they are made.

It appears not only does the Mayor's Office destroy their own records, they now want to insinuate themselves into stopping SFPD from doing their own job under the CPRA, since SFPD retains the texts.

I will be alleging a willful violation by SFPD and the Mayor's Office in preventing any access to the Scott texts for over 3 months, which constitutes an unreasonable delay and a failure to provide rolling response. We're going to get to the bottom of all the Breed texts, no matter where they are. The harder the Mayor's office tries to stop them from being released, the more interesting it implies they are.

**Sup of Records Herrera:** Please determine in writing that the records requested linked above on Dec 5 are public and order SFPD to disclose them.

**Lt. Cox:** please provide all communications (whether email or text or any other form) between SFPD public records staff (whether in your unit or the Office of the Chief or anywhere else) and Hank Heckel or Sean Elsbernd between Dec 5 2020 and present (inclusive). Provide rolling responses and exact copies.

**NOTE:** 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. I am not an attorney. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any
other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

Sent from ProtonMail Mobile

On Wed, Mar 17, 2021 at 4:16 PM, Anonymous Records Requester <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:

--------- Forwarded message ---------
From: Anonymous Records Requester <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Date: On Wed, Mar 17, 2021 at 2:15 PM
Subject: Fwd: SF Corruption - The Now-Public Text Messages of Harlan Kelly and Walter Wong, and hopefully soon of Mayor Breed
To: Board of Supervisors (BoS, SF) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>, bos-legislative_aides@sfgov.org
Cc: COTE, JOHN (CAT) <John.Cote@sfcityatty.org>, City Attorney's Office (City Attorney, SF) <cityattorney@sfcityatty.org>, Feitelberg, Brittany (CAT) <Brittany.Feitelberg@sfcityatty.org>, Bruce Wolfe (Chair, SOTF, SF) <sotf@brucewolfene.net>, SOTF (SF) <sotf@sfgov.org>, controller.con@sfgov.org <controller.con@sfgov.org>, mcarlin@sewater.org <mcarlin@sewater.org>, Givner, Jon (CAT) <Jon.Givner@sfcityatty.org>, Ruski Augusto Sa, Mayara <MRuskiAugustoSa@sewater.org>, ethics.commission@sfgov.org <ethics.commission@sfgov.org>

Dear Supervisors,  
cc Mayor's Office, City Attorney, Controller, PUC, Ethics, and SOTF members

The Public Utilities Commission, working with the City Attorney's Office, recently released to me most of the text messages between Harlan Kelly and Walter Wong, as now reported by KQED. They are linked [DocCloud] [MuckRock] and speak for themselves. Given that I told you this yesterday at public comment, and a number of you commented on the matter to KQED, you are well aware of this.

This City's refusal to regulate public officials' use of personal communication devices and accounts to conduct business contributes directly to the culture of impunity and corruption which many of you claim to want to strike down. Do what I urged yesterday: make it a crime for any public official to destroy, fail to retain for less than 1 year, or fail to disclose ALL writings of any form about the conduct of public business on personal property. Not just formal
"records" as defined in Admin Code Ch 8, but all "public records" as defined in CPRA - which in a twist of legal irony is a much broader definition. Do any of you have the guts to do all of this, without also weakening the Sunshine Ordinance as some of you are itching to do?

Remember the public only found about what happened here because I used every available strategy under the Ordinance and kept on pushing. Herrera is still to issue a ruling on the Breed-Kelly texts too (see below). When City officials float suppressing my personal rights of request or appeal under the Ordinance and CPRA - keep in mind this is what they're helping to stop the public from knowing.

====================== The longer story:

I had originally requested Harlan Kelly's text messages in June 2020, prior to his arrest, pursuant to the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA. While Kelly had initially released almost all of a certain type of message with Walter Wong to me (not including the encrypted messages on Chinese platforms as alleged by the DoJ), after I had already reviewed the unredacted original set of texts, PUC then retracted that initially-released set, requested I delete my copy (which I did voluntarily, without conceding any obligation to do so), requested MuckRock delete their copy (which MuckRock claims to never have had) and released a heavily-redacted version instead.

However, the original unredacted records had already been and continued to be posted on PUC's own website https://sfpuc.sharefile.com/d-sfaf513caac747dcb (though they appear to have later been removed by PUC) and accessible to anyone. Though MuckRock appears to have never posted the PDF itself, the link to PUC's dropbox is of course available publicly at https://www.muckrock.com/foi/san-francisco-141/inter-agency-text-messages-immediate-disclosure-request-sf-puc-94992/#comm-911729 . This is the beauty of dealing in public records using MuckRock, DocumentCloud, and similar services - everyone can research public records independently, and all of us can learn from each other to request more records and dig deeper.

After the retraction, I immediately filed a Sunshine Ordinance Task Force complaint and a Supervisor of Records petition to Herrera in July 2020, pursuant to SF Admin Code 67.21(e) and (d) respectively, because the then-newly-redacted messages between Kelly and Wong appeared to reflect discussions of payments, insurance, and travel between a City contractor and a high-ranking City official - and thus were highly relevant to the conduct of public business.

In February, PUC wrote to me to again supplement their earlier now-admittedly-unlawful response to my request, and provide a new unredacted Kelly-Wong message batch. Why did Herrera and PUC wait over half a year to release these records when petitioned by me to do so in July 2020? It remains unclear. Unlike SOTF, Herrera, as PUC's attorney and the Supervisor of Records, can and does review the
original records in camera to determine whether they should be disclosed. He could’ve done so in July or any time before February.

There remain a few important mysteries: Per the PUC's letter, PUC apparently allowed Harlan Kelly to redact whatever he wanted in the Walter Wong messages without any oversight (as this method is apparently officially endorsed by City Attorney Herrera in his *City of San Jose v Superior Court* memo). But PUC also released a mostly-redacted set of London Breed-Harlan Kelly text messages and those Breed-Kelly records remain heavily redacted at this moment. London Breed claims she has no copies of these messages (i.e. she has deleted or failed to retain them at some point apparently) and usually claims she has no copies of any texts, period. The only copy of the mystery messages between Kelly and Breed are in the possession of the PUC, the City Attorney, or both. The integrity of the PUC and Herrera is measured not on their ability simply to release records after an official resigns or is arrested but when an official is still in the City's employ. To be clear, the Kelly-Breed messages may be completely innocuous, but the public should get to judge for themselves.

The people of San Francisco should not have to wait until the FBI finds alleged criminal activity to hold public officials accountable and even more simply to know what they are up to. Every person has a Constitutional right to access public records of officials, at all times, for any purpose whatsoever, and the City must not delay or prevent access due to a concern for the political consequences to officials. Politics is not an exemption to public access. If officials are worried about the political impact of releasing their texts, perhaps the solution is to act behind-the-scenes in a way that does not dishonor themselves and is consistent with their public policy positions.

We shall see if PUC or Herrera release these messages, or whether Breed’s strategy to permanently hide her communications with other City officials succeeds.

**NOTE:** 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. I am not an attorney. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous
From: Elsernd, Sean (MYR)
Sent: Friday, December 18, 2020 3:54 PM
To: Heckel, Hank (MYR) <hank.heckel@sfgov.org>
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text Messages / Walter Wong and others - Immediate Disclosure Request

I know. I just want them to redact the personal information and let us review before production.

From: Heckel, Hank (MYR)
Sent: Friday, December 18, 2020 3:40 PM
To: Elsernd, Sean (MYR) <sean.elsernd@sfgov.org>
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text Messages / Walter Wong and others - Immediate Disclosure Request

PD saves everything.

From: Heckel, Hank (MYR)
Sent: Friday, December 18, 2020 3:25 PM
To: Elsernd, Sean (MYR) <sean.elsernd@sfgov.org>
Subject: FW: California Public Records Act Request: Text Messages / Walter Wong and others - Immediate Disclosure Request

I don't have texts.

From: 98380-37550836@requests.muckrock.com <98380-37550836@requests.muckrock.com>
Sent: Friday, December 18, 2020 3:21 PM
To: Elsernd, Sean (MYR) <sean.elsernd@sfgov.org>
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text Messages / Walter Wong and others - Immediate Disclosure Request

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

December 18, 2020

This is a follow up to a previous request:

Sean Elsernd,

Please provide as an immediate disclosure request your copy of the attached public record texts disclosed by Commissioner Taylor.

--Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 98380-37550836@requests.muckrock.com
Buta, Odaya (CAT)

From: 81856-14311352@requests.muckrock.com
Sent: Friday, March 19, 2021 1:32 PM
To: Supervisor Records (CAT)
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request #20075

March 19, 2021

This is a follow up to request number 20075:

Supervisor of Records Herrera,

Sean Elsbernd, Hank Heckel, and Office of the Mayor were requested on Jan 19, 2021 to provide records requests they received from Jan 5 2021 to present. No response whatsoever having been received in the last 2+ months, they have refused to comply. Please determine in writing that the records are public and order them disclosed.

(Ignore the "Adnan" spam on the mailing list below)

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 81856-14311352@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:
XKz5U%3A1INLmq%3AEJLPohEzhhsR90-ryT3oNJ3ObCu0
Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 81856
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.

---

On Feb. 9, 2021:
Subject: Calling for help! - Ref: 937034560216, Tuesday, February 9, 2021 6:3:58

##- Please type your reply above this line -##
Hello,
Please do you handle cases regarding deceased partner's property settlement?
Please help us with the issue of my deceased husband's assets.
Please give me some advice.
Thank you!
Mrs. Adnan
---

On Jan. 19, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request #20075
This is an immediate disclosure request for all records requests received by the Mayor's Office from Jan 5, 2021 to present.
---

On Jan. 19, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request #20075
This is an immediate disclosure request for all records requests received by the Mayor's Office from Jan 5, 2021 to present.
---

On Jan. 19, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request #20075
This is an immediate disclosure request for all records requests received by the Mayor's Office from Jan 5, 2021 to present.
---

On Dec. 18, 2020:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request #20075
Thank you for your email. We are not further responding to this petition, as they Mayor's Office has indicated they did not withhold information. Thank you.

Bradley Russi
Deputy City Attorney
Office of City Attorney Dennis Herrera
City Hall, Room 234
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., San Francisco, CA 94102
www.sfcityattorney.org
---

On Oct. 17, 2019:
Subject: California Public Records Act Request: Mayor's Notes - Immediate Disclosure Request
Mayor Breed,

** Note that all of your responses (including disclosed records) may be automatically and instantly available to the public on the MuckRock.com service used to issue this request (though I am not a MuckRock representative). Redact your responses correctly - once you send them to us there is no going back. **

This is a new Immediate Disclosure Request under the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance and the CPRA. This is also a 67.21(c) request for the statement of quantity, nature, and form (even if exempt!) for each of #1, 2, and 3, within 7 days without extension.

All records must be provided in rolling fashion.
Please remember to justify all redactions with specificity - there is an Adobe Acrobat menu item designed exactly for this where you can code each redaction with a statute section number and then apply all the redactions, instead of writing a typed letter describing page locations (though it is your choice, Acrobat's functionality is superior).

Although you may not retain the records below formally, if you retain, own, use, or prepared them at the time of receipt of request you must provide them.

I am asking for very few documents, which should be readily available to the Mayor, and thus immediately disclosed.

Please provide:
1. IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE: an electronic scanned copy of the last 5 non-blank pages of the Mayor’s most recently used physical business memo- or note-book written in by her individually (not her staff on her behalf). If no such notebooks exist, you must indicate there are no responsive records.

2. IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE: an electronic copy (in PDF format, without printing physically and scanning) of the last 5 business electronic writings (whether Word documents, emails, etc.) written by the Mayor individually (not her staff on her behalf) to any City staff. If no such electronic writings exist, you must indicate there are no responsive records.

3. IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE: personal property responsive to #1 or #2 containing public business, from the Mayor, per City of San Jose v Superior Court

Please provide only those copies of records available without any fees. If you determine certain records would require fees, please instead provide the required notice of which of those records are available and non-exempt for inspection in-person if we so choose.

I look forward to your immediate disclosure.

Sincerely,
Anonymous

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 81856-14311352@requests.muckrock.com
Upload documents directly:
https://accounts.muckrock.com/accounts/login/?next=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.muckrock.com%2Faccounts%2Flogin%2F%3Fnext%3D%2Faccounts%2Fagency_login%252Foffice-of-the-mayor-3891%252Fmayors-notes-immediate-disclosure-request-81856%252F%253Femail%253Dsupervisor.records%2540sfcityatty.org&url_auth_token=AAAxJOK2OUULoYu4xv2F8W%7EXKz5U%3A1NLmq%3AEJLPohEzhsR9O-ryT3oNJ3ObCu0

Is this email coming to the wrong contact? Something else wrong? Use the above link to let us know.

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 81856
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.
Supervisor of Records Herrera,

All Supervisors and the Clerk of the Board having failed to notify me that their future calendars are disclosable public records, you must determine in writing that they are public, and order them disclosed.

IMPORTANT:
1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.
2. If you are NOT a public official: This communication is confidential and may contain unpublished information or confidential source information, protected by the California Shield Law, Evidence Code sec. 1070. I am a member of the electronic media and regularly publish information about the conduct of public officials.
3. I am not an attorney. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.
4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

------- Original Message -------
On Monday, March 8th, 2021 at 1:11 PM, Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:

Clerk Calvillo, and Supervisors Chan, Haney, Mandelman, Mar, Melgar, Peskin, Preston, Ronen, Safai, Stefani, and Walton, and all Offices thereof:

None of you have so far provided a notice of determination whether your future calendars are disclosable, violating Gov Code 6253(c). In addition to filing complaints against all of you I will be making an archive of all of your future calendars.

The following are additional immediate disclosure requests

- the details of each entry on all calendars or scheduling documents containing your future meetings (physical, virtual, phone, or in any other form) for the dates of May 1st through May 14th, 2021 regardless of whether that calendar is electronic or physical, or on your government account, your personal account (see City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017)), or the government or personal accounts of your staff members/assistants documenting your own meetings, and preserving all details including but not limited to attendees, date and time stamps, email addresses, subject lines, category/importance flags, locations, attendee/invite status, hyperlinks, images, body text, and attachments. Pursuant to SFAC 67.21(L), please produce electronic records in individual meeting details format (called "Memo Style" in Microsoft Outlook) and NOT as a monthly, daily, or weekly summary. If records of business-
related meetings that *you (the Supervisor/Clerk) will attend* are documented on someone else's calendar (like an aide's), I am indeed requesting those records as well.

In San Francisco, the deliberative process privilege is prohibited (SFAC 67.24(h)) - therefore *the people do indeed have the right to know who you will meet with and for what purpose even in the future.* Please also note that if you decide to redact security information, it is only redactable if the info is a *security procedure of a police agency* (i.e. if the sheriff or SFPD are protecting you at the meeting - see Gov Code 6254(f)). Redacting or withholding supposedly "sensitive" information not explicitly exempt under a law will be challenged.

Please see:

- Wednesday's SOTF Compliance recommendation against Breed that she has not fully complied with SOTF Order 19103 deeming her future calendars public
- **SOTF Order 19103** *Anonymous v Breed* ordering Mayor Breed to produce her future calendars with redactions for security procedures
- **SOTF Order 19112** *Anonymous v Scott* ordering Chief Scott to produce his future calendars with redactions for security procedures, and referral of Scott to the Ethics Commission
- City Attorney Herrera's Feb 1, 2021 voluntary change of mind and decision to disclose in redacted form his own future calendars after SOTF Order 19103, quoting: "In light of recent discussions at the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force regarding public officials’ disclosure of their future calendars, we have re-evaluated the legal question and consulted with the Police Department about security risks. Following that evaluation, we have concluded that in most circumstances the City Attorney may safely and legally disclose certain information about his future meetings, including the subject matter of the meeting and the attendees, if that information is recorded in his calendar, and the week during which the meeting will occur. Due to security concerns, we will continue to withhold the location, time, and specific date of each meeting. There may be circumstances in the future where information about the subject matter or attendees of a meeting should be withheld based on fact-specific security concerns or other legal grounds, but your current request does not raise those concerns."

If you wait to produce the entries after the meetings occur (as happened in 19103/19112) or attempt to hide politically sensitive meetings (which are not exempt under any law), I will file immediate appeals and complaints, and given past rulings I expect to win.

**NOTE:** 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous
Dear Supervisor of Records Dennis Herrera:

Attached is a 67.21(d) petition covering email, text, and calendar metadata and related issues (email addresses, urls, etc.)

The power is yours to avoid the inefficiencies of per-request complaints/petitions as you previously stated you want to. Here is your chance: as you did with the future calendars issue, you must reverse your years of wrong determinations, correct your opinion in writing via this composite petition against various departments for the listed requests, and let the City move on from metadata as a controversy with strictly more public access.

Give the public a firm determination/order that all petitioned City departments will comply with and I won't need to go to SOTF on the issue piecemeal.

It is up to you Mr. Herrera.

BCC-ed Custodians: It is in your interest that Mr. Herrera summarily resolve the metadata issue for the entire City in the same direction as SOTF has one-off for each of you whose complaints have so far been adjudicated. Consider encouraging him to do the right thing.

Cc public communication to SOTF-IT for visibility.

**IMPORTANT:**
1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.
2. If you are NOT a public official: This communication is confidential and may contain unpublished information or confidential source information, protected by the California Shield Law, Evidence Code sec. 1070. I am a member of the electronic media and regularly publish information about the conduct of public officials.
3. I am not a lawyer. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.
4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

Sent from ProtonMail for iOS
April 12, 2021

Petition under SFAC § 67.21(d) re: email, text, and calendar metadata

Supervisor of Records Dennis Herrera:

Under Admin Code 67.21(d), please determine in writing that records or parts thereof are public, and order the custodians to comply with the requests, in at least each request listed at the bottom of this email (Appendix A). You have closely related petitions from Oct 9–11, 2020 outstanding on similar topics.

You have expressed a concern with the efficiency of the per-request complaint process – you can with a response to all petitions herein set the entire City on the correct footing with regards to release of email, calendar, and text message metadata.

Previously-internal custodian communications within the City disclosed to me indicate that your old anti-metadata legal memorandum is no longer applicable within the City. Specifically, in February 2021, when a custodian deferred to your anti-metadata memo in helping a second custodian understand the policy about not producing metadata to a records request, Mayoral compliance officer Hank Heckel states to the other custodians, “There have been major changes in the policy surrounding this that we should discuss.”¹ Therefore, I am expecting a reply similar to your latest summary determination to my future calendar petitions reversing your numerous earlier incorrect determinations, and laying out the proper ruling now to set the record straight.

The parts of records relevant to these petitions that should be disclosed are at least:

● every email address in the To, From, Sender, Cc, and Bcc (for email) and Attendees, Invitees, and Organizer (for calendars) that are not exempt under Constitutional privacy

¹<https://www.documentcloud.org/documents/20603951-re20library20prrs-redactedhtml>
• every sender and all recipients of text/chat messages
• every hyperlink url not otherwise specifically exempt
• every row/header/field name in email headers and calendar ICS data
• every portion of the email headers and calendar ICS data values not explicitly deemed an exempt information security record or not otherwise specifically exempt

Moreover, email headers and calendar ICS data (both “metadata”) are both public and, generally, disclosable (with exceptions that may be redacted).

You claim to lack jurisdiction over the format (Admin Code 67.21(L)) of a record. But I am not challenging the format here, I am challenging the unlawful withholding of specific information (or, in the words of Admin Code 67.21(d), parts of records) including that listed above, which constitutes an incomplete response – which you do have jurisdiction over.

It is in fact possible to produce this info in PDF format, as you personally have done in SOTF 19044 for email headers, the Mayor has done in SOTF 19047 for calendars ICS data, the Mayor has done voluntarily for email addresses, DPW has done in SOTF 19097 for email headers, urls, and email addresses, DPW has done voluntarily thereafter for both email and calendars, DT has done in SOTF 19119 for email headers and calendar ICS data, DT has done voluntarily thereafter for both, and the Treasurer has done in SOTF 19131 most recently.

PETITIONED REQUESTS (APPENDIX A):

Each of the following requests has been incompletely complied with and is petitioned. They are chosen to run the gamut across agencies and across email, text, and calendar metadata and related issues (email addresses, urls, etc.)

1. In the SOTF 19044 request’s records from City Attorney, the email header “Authentication-Results” that remains redacted (John Cote represented to SOTF during Compliance that if the IT experts determined this could be disclosed, they would do so, and DT has in fact disclosed this header to me in their own email metadata based on the latest revision of the metadata redactor)

2. My Jan 23, 2020 request to City Attorney from this email address for the ICS data of the April 28 – May 4, 2019 Herrera calendar (sub-part 7)

3. My July 2, 2019 request to SFPD from 76435-93915115@requests.muckrock.com for certain emails “with all headers, metadata, timestamps, attachments, appendices, exhibits, and inline images, except those explicitly exempted by the Ordi-
nance,” and certain text/chat messages “with all headers, metadata, timestamps, attachments, appendices, exhibits, and inline images, except those explicitly exempted by the Ordinance”

4. My various requests from November 2, 2019 to May 20, 2020 from 82814-07144940@requests.muckrock.com to the Office of Mayor periodically archiving the ICS calendar data of Mayor Breed, Andrea Bruss, and Sean Elsbernd’s calendars (sub-part 3a in each of the requests dated: Nov 2, 2019; Nov 8, 2019; Nov 16, 2019; Nov 21, 2019; Nov 27, 2019; Dec 7, 2019; Dec 13, 2019; Dec 19, 2019; Dec 27, 2019; Jan 3, 2020; Jan 13, 2020; Jan 24, 2020; Jan 31, 2020; Feb 8, 2020; Feb 18, 2020; Feb 21, 2020; March 2, 2020; March 7, 2020; March 16, 2020; April 6, 2020; May 5, 2020; and May 20, 2020)

5. My request numbered 20-881 from 82814-07144940@requests.muckrock.com to Public Works regarding Sandra Zuniga’s ICS calendar data (sub-part 3a)

6. My Feb 5, 2021 request to the Library Commission from this email address for emails where email addresses and hyperlinks were withheld

7. My March 4, 2021 request to the Mayor’s Office from 98380-37550836@requests.muckrock.com for communications with Recology’s Paul Giusti “preserving all attachments, images, audio, video, To/From/Cc/Bcc email addresses, hyperlinks, urls, formatting.”

8. My separate Dec 7, 2019 requests to the

   a) Office of the Clerk of the Board,
   b) Office of City Administrator,
   c) Department of Emergency Management,
   d) Municipal Transportation Agency,
   e) Office of Economic and Workforce Development,
   f) Controller’s Office,
   g) Public Health,
   h) Building Inspection,
   i) Sheriff,
j) Airport Commission,

k) Public Utilities Commission,

l) Chief Medical Examiner,

m) Animal Care,

n) Elections,

o) Arts Commission,

p) Fire Department,

q) Recreation and Park,

r) Assessor Recorder,

s) Fine Arts Museums,

t) Public Defender,

u) Homelessness and Supportive Housing

from *@requests.muckrock.com for certain email “with all non-exempt headers and metadata, and you must preserve all attachments, exhibits, formatting, hyperlinks, images, colors, and From/To/Cc/Bcc email addresses” and certain calendar ICS data “with all non-exempt headers and metadata, and you must preserve all attachments, exhibits, formatting, hyperlinks, images, colors, email addresses, invitees and their attendance status, recurrences, exact start/end times, locations, titles, and descriptions.”

9. My separate Dec 16, 2019 requests to the

   a) Child Support Services,

   b) Status of Women,

   c) Entertainment Commission,

   d) Environment,

   e) Human Resources,
Anonymous Petition under SFAC § 67.21(d) re: email, text, and calendar metadata

f) Housing and Community Development,

g) Port of San Francisco,

h) Office of Contract Administration,

i) Office of Cannabis,

j) Human Services Agency

from *@requests.muckrock.com for certain email “with all non-exempt headers and metadata, and you must preserve all attachments, exhibits, formatting, hyperlinks, images, colors, and From/To/Cc/Bcc email addresses” and certain calendar ICS data “with all non-exempt headers and metadata, and you must preserve all attachments, exhibits, formatting, hyperlinks, images, colors, email addresses, invitees and their attendance status, recurrences, exact start/end times, locations, titles, and descriptions.”

NOTE TO HERRERA:

If you refuse to review the records and issue a determination and order if needed, you will be violating Admin Code 67.21(d) yourself and potentially aiding your City clients in violating the law as a direct result of willfully refusing to perform your own legally-mandated duties.

As long as the City continues to violate the law, no ethical option exists other than to continue to petition and appeal for complete, timely, and lawful disclosure, without exception. Vigorous pursuit of Sunshine violators will continue until the day your office ceases its willful non-compliance and properly trains the City to reduce violations to your arbitrarily chosen 6 violations per year.

Sincerely,

An Anonymous Independent Journalist
Buta, Odaya (CAT)

From: Anonymous Records Requester <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Friday, April 23, 2021 10:42 PM
To: SOTF, (BOS); Supervisor Records (CAT)
Subject: 67.21(d) petition and SOTF Complaint vs. Ethics Commission
Attachments: 20210423_vs_ethics-F.pdf; signature.asc

SOTF: Please file the attached complaint Anonymous v Ethics Commission, LeeAnn Pelham, and Jeffrey Pierce.
Supervisor of Records Herrera: This is a 67.21(d) to determine in writing that records thereof are public and order them disclosed.

Regards,

Anonymous
Twitter @journo_anon

IMPORTANT:
1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.
2. If you are NOT a public official: This communication is confidential and may contain unpublished information or confidential source information, protected by the California Shield Law, Evidence Code sec. 1070. I am a member of the electronic media and regularly publish information about the conduct of public officials.
3. I am not a lawyer. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.
4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sent with ProtonMail Secure Email.
Complaint Anonymous v Ethics Commission, et al., April 23, 2021

Sunshine Ordinance Task Force:

Please file a complaint Anonymous v Ethics Commission, Jeffrey Pierce, and LeeAnn Pelham. Allegations: violation of SFAC §67.24(h) for unlawfully withholding information under the deliberative process privilege; SFAC §67.24(c)(7) for unlawfully withholding records of confirmed misconduct; SFAC §67.27 for withholding information without an appropriate written legal justification; SFAC §67.26 for withholding more than the minimum exempt information. You should take as proven any allegation not specifically denied by the Respondents. (Supervisor of Records: This is also a petition under Admin Code §67.21(d) to determine in writing that any records withheld under an illegal justification are public, and to order them disclosed.)

1. BACKGROUND

2. On Feb 21, 2021 via email I filed 3 records requests to the Ethics Commission. (Full request text and response thread are in Exhibit A).

   “1. This is an immediate disclosure request for the records request-tracking spreadsheet/database/log (if you keep any) for all records requests made to your agency meeting either of the following criteria: request was received on or after March 23, 2020 OR any response was issued on or after March 23, 2020. ..." 

   2. This is an immediate disclosure request for all emails or mailed letters related to records requests/responses with the phrase "10 business days" case-insensitive anywhere in the thread (i.e. including replies/forward bodies included in other emails) sent by anyone in your Office/agency (sent to a requester, or to another City employee) on or after March 23, 2020. ...
3. To SOTF and Ethics only: This is an immediate disclosure request for any tracking spreadsheet/database/log for all complaints filed with your agency from March 23, 2020 to present. This request includes personal account searches. Include all columns or fields in any database. Any electronic format preserving ALL non-exempt electronic information is acceptable (all exempt info in the original electronic record must be specifically justified).”

3. Respondents replied on Feb 22, 2021 withholding records citing a section of the City charter (instead of State law). Because local law cannot exempt information otherwise disclosable under State law, I will ignore this citation (they revise their response below).

4. On Feb 23, Respondents clarified that the Feb 22 response was not their complete response. On Feb 25, Respondents provided further responses, but restated their total withholding for request number 3 under their earlier Feb 22 citation.

5. On Apr 14, Respondents revised their response to request number 3, by providing one record and withholding all others under the following 3 state law citations:


   2. The official information privilege in Evidence Code section 1040.

   3. The constitutional right to privacy under Article I, section 1.”

6. These citations and withholdings are not legal in San Francisco. This is especially troubling because the Ethics Commission is one of the few bodies legally endowed with the teeth to enforce the Sunshine Ordinance. Given that the Ethics Commission clearly does not understand the enhancements in the Sunshine Ordinance above and beyond the CPRA, how can the people of San Francisco trust the Ethics Commission to appropriately enforce the various violations that the Task Force refers to it? Perhaps this is why the Commission almost always refuses to enforce the Ordinance against any City official no matter how egregious the violation.

7. For the purposes of this complaint, the Mayor’s Fifth Supplemental COVID-19 Declaration purporting to suspend certain portions of the Sunshine Ordinance is presumed valid unless it is rescinded by the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors or voided by a court, but as always I do not concede that it is indeed valid and may

---

1They also referred me to their website for closed cases: [https://sfethics.org/enforcement/case-resolutions](https://sfethics.org/enforcement/case-resolutions)
continue to challenge it in other forums.²

8. **ALLEGATION 1: Violation of Admin Code 67.24(h)**

9. Admin Code 67.24(h) states: “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.”

10. Respondents stated on April 14: “Regarding the withholdings the Commission previously identified, the Commission withholds complaints alleging violations of campaign finance, lobbying, conflicts of interest and governmental ethics, and whistleblower protection violations, and records of investigations, under the following provisions of State law: 1. The deliberative process privilege under Government Code section 6255. ...”

11. Thus, Respondents unlawfully asserted an exemption for withholding based on a “deliberative process” exemption. All information withheld under this privilege must be disclosed.

12. **ALLEGATION 2: Violation of Admin Code 67.24(c)(7)**

13. Admin Code 67.24(c)(7) states: “(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: ... (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.”

14. Any information responsive to my requests related to “confirmed misconduct” must be disclosed and are not exempt under personal privacy as cited by Respondents in their third justification of April 14.

15. **ALLEGATION 3: Violation of Admin Code 67.27**

16. Admin Code 67.27 requires that “Any withholding of information shall be justified, in writing, as follows: (a) A withholding under a specific permissive exemption in the California Public Records Act, or elsewhere, which permissive exemption is not forbidden to be asserted by this ordinance, shall cite that authority. ...”

²Note that the Declaration states “This paragraph does not suspend Administrative Code Section 67.24(h) regarding a ‘deliberative process’ exemption.”
17. The deliberative process privilege is forbidden to be asserted by this ordinance (see Allegation 1).

18. Respondents’ second April 14 citation is also not permitted because it is not a “specific” exemption: “The official information privilege in Evidence Code section 1040.”

19. Evidence Code §1040 does not contain only a single exemption - it contains two distinct exemptions, and Respondents must choose.

20. Consider a citation to Gov Code §6254 – that would not be sufficient. Instead, agencies must cite a “specific [] exemption” such as 6254(c) or 6254(f).

21. In the same vein, Respondents must cite in writing whether they are using §1040(b)(1) or §1040(b)(2), which exempt two different types of information: (1) official information³ for which “disclosure is forbidden by an act of the Congress of the United States or a statute of this state.” OR (2) official information for which “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”.

22. All information withheld under this section must be disclosed, unless Respondents can cite a specific portion of Evidence Code 1040 under which the information is genuinely exempt. And if §1040(b)(1) is chosen, Respondents must also cite a state or federal law that prohibits the disclosure (they have only cited in the past a local law).

23. Finally, the third April 14 citation also appears to be insufficient: “3. The constitutional right to privacy under Article I, section 1.”. There is a more specific exemption available under Govt Code §6254(c). Privacy is not a blanket reason for withholding information. Only “unwarranted invasion of personal privacy” is a reason for withholding. By running for office, being elected, or employed by the City, persons voluntarily exchange some of their personal privacy for the power they have as government representatives. Furthermore courts have held that disclosure of certain records of misconduct – even in some cases mere allegations of such misconduct – does not constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy (see below).

24. ALLEGATION 4: Violation of Admin Code 67.26

³Official information is defined in Evidence Code §1040(a) as “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”
25. Admin Code 67.26 requires the City to withhold only the minimum exempt portion of a public record so as to disclose as much else as possible. Usually, redaction is used to achieve this.

26. For records that supposedly invade personal privacy, Respondents could for example redact names or contact info of complainants and release the remainder of the record.

27. As it regards the privacy of the alleged perpetrators in Ethics Commissions complaints, courts have held, after considering the Constitutional privacy provisions, that “it is in keeping with ... the express purpose of the [Public Records] Act that where there is reasonable cause to believe the complaint to be well founded, the right of public access to related public records exists” 44 (Am. Fed. of St. Emp. v. Regents of Univ. of Calif, 80 Cal.App.3d 913, 918 (Cal. Ct. App. 1978)). Any information for “confirmed misconduct” is disclosable as well (see Allegation 2).

28. And, as the League of California Cities describes, “even if the local agency employee is exonerated of wrongdoing, disclosure may be warranted if the allegations of misconduct involve a high-ranking public official or local agency employee in a position of public trust and responsibility, given the public’s interest in understanding why the employee was exonerated and how the local agency employer treated the accusations.” 5

44We are aided greatly by the case of Chronicle Pub. Co. v. Superior Court, 54 Cal.2d 548 [7 Cal.Rptr. 109, 354 P.2d 637], which concerned the public right to information concerning records of complaints of wrongdoing against members of the State Bar of California, a context, we opine, reasonably analogous to that of the case at hand. The high court concluded (p. 572) that: "Only strong public policies weigh against disclosure" of such matters. Such a strong public policy was found in the case of trivial or groundless charges which often, "no matter how guiltless the attorney might be, if generally known, would do the attorney irreparable harm..." (P. 569.) In such a situation the attorney was to be compared with ""public officers and employees"" generally, against whom such communications ""are to be considered as highly confidential, and as records to which public policy would forbid the confidence to be violated."" (Pp. 568-569.) But where the charges are found true, or discipline is imposed, the strong public policy against disclosure vanishes; this is true even where the sanction is a private reproval. In such cases a member of the public is entitled to information about the complaint, the discipline, and the "information upon which it was based." (P. 575.)

We are further of the opinion that a proper reconciliation of the Act and the constitutional right of privacy mandates that, in situations such as that before us, the recorded complaint be of a substantial nature before public access is permitted. And patently, it is in keeping with the rationale of Chronicle Pub. Co. and the express purpose of the Act that where there is reasonable cause to believe the complaint to be well founded, the right of public access to related public records exists. Courts should not be bound by a contrary determination of the public agency, for if that were so the Act’s decree that — "access to information concerning the conduct of the people’s business is a fundamental and necessary right of every person in this state" — would be largely frustrated.

29. It is also likely that at least some of the information withheld under any subsection of Evidence Code 1040 was not in fact “acquired in confidence” by the Ethics Commission employees, either because they did not “acquire” the information (such as information generated by Ethics Commission employees themselves), or if they did “acquire” it, it was not given to them in “confidence.” Such information is not even “official information” by definition (Evidence Code §1040(a)), and thus cannot be withheld under either provision of Evidence Code §1040(b)(1 or 2).

30. Finally, all information withheld under deliberative process privilege must be disclosed.

31. **ALLEGATION 5: Official Misconduct under Admin Code 67.34 (against Pierce only)**

32. Admin Code 67.34 requires “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.”

33. Respondent Pierce is presumably at least a managerial city employee, based on his title “Director of Enforcement.” It is unclear whether he is the department head for the Ethics Commission.

34. Based on Pierce’s job duties including enforcement of the Sunshine Ordinance, he must have expertise in the Sunshine Ordinance.

35. Therefore Pierce knew or should have known that at least his citation to the deliberative process privilege was unlawful.

36. Admin Code 67.24(h) is a duty of every City office, employee, and agent.

37. Therefore, Pierce willfully failed to discharge the duty imposed by the Sunshine Ordinance to not cite the locally-illegal deliberative process privilege.

38. **REQUEST FOR RELIEF**

39. Please find that Respondents violated SF Admin Code 67.24(h), 67.24(c)(7), 67.27, 67.26, and/or 67.34.

40. Please order disclosed all public information unlawfully withheld.

---

Anonymous

Complaint Anonymous v Ethics Commission, et al., April 23, 2021

Sincerely,

Anonymous
EXHIBIT A
Dear Anonymous,

Upon further review, the Ethics Commission has located one non-exempt record responsive to part 3 of your request, below, seeking “any tracking spreadsheet/database/log for all complaints filed with [the Ethics Commission] from March 23, 2020 to present.” That record is attached.

Regarding the withholdings the Commission previously identified, the Commission withholds complaints alleging violations of campaign finance, lobbying, conflicts of interest and governmental ethics, and whistleblower protection violations, and records of investigations, under the following provisions of State law:

1. The deliberative process privilege under Government Code section 6255.
2. The official information privilege in Evidence Code section 1040.
3. The constitutional right to privacy under Article I, section 1.

Sincerely,
Jeff

In answer to part 1 of your request, I’m attaching the Ethics Commission’s records requests log with requests and/or responses from 3/23/20 to present.

In answer to part 2 of your request, the Ethics Commission has no responsive records.

Please refer to my message below, from Monday, in answer to part 3 of your request.

Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Jeff
Jeff Pierce  
Director of Enforcement  
San Francisco Ethics Commission  
415-252-3100  
sfethics.org | jeffrey.pierce@sfgov.org

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This communication and its contents may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information. This communication contains information solely for the use of the intended recipient. Unauthorized interception, review, use or disclosure is prohibited and may violate applicable laws, including the San Francisco Charter, section C3.699-13. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender immediately and destroy all copies of this communication.

From: Pierce, Jeffrey (ETH)  
Sent: Tuesday, February 23, 2021 7:47 PM  
To: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>  
Subject: RE: The Path to Forced, Universal Government Transparency - Immediate disclosure request

Anonymous,

I am following up on the other aspects of your request and will be your contact for that purpose.

You may be aware that the Mayor has suspended the Immediate Disclosure Request provisions during the pandemic. I will endeavor to produce to you any responsive and disclosable documents within the 10-day response timeframe.

Sincerely,
Jeff

From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>  
Sent: Monday, February 22, 2021 6:08 PM  
To: Pierce, Jeffrey (ETH) <jeffrey.pierce@sfgov.org>  
Subject: RE: The Path to Forced, Universal Government Transparency - Immediate disclosure request

Is this the Ethics Commission's complete response to my records request?

NOTE: 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or
implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no
event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any
other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if
any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely
authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

-------- Original Message --------
On Monday, February 22nd, 2021 at 6:02 PM, Pierce, Jeffrey (ETH)
<jeffrey.pierce@sfgov.org> wrote:

   Dear Anonymous,

   Under the provisions of Charter section C3.699-13(a), records of any
   investigation – including complaints received – are considered confidential.

   Matters for which the Commission has achieved a public resolution may be
   viewed here.

   Sincerely,
   Jeff

   **Jeff Pierce**
   Director of Enforcement
   San Francisco Ethics Commission
   415-252-3100
   sfethics.org | jeffrey.pierce@sfgov.org
From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 21, 2021 11:43 PM
To: Dennis Herrera (City Attorney, SF) <dennis.herrera@sfgov.org>
Cityattorney <Cityattorney@sfcityatty.org>; FEITELBERG, BRITTANY (CAT) <Brittany.Feitelberg@sfcityatty.org>; Ethics Commission, (ETH) <ethics.commission@sfgov.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; SOTF, (BOS) <sotf@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Elsbernd, Sean (MYR) <sean.elsbernd@sfgov.org>; Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org>; Thompson, Marianne (ECN) <marianne.thompson@sfgov.org>; GIVNER, JON (CAT) <Jon.Givner@sfcityatty.org>
Subject: The Path to Forced, Universal Government Transparency - Immediate disclosure request

see bottom for requests to your agencies

Mayor Breed and City Attorney Herrera:

departments BCC-ed

A member of the public astutely hypothesized that your offices make the risk analysis that it is efficient for your subordinates and clients to regularly violate CPRA/Sunshine laws for all members of the public and then just deal later with people like me, as a cost of doing business.
If true, no matter how many rulings SOTF makes in specific cases, it will never help generally improve government transparency for all. According to this theory you and the City have made a rational economic calculation to, as a rule, violate the Sunshine Ordinance because it allows you and your fellow officials to hide or delete records, over-redact them without legal justifications, and delay access to the vast majority of the public, even if it means belatedly losing appeals repeatedly to the small number of us who will vigorously defend our legal rights. But its not just those other requesters that lose out - the public domain is deprived of timely, lawfully disclosable public records which illuminate how officials conduct the public's business.

Your strategy's success depends on:

- no meaningful penalty to you or the City as long as we few use only SOTF which imposes no financial penalty, instead of Superior Court which does, (example: agencies routinely wait until immediately prior to an SOTF hearing to produce records voluntarily),
- the Ethics Commission ignoring the Sunshine Ordinance so as to protect senior officials from the few personal consequences that do exist in law (example: even if my complaints about you destroying your text message public records in violation of 67.29-7 are eventually heard and won by me, you will still have gotten the substantial political benefits of destroying records for years prior, which the public will permanently never be able to learn about), and
- your certainty that only a small percent of requesters are aware of their rights or have the time, legal, or financial resources to defend their rights even if known.

However... such a strategy would no longer be viable if a person who does know how to enforce the transparency laws re-makes the same requests for which you violate others' rights, and enforced full compliance themselves in court where you would be forced to pay for each and every violation, and where Breed, Herrera, and the Board cannot change the judges (or pressure them during appointment) or suspend the rules when they lose. Evidence shows even the Ethics Commission bends to a court that once forced it to do its job.

The City will be transparent only when it fears meaningful, legally-enforced financial repercussions for unlawful opacity. And when the taxpayers get tired of footing the bill for their officials' obstruction of transparency laws,
voters can boot them out of office or amend the law to make department heads and elected officials personally financially liable for violations. Having partially and successfully tested this strategy in a few others' requests, it is now time to implement it fully:

To Each Supervisor, President Walton (for the Board), Mayor Breed, Chair Wolfe and Vice-Chair Yankee (for the SOTF), Clerk Calvillo, Chair Ambrose and Vice-Chair Lee (for the Ethics Commission), OEWD, and City Attorney Herrera:

Unlike many City agencies, none of your agencies use NextRequest or another web platform to make automatically public all of your records requests so I cannot statistically analyze the quality of your responses to other requesters automatically.

1. This is an immediate disclosure request for the records request-tracking spreadsheet/database/log (if you keep any) for all records requests made to your agency meeting either of the following criteria: request was received on or after March 23, 2020 OR any response was issued on or after March 23, 2020. This request includes personal account searches. Include all columns or fields in any database. Any electronic format preserving ALL non-exempt electronic information is acceptable (all exempt info in the original electronic record must be specifically justified). For the SOTF and Ethics Commission: these requests do NOT include any logs tracking complaints filed with your agency - only records requests made to your agency.

2. This is an immediate disclosure request for all emails or mailed letters related to records requests/responses with the phrase "10 business days" case-insensitive anywhere in the thread (i.e. including replies/forward bodies included in other emails) sent by anyone in your Office/agency (sent to a requester, or to another City employee) on or after March 23, 2020. Exact PDF copies with all attachments, formatting, hyperlinks, images, email addresses, INCLUDING To/From/Cc AND Bcc email address, is necessary and sufficient; other email headers are not necessary at this time. This request includes personal account searches. For some period of time since the COVID emergency orders - Herrera's office falsely told records
requesters that the City had "10 business days" to respond (i.e. 14 calendar
days as opposed to 10) under the CPRA. I would like to determine whether
this false statement of law was directed solely to me, or all requesters.
Mysteriously, immediately after I complained, Herrera stopped doing this
(to me at least). This is especially interesting in light of the fact that
Herrera - long before I complained - had issued a public legal opinion about
the City's obligation to meet the 10 day requirement under state law even
under the Mayor's purported orders. For the SOTF and Ethics Commission:
these requests do NOT include any logs tracking complaints filed with your
agency - only records requests made to your agency.

3. To SOTF and Ethics only: This is an immediate disclosure request for
any tracking spreadsheet/database/log for all complaints filed with your
agency from March 23, 2020 to present. This request includes personal
account searches. Include all columns or fields in any database. Any
electronic format preserving ALL non-exempt electronic information is
acceptable (all exempt info in the original electronic record must be
specifically justified).

Unfortunately, if the City is only correcting the legal process of records
response just for me, I'm not really achieving my goal of universal
government transparency as required by law. In some ways, thus it helps
that there are now so many unaffiliated members of the public using
MuckRock with an anonymous moniker and copy-pasting my request
verbiage -- instead of complying with the law just in my cases, you are
forced to comply with the law at least a larger group of people.

NOTE: 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all
be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your
messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is
legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all
warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of
merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any
special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4.
The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not
an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the
sender.
Sincerely,

Anonymous
San Francisco District Attorney's office  
PRA Office  
Room 322  
850 Bryant Street  
SF, CA 94103  

April 30, 2021  

This is a follow up to a previous request:  

Attached is a 67.21(d) petition against David Campos.  

View request history, see one related attachment, upload responsive documents, and report problems here:  
https://accounts.muckrock.com/accounts/login/?next=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.muckrock.com%2Faccounts%2Fllogin%2F%3Fnext%3D%253D%252Faccounts%252Fagency_login%252Fsan-francisco-district-attorneys-office-5810%252Fdistrict-attorneys-office-secret-meeting-immediate-disclosure-request-109912%252F%253Demail%253Dsupervisor.records%252540sfcityatty.org&url_auth_token=AABUMPX3XsHTUt0XtehY%3A1lcW0r%3AXFFwx-dDson0S-s0fbYazbdSUCa  

Attachments:  
• 20210430_vs_campos-F.pdf  

Filed via MuckRock.com  
E-mail (Preferred): 109912-45425417@requests.muckrock.com  

For mailed responses, please address (see note):  
MuckRock News  
DEPT MR 109912  
411A Highland Ave  
Somerville, MA 02144-2516  

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.  

---
On March 21, 2021:
Subject: California Public Records Act Request: DCCC/Supervisors Secret Meeting - Immediate Disclosure Request
David Campos:

A (different) anonymous person brought the following SOTF complaint recently:
https://sfgov.org/sunshine/sites/default/files/eotc_032321_item7.pdf#page=6

These are 2 separate requests. "The DCCC meeting" is defined as every DCCC meeting from July 19 to 23, 2020 (inclusive). You must inform me whether or not disclosable public records exist for each request below, and an explanation/justification:

1. Produce all communications planning or preparing the DCCC meeting (incl with Sup Mar, Ronen, Haney or their offices), all agenda items, all minutes, all discussions regarding the meeting either before or after the meeting took place, on any government account.

2. Produce all communications planning or preparing the DCCC meeting (incl with Sup Mar, Ronen, Haney or their offices), all agenda items, all minutes, all discussions regarding the meeting either before or after the meeting took place, on any personal account. Remember that you must produce all records on personal property about the conduct of *public* business.

Thank you in advance for your anticipated cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

Anonymous Journalist
https://sunshine-advocacy.gitlab.io/san-francisco-ca-us/01/log

View request history, see one related attachment, upload responsive documents, and report problems here:

Attachments:
• 20210430_vs_campos-F.pdf

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 109912-45425417@requests.muckrock.com

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 109912
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.
Sunshine Ordinance Task Force and
Supervisor of Records Dennis Herrera
San Francisco, CA
via email
Final

April 30, 2021

Complaint Anonymous v Campos, et al., April 30, 2021

Sunshine Ordinance Task Force:

Please file a complaint Anonymous v David Campos and the Office of the District Attorney. Allegations: violation of CPRA Gov Code 6253(c) for failing to provide a notice of disclosable public records or extension within 10 days of a request; SFAC §67.21 for an untimely and incomplete response to a records request; SFAC §67.27 for withholding information without an appropriate written legal justification; SFAC §67.26 for withholding more than the minimum exempt information. You should take as proven any allegation not specifically denied by the Respondents. (Supervisor of Records: This is also a petition under Admin Code §67.21(d) to determine in writing that any records withheld under an illegal justification are public, and to order them disclosed.)

1. BACKGROUND

2. On March 21, 2021 via email from 109912-45425417@requests.muckrock.com to david.campos@sfgov.org I filed 2 records requests to the Respondents. (Full request text and lack of response thread are in Exhibit A).

“David Campos:

A (different) anonymous person brought the following SOTF complaint recently: https://sfgov.org/sunshine/sites/default/files/eotec_032321_item7.pdf#page=6

These are 2 separate requests. "The DCCC meeting" is defined as every DCCC meeting from July 19 to 23, 2020 (inclusive). You must inform me whether or not disclosable public records exist for each request below, and an explanation/justification:

1. Produce all communications planning or preparing the DCCC meeting
Anonymous Complaint
Anonymous v. Campos, et al., April 30, 2021

1. Produce all communications planning or preparing the DCCC meeting (incl. with Sup Mar, Ronen, Haney or their offices), all agenda items, all minutes, all discussions regarding the meeting either before or after the meeting took place, on any government account.

2. Produce all communications planning or preparing the DCCC meeting (incl. with Sup Mar, Ronen, Haney or their offices), all agenda items, all minutes, all discussions regarding the meeting either before or after the meeting took place, on any personal account. Remember that you must produce all records on personal property about the conduct of *public* business. .."

3. Follow-ups were sent on March 31, April 15, and April 30, 2021.

4. Respondents have never replied in any fashion to either of these requests.

5. Because no records or response has been provided, the records have been effectively withheld\(^1\)\(^2\) in their entirety and the request has not been complied with.

6. The DCCC meetings were attended, as admitted by the Supervisors in SOTF 20087 *SJD Anonymous v Ronen* and its closely related complaints against Supervisors Mar and Haney, by majorities of committee(s) of the Board of Supervisors.\(^3\) However, the Supervisors argue that the meeting was not a public meeting under the Brown Act because the issues discussed were not within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Board’s committees.

7. Without conceding that the meeting was not a Brown Act public meeting, I argue that the meeting was a public meeting under the Sunshine Ordinance, which has a broader definition.

8. Unlike the Brown Act, Sunshine Ordinance Sec 67.3’s definition of a "meeting"

\(^{1}\)The effect of the City’s inability or unwillingness to locate the records had the same effect as withholding requested information from the public.” (Community Youth Athletic Center v. City of National City (2013) 220 Cal.App.4th 1385, 1425)

\(^{2}\)“The City correctly states there is no evidence it intentionally withheld known responsive documents. At the hearing on the fee motion, even Sukumar’s attorney admitted there was no evidence City representatives acted in bad faith. However, bad faith is not the test. The effect of the City’s inability or unwillingness to locate and produce these documents until court-ordered discovery ensued after March 8, 2016, is tantamount to withholding requested information from a PRA request." (Sukumar v. City of San Diego (2017), 14 Cal.App.5th 451, 466; internal citations omitted)

\(^{3}\)Sup. Ronen’s representative Amy Beinart stated on Sep. 11, 2020: “This complaint cites Supervisor Ronen’s participation in the July 23, 2020, meeting of the SF DCCC that was also attended by Supervisors Mar and Haney. While it is true that Supervisors Ronen and Mar together, as two of three members of the Rules Committee of the Board of Supervisors, meet the threshold for quorum for that Committee, there was no matter on the DCCC agenda that was under the Board of Supervisors’ (or Rules Committee’s) subject matter jurisdiction, and therefore not a violation of the Brown Act.”

https://sfgov.org/sunshine/sites/default/files/eotc_032321_item7.pdf#page=23
does NOT have a subject matter jurisdiction requirement – every "congregation of a majority" of a BoS or its Committees qualifies, UNLESS it is a "regional, statewide or national conference," "meeting organized to address a topic of local community concern and open to the public," or "purely social, recreational or ceremonial occasion" (the latter 3 having a subject matter jurisdiction qualifier to be a "meeting") or two other exceptions not relevant here. The SF Democratic County Central Committee does not appear to be a conference, meeting organized to address a topic of local community concern and open to the public, or purely social. Thus all DCCC meetings having a quorum of the BoS or its committees should qualify as a Sunshine meeting of a policy body, subject to all Sunshine requirements, regardless of a subject matter jurisdiction requirement.

9. Therefore, records about that meeting are also public records and should, barring a specific cited exemption, be disclosed.

10. Respondents bear the burden of proving that the records sought are NOT public. Admin Code 67.21(g), states “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.”

11. ALLEGATION 1: Violation of CPRA Gov Code 6253(c)

12. Gov Code 6253(c) states: “Each agency, upon a request for a copy of records, shall, within 10 days from receipt of the request, determine whether the request, in whole or in part, seeks copies of disclosable public records in the possession of the agency and shall promptly notify the person making the request of the determination and the reasons therefor. In unusual circumstances, the time limit prescribed in this section may be extended by written notice by the head of the agency or their designee to the person making the request, setting forth the reasons for the extension and the date on which a determination is expected to be dispatched. No notice shall specify a date that would result in an extension for more than 14 days. When the agency dispatches the determination, and if the agency determines that the request seeks disclosable public records, the agency shall state the estimated date and time when the records will be made available. ...”

13. My request was sent Sunday March 21, and thus deemed received March 22. As of April 30, long after both the 10-day and 24-day-with-extension period, no determination or other reply was received.

14. ALLEGATION 2: Violation of Admin Code 67.21

15. Admin Code 67.21(b) states: “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.”

16. “Custodian of a public record” is not, contrary to the City’s apparent belief, a special title that applies only to a specific person in an agency. It is defined in the ordinance as “Every person having custody of any public record or public information, as defined herein, (hereinafter referred to as a custodian of a public record)”

17. In over one month, Campos, the person having custody of his own records, has not responded in any fashion to the request, which also constitutes an unreasonable delay.

18. **ALLEGATIONS 3 and 4: Violation of Admin Code 67.27 and 67.26**

19. Admin Code 67.27 requires that “Any withholding of information shall be justified, in writing, as follows: ... ”

20. Admin Code 67.26 requires the City to withhold only the minimum exempt portion of a public record so as to disclose as much else as possible. Usually, redaction is used to achieve this.

21. The Respondents’ inability or unwillingness to search for or provide the records is equivalent to withholding the records in entirety (see footnotes 1 and 2). No justification for doing so was provided.

22. **REQUEST FOR RELIEF**

23. Please find that Respondents violated CPRA Gov Code 6253(c), SF Admin Code 67.21, 67.26, and/or 67.27.

24. Please order disclosed all public records not yet provided.

Sincerely,

Anonymous
From: Anonymous Journalist
03/21/2021

Subject: California Public Records Act Request: DCCC/Supervisors Secret Meeting - Immediate Disclosure

David Campos:

A (different) anonymous person brought the following SOTF complaint recently: https://sfgov.org/sunshine/sites/default/files/eotc_032321_item7.pdf#page=6

These are 2 separate requests. "The DCCC meeting" is defined as every DCCC meeting from July 19 to 23, 2020 (inclusive). You must inform me whether or not disclosable public records exist for each request below, and an explanation/justification:

1. Produce all communications planning or preparing the DCCC meeting (incl with Sup Mar, Ronen, Haney or their offices), all agenda items, all minutes, all discussions regarding the meeting either before or after the meeting took place, on any government account.

2. Produce all communications planning or preparing the DCCC meeting (incl with Sup Mar, Ronen, Haney or their offices), all agenda items, all minutes, all discussions regarding the meeting either before or after the meeting took place, on any personal account. Remember that you must produce all records on personal property about the conduct of *public* business.

Thank you in advance for your anticipated cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

Anonymous Journalist
https://sunshine-advocacy.gitlab.io/san-francisco-ca-us/01/log

From: Muckrock Staff
03/31/2021


To Whom It May Concern:

I wanted to follow up on the following California Public Records Act request, copied below, and originally submitted on March 21, 2021. Please let me know when I can expect to receive a response.

Thanks for your help, and let me know if further clarification is needed.

From: Muckrock Staff
04/15/2021


To Whom It May Concern:

I wanted to follow up on the following California Public Records Act request, copied below, and originally submitted on March 21, 2021. Please let me know when I can expect to receive a response.

Thanks for your help, and let me know if further clarification is needed.
To Whom It May Concern:

I wanted to follow up on the following California Public Records Act request, copied below, and originally submitted on March 21, 2021. Please let me know when I can expect to receive a response.

Thanks for your help, and let me know if further clarification is needed.
Public Utilities Commission
PRA Office
Polk Street
525 Golden Gate Avenue
SF, CA 94102

May 3, 2021

This is a follow up to a previous request:

See attached 67.21(d) petition.

View request history, see one related attachment, upload responsive documents, and report problems here:
%3Fnext%3D%2522Faccounts%252Fagency_login%252Fpublic-utilities-commission-4834%252Fexternal-affairscommunity-benefits-sfpuc-
111478%252F%253Femail%253Dsupervisor.records%2540sfcityatty.org&url_auth_token=AABcOvcgKY8Kp2249Biuij8
PPBY%3A1ldhUh%3AUokQNuX4Oto0TdH4jMGoXOTxVL8

Attachments:
• 20210503_vs_puc_audit-F.pdf

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 111478-55598386@requests.muckrock.com

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 111478
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.

---

On April 30, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: External Affairs/Community Benefits - SFPUC
Dear Requestor,
The SFPUC has conducted a diligent search and we found no records responsive to your request. Therefore, we consider your request closed.

Please note that the Controller's Office has not conducted an External Affairs / Community Benefits audit. An audit was scheduled to happen in 2019-2020. However, the audit was postponed due to the pandemic and the local emergency.

Best Regards,
Mayara Ruski Augusto Sa
SFPUC Public Records Senior Analyst

---

On April 28, 2021:
Subject: California Public Records Act Request: External Affairs/Community Benefits - SFPUC
Dear Requester,

Thank you for your public records request. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Mayor has issued supplementary orders suspending select provisions of the Sunshine Ordinance which will affect how soon you may receive responsive documents. This memo<https://www.sfwater.org/modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentID=15142> provides details.

We have forwarded your request to the appropriate staff and will provide an update including a potential timeline within 10 days of your request.

Best Regards,
Mayara Ruski Augusto Sa
SFPUC Public Records Senior Analyst

---

On April 23, 2021:
Subject: California Public Records Act Request: External Affairs/Community Benefits - SFPUC
To Whom It May Concern:

Pursuant to the CPRA and Sunshine Ordinance, I hereby request the following records:

- all records provided by your agency to the Controller's Office for the External Affairs / Community Benefits audit, in the electronic format that you provided them to the Controller

Note that *you* are not an auditor, so the auditor CPRA exemptions do not apply to you. I'm just asking for things that are your public records that you also happened to provide to the Controller. You must provide every record prepared, owned, used, or retained by your agency -- which includes any records from your contractors that happen to be in your computer systems.

Provide rolling responses (SFAC 67.25(d)).

The requested documents will be made available to the general public, and this request is not being made for commercial purposes.

In the event that there are fees, I would be grateful if you would inform me of the total charges in advance of fulfilling my request. I would prefer the request filled electronically, by e-mail attachment if available or CD-ROM if not.

Thank you in advance for your anticipated cooperation in this matter.

I look forward to receiving your response to this request within 10 calendar days, as the statute requires.

Sincerely,
Anonymous Journalist

View request history, see one related attachment, upload responsive documents, and report problems here: https://accounts.muckrock.com/accounts/login/?next=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.muckrock.com%2Faccounts%2Fpass%2F%3Fnext%3D%252F252Fagency_login%252Fpublic-utilities-commission-4834%252Fexternal-affairs-community-benefits-sfpucc-111478%252F253Femail%252F253Dsupervisor.records%252F2540sfcityatty.org&url_auth_token=AABcOvcgKY8Kp2249Biuij8PPBY%3A1ldhUh%3AUokQNuX4Oto0TdhH4jMGoXOTxVL8

Attachments:
- 20210503_vs_puc_audit-F.pdf

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 111478-55598386@requests.muckrock.com

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 111478
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.
May 7, 2021

This is a follow up to request number 21-81:

CORRECTION: The attached 67.21(d) petition for two DPH requests replaces the petition you received earlier today.


Attachments:
• 20210507_dph_texts_REV_2.pdf

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 105584-70579615@requests.muckrock.com

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 105584
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.

---

On May 7, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request #21-81
See attached combined petition under 67.21(d) for two DPH requests.

---

On May 7, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request #21-81
See attached combined petition under 67.21(d) for two DPH requests.
---
On May 7, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request #21-81
RE: 21-80 - Thank you.

1) But why did you close this request? You still need to produce the remainder of the records. All I said is that Breed and Elsbernd are most important, not that I was waiving the other participants, like Bruss or Kelly. Please produce the remainder on a rolling basis.

2) We are challenging and will file complaints on all redactions based on recommendation of the author. The City continues to misunderstand Admin Code 67.24(a)(1). All recommendations of authors are not exempt - that would merely be using the deliberative process privilege under a different name as it is prohibited by Admin Code 67.24(h). Only a *draft* recommendation of the author is exempt, not all recommendations. And any factual content must be released as well within those messages. For example, if Colfax hypothetically initially recommends shutting down restaurants and bars, and then finally recommends shutting down only bars then only the first recommendation is exempt as a *draft*. If the recommendations made by Colfax are not drafts and are his final recommendations they need to be disclosed.

3) We are challenging and will file complaints on all redactions based on official information privilege. The City continues to misunderstand Evidence Code 1040. Evid Code 1040(a) that you cited merely defined official information; it does not exempt it. Only *some* not all official information is exempt - those exemptions are defined in Evid Code 1040(b)(1) and (b)(2) and you must cite which of the two exemptions you are using. The first exempts information whose disclosure is prohibited by state or federal law (if you are using (b)(1) please state that other law prohibiting disclosure). The second is a balancing test in the interest of justice (if you are using (b)(2) please explain in detail how disclosing each of those messages would harm the interest of justice).

DPH bears the burden of proof in showing how these exemptions apply to each redacted message.

---

On May 6, 2021:
Subject: [Document Released] City and County of San Francisco public records request #21-80
City and County of San Francisco

************************************************************************
Hi there

Documents have been released for record request #21-80 along with the following message:

Please find the legal justifications for every redaction which are cross-referenced to the document names.

20-80_Me_Mayor_London_Breed_Redacted_v1.pdf

* 7 A city employee cell phone number was redacted due to privacy concerns. (Cal. Gov’t Code § 6254(c); Internat. Federation of Prof. &amp; Technical Engineers, Local 21, AFL-CIO v. Super. Ct. (2007) 42 Cal.4th 319, 339 [while names and salaries of City employees must be disclosed, the “City has not been asked to disclose any contact information for these employees, such as home addresses or telephone numbers”].)
* 8–9 Information was redacted under the official information privilege. (Cal. Gov’t Code § 6254(k).) This privilege is codified in California Evidence Code section 1040, which defines “official information” as “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.” (Id. at § 1040(a).)

* 17 Information was redacted as non-responsive because “[c]ommunications that are primarily personal, containing no more than incidental mentions of agency business, generally will not constitute public records.” (City of San Jose v. Super. Ct. (2017) 2 Cal.5th 608, 619.)

* 19 A cell phone number of the public was redacted because such personal contact information implicates the privacy rights of individuals and typically sheds no light on DPH’s operations. (Cal. Gov’t. Code § 6254(c).)

* 20 Information was redacted as “personnel, medical, or similar files, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.” (Cal. Gov’t Code § 6254(c).)

* 20–22 Information was redacted as non-responsive because “[c]ommunications that are primarily personal, containing no more than incidental mentions of agency business, generally will not constitute public records.” (City of San Jose v. Super. Ct. (2017) 2 Cal.5th 608, 619.)

20-80_Me_Sean_Elsbernd_1_Redacted_v1.pdf

* 3–4, 112 Information was redacted as “personnel, medical, or similar files, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.” (Cal. Gov’t Code § 6254(c).)

* 9, 25, 36, 38–39, 45–46, 98, Information was redacted under the official information privilege. (Cal. Gov’t Code § 6254(k).) This privilege is codified in California Evidence Code section 1040, which defines “official information” as “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.” (Id. at § 1040(a).)

* 16, 19, 51, 85 Information was redacted as non-responsive because “[c]ommunications that are primarily personal, containing no more than incidental mentions of agency business, generally will not constitute public records.” (City of San Jose v. Super. Ct. (2017) 2 Cal.5th 608, 619.)
19 City employees cell phone numbers were redacted due to privacy concerns. (Cal. Gov't Code § 6254(c); Internat. Federation of Prof. & Technical Engineers, Local 21, AFL-CIO v. Super. Ct. (2007) 42 Cal.4th 319, 339 [while names and salaries of City employees must be disclosed, the “City has not been asked to disclose any contact information for these employees, such as home addresses or telephone numbers”].)

35, 74, 88 DPH does not disclose personal contact information for members of the public because such personal contact information implicates the privacy rights of individuals and typically sheds no light on DPH’s operations. (Cal. Gov't. Code § 6254(c).)

28–29, 80–83, 87, 93–95, 103 Redactions of author recommendations were redacted. Such redactions are authorized under San Francisco Administrative Code Section 67.24(a)(1).

11, 30, 40, 73, 97, 104–106 The Public Records Act allows an agency to decline to disclose “[r]ecords, the disclosure of which is exempted or prohibited pursuant to federal or state law, including, but limited to, provisions of the Evidence Code relating to privilege.” (Cal. Gov’t Code § 6254(k).) California Evidence Code section 954 protects from disclosure communications between attorneys and their clients. Disclosure of communications between the DPH and the City Attorney’s Office would chill DPH’s ability to discuss candidly issues on which legal advice is sought.

20-80_Me_Sean_Elsbernd_2_Redacted_v1.pdf

31, 35, 50 Information was redacted under the official information privilege. (Cal. Gov't Code § 6254(k).) This privilege is codified in California Evidence Code section 1040, which defines “official information” as “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.” (Id. at § 1040(a).)

9, 13, 18, 36 DPH does not disclose personal contact information for members of the public because such personal contact information implicates the privacy rights of individuals and typically sheds no light on DPH’s operations. (Cal. Gov’t. Code § 6254(c).)

1, 6, 35–36 DPH does not disclose ‘personnel, medical, or similar files, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.’ (Cal. Gov’t Code § 6254(c).)

4, 26 Redactions of author recommendations were redacted. Such redactions are authorized under San Francisco Administrative Code Section 67.24(a)(1).
* 20, 44 Non-responsive because “[c]ommunications that are primarily personal, containing no more than incidental mentions of agency business, generally will not constitute public records.” (City of San Jose v. Super. Ct. (2017) 2 Cal.5th 608, 619.)

* 20-80_Me_Mayor_London_Breed_Redacted_v1_Redacted_04.05.2021.pdf

* 20-80_Me_Sean_Elsbernd_1_Redacted_v1_Redacted_04.05.2021.pdf

* 20-80_Me_Sean_Elsbernd_2_Redacted_v1pdf_Redacted_04.06.2021_Redacted.pdf

Document links are valid for one month. After June 6, you will need to sign in to view the document(s).

************************************************************************

Questions about your request? Reply to this email or sign in to contact staff at City and County of San Francisco.

Technical support: See our a href='https://www.nextrequest.com/support'>help page</a>

---

On May 6, 2021:
Subject: Your City and County of San Francisco public records request #21-80 has been closed.
City and County of San Francisco

************************************************************************

Hi there

Record request #21-80 has been closed and published. The closure reason supplied was:

This concludes your public records request.

************************************************************************

Questions about your request? Reply to this email or sign in to contact staff at City and County of San Francisco.

Technical support: See our a href='https://www.nextrequest.com/support'>help page</a>

---

On Dec. 5, 2020:
Subject: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (DPH)
To Department of Public Health and its Department Head or Elected Official:

** DO NOT DESTROY ANY RESPONSIVE RECORDS. YOU MUST PRESERVE AND ORDER YOUR EMPLOYEES TO PRESERVE RECORDS DURING THE PENDENCY OF ALL APPEALS. WE WILL APPEAL ALL REDACTIONS OR WITHHOLDINGS. **

Immediate Disclosure Request.

Every department head/elected official must preserve and maintain all correspondence in a professional and businesslike manner (SFAC 67.29-7(a)) and also separately must comply with retention policies (SFAC 67.29-1). Note that if your retention policies do not retain text messages, I will argue before the SOTF and court that this is a failure to maintain **all correspondence** in a professional and businesslike manner.
Relevant precedent: SOTF 19098 - Anonymous v SFPD. Unanimous finding of violation for unlawfully withholding text message metadata (including the to/from/etc. - note SFPD had provided the dates and times, and you must as well), and also for unlawfully printing and scanning electronic records which does not constitute a "copy" of an electronic record. See also prior rulings in my favor in SOTF 19044, 19047, 19091, 19098, 19103, and 19108 which ruled against the City for email, text messages, past and future calendar entries, meeting details, electronic metadata, and attachments.

The Mayor's Office appears to have destroyed their copies of certain text messages. I'd be happy to get them from her, if she preserved every record. Alas she did not, therefore we must now conduct a universal search of the City. You cannot refer me to another department unless you search and determine that you have no copies in your department. If this is causing more work for you, ask your Mayor to stop destroying her public records.

Note there are many anonymous requesters using MuckRock - I am just one of them. If you previously produced some subset of these records to a MuckRock email address, please reference that prior response so you do not duplicate work. If I am unable to get the prior MuckRock response because it is someone else's and they have marked it private, you will however need to provide me a copy here as well.

1. This is an immediate disclosure request for text, chat, or instant messages between Grant Colfax and either Sean Elsbernd, Andrea Bruss, London Breed, Harlan Kelly, Jr., Naomi Kelly, Hank Heckel, or Walter Wong, including all group messages, and all messages in threads, in any form and any app (including, but not limited to, SMS, MMS, text, iMessage, Teams, Discord, WeChat, QQ, Signal, Telegram, WhatsApp, Facebook, Facebook Messenger, Twitter, Instagram, Hangouts, Meet, Slack, Skype, Viber, Snapchat, Line, Kik, FaceTime, Wickr Me, Chatroulette, Threema, KakaoTalk, Duo, GroupMe, Wire, Vomer, Allo, Tango, Bumble, Grindr, Tinder, Olive, Taimi, but NOT including email), on any government accounts/devices or on personal accounts or devices regarding the conduct of public business, including all participant names, message text, images, attachments, dates, and times, including any in trash or deleted folders or similar (see Good Government Guide - if the records have not been permanently deleted as of the time you receive this request, you must retrieve them from the so-called trash folders and provide them). Provide rolling responses. Provide exact copies including all metadata. There is no limitation by subject or date. If the total pages to produce numbers over 500, inform me of the rough dates, employees involved, and subject matter, and I may be willing to narrow the initial production, AS LONG AS YOU PRESERVE ALL THE RECORDS.

2. This is an immediate disclosure request for text, chat, or instant messages between Tomas Aragon and either Sean Aragon, London Breed, Harlan Kelly, Jr., Naomi Kelly, Hank Heckel, or Walter Wong, including all group messages, and all messages in threads, in any form and any app (including, but not limited to, SMS, MMS, text, iMessage, Teams, Discord, WeChat, QQ, Signal, Telegram, WhatsApp, Facebook, Facebook Messenger, Twitter, Instagram, Hangouts, Meet, Slack, Skype, Viber, Snapchat, Line, Kik, FaceTime, Wickr Me, Chatroulette, Threema, KakaoTalk, Duo, GroupMe, Wire, Vomer, Allo, Tango, Bumble, Grindr, Tinder, Olive, Taimi, but NOT including email), on any government accounts/devices or on personal accounts or devices regarding the conduct of public business, including all participant names, message text, images, attachments, dates, and times, including any in trash or deleted folders or similar (see Good Government Guide - if the records have not been permanently deleted as of the time you receive this request, you must retrieve them from the so-called trash folders and provide them). Provide rolling responses. Provide exact copies including all metadata. There is no limitation by subject or date. If the total pages to produce numbers over 500, inform me of the rough dates, employees involved, and subject matter, and I may be willing to narrow the initial production, AS LONG AS YOU PRESERVE ALL THE RECORDS.

3. This is a regular records request for text, chat, or instant messages between the other dept employees (not Colfax or Aragon) and either Sean Elsbernd, Andrea Bruss, London Breed, Harlan Kelly, Jr., Naomi Kelly, Hank Heckel, or Walter Wong, including all group messages, and all messages in threads, in any form and any app (including, but not limited to, SMS, MMS, text, iMessage, Teams, Discord, WeChat, QQ, Signal, Telegram, WhatsApp, Facebook, Facebook Messenger, Twitter, Instagram, Hangouts, Meet, Slack, Skype, Viber, Snapchat, Line, Kik, FaceTime, Wickr Me, Chatroulette, Threema, KakaoTalk, Duo, GroupMe, Wire, Vomer, Allo, Tango, Bumble, Grindr, Tinder, Olive, Taimi, but NOT including email), on any government accounts/devices or on personal accounts or devices regarding the conduct of public business, including all participant names, message text, images, attachments, dates, and times, including any in trash or deleted folders or similar (see Good Government Guide - if the records have not been permanently deleted as of the time you receive this request, you must retrieve them from the so-called trash folders and provide them). Provide rolling responses. Provide exact copies including all metadata. There is no limitation by subject or date. If the total pages to produce numbers over 500, inform me of the rough dates, employees involved, and subject matter, and I may be willing to narrow the initial production, AS LONG AS YOU PRESERVE ALL THE RECORDS.
deleted folders or similar (see Good Government Guide - if the records have not been permanently deleted as of the time you receive this request, you must retrieve them from the so-called trash folders and provide them). Provide rolling responses. Provide exact copies including all metadata. There is no limitation by subject or date. If the total pages to produce numbers over 500, inform me of the rough dates, employees involved, and subject matter, and I may be willing to narrow the initial production, AS LONG AS YOU PRESERVE ALL THE RECORDS.

Please provide only those copies of records available without any fees. If you determine certain records would require fees, please instead provide the required notice of which of those records are available and non-exempt for inspection in-person if we so choose.

Your non-exhaustive obligations:
- All withholding of any information must be justified in writing by specific statutory authority (SFAC 67.27).
- Every redaction must be keyed by footnote or by other clear reference to the specific justification for that redaction, and only the minimal exempt portion of any record may be withheld (SFAC 67.26).
- You must respond to emailed requests (SFAC 67.21(b)).
- You must notify us of whether or not responsive records exist and/or were withheld for each above request (Gov Code 6253(c), 6255(b)).
- You must state the name and title of each person responsible for withholding any information (Gov Code 6253(d)).
- Do not impose any end-user restrictions upon me (Santa Clara Co. vs Superior Ct, 170 Cal.App 4th 1301); so if you use a third-party website to publish records, please make them completely public without any login or sign-in.

Your agency must do all of the above things in your response, and you cannot wait until we file complaints.

****** We have no duty to, and we will not again, remind the City of its obligations. Instead, we will file complaints for every Sunshine Ordinance or CPRA violation. We will continue to file complaints until the City's procedures are modified to fully comply with the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA, without caveat or exception. ******

I look forward to your lawful response.

NOTE: THE EMAIL ADDRESS SENDING THIS REQUEST IS A PUBLICLY-VIEWABLE MAILBOX. Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

View request history, see one related attachment, upload responsive documents, and report problems here: https://accounts.muckrock.com/accounts/login/?next=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.muckrock.com%2Faccounts%2Flogin%2F%3Fnext%3D%253Faccounts%252Fagency_login%252Fdepartment-of-public-health-4836%252Ftext-and-chat-messages-immediate-disclosure-request-san-francisco-universal-search-dph-105584%252F252Femail%252D253Dsupervisor.records%252540sfcityatty.org&url_auth_token=AAAe_VQf-k0KxR9XR24yQKwiCpi%3A1f2Ha%3AV_ytkX-FT9-lp_uIp1PEkxRfBxM

Attachments:
• 20210507_dph_texts_REV_2.pdf
Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 105584-70579615@requests.muckrock.com

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 105584
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.
RE: DPH Requests 21-80 and 20-2942 – REVISION 2 – May 7, 2021

Supervisor of Records Dennis Herrera:

This is a petition under Admin Code §67.21(d) to determine in writing that records or parts thereof are public, regarding what DPH has labeled requests 21-80 and 20-2942. This is a corrected, 2nd revision, which replaces the earlier petition received on May 7, 2021 from this email address. Specifically, we challenge:

1. All withholding of attachments in the messages.

   Because audio, video, and image records have not been provided and clearly exist in the screenshots of these messages, the records have been effectively withheld in their entirety and the request has not been complied with (see Community Youth Athletic Center v. City of National City (2013)1 and Sukumar v. City of San Diego (2017)2). It is unknown whether the messages are on City-owned or personal devices, however, even if the devices are personal, attachments stored on them about the conduct of public business would be considered in the constructive possession of the City, and must be provided (City of San Jose v. Superior Court (2017)).

2. All redactions based on recommendation of the author. The City continues to misunderstand Admin Code 67.24(a)(1).

---

1"The effect of the City’s inability or unwillingness to locate the records had the same effect as withholding requested information from the public." (Community Youth Athletic Center v. City of National City (2013) 220 Cal.App.4th 1385, 1425)

2"The City correctly states there is no evidence it intentionally withheld known responsive documents. At the hearing on the fee motion, even Sukumar’s attorney admitted there was no evidence City representatives acted in bad faith. However, bad faith is not the test. The effect of the City’s inability or unwillingness to locate and produce these documents until court-ordered discovery ensued after March 8, 2016, is tantamount to withholding requested information from a PRA request." (Sukumar v. City of San Diego (2017), 14 Cal.App.5th 451, 466; internal citations omitted)
All recommendations of authors are not exempt – that would merely be using the deliberative process privilege under a different name as it is prohibited by Admin Code 67.24(h). Only a draft recommendation of the author is exempt, not all recommendations. And any factual content must be released as well within those messages.

For example, if Colfax hypothetically initially recommends shutting down restaurants and bars because of 17 positive COVID tests, and then finally recommends shutting down only bars then only the first recommendation is exempt as a draft and the phrase "17 positive COVID tests" must be unredacted as factual information.

Also, if the recommendations made by Colfax are not drafts at all and are his only (and thus final) recommendations they need to be disclosed. Furthermore, Elsbernd's responses to Colfax's exempt draft recommendations of the author are not necessarily draft recommendations themselves (or vice-versa). No where is the discussion by another party of the first party's draft recommendation exempted – in fact the exemption specifically states it must be the recommendation of the author.

3. All redactions based on official information privilege. The City continues to misunderstand Evidence Code 1040.

DPH merely cites Evid Code 1040(a) – simply defining official information; it does not exempt it. Only some not all official information is exempt – those exemptions are defined in Evid Code 1040(b)(1) and (b)(2) and DPH must cite which of the two exemptions they are using. The first exempts information whose disclosure is prohibited by state or federal law (if you are using (b)(1) please state that other law prohibiting disclosure). The second is a balancing test in the interest of justice (if you are using (b)(2) please explain in detail how disclosing each of those messages would harm the interest of justice).

4. All redactions under the attorney-client privilege on communications where no attorney for the City is part of the communication.

Evid Code 954 protects "a confidential communication between client and lawyer" – but these are not communications between the City and its lawyers. Communications between two non-DCA employees are not protected under Evid Code 954. Even if Sean Elsbernd is a lawyer, he does not and cannot act as a lawyer for the City (his law license is inactive in California).

DPH bears the burden of proof in showing how these exemptions apply to each redacted message.
It appears DPH is just using the above citations to hide the sensitive information in policy discussion.

Please order disclosed all public records not yet provided.

Sincerely,

Anonymous
Supervisor of Records Herrera,

The following PUC public record produced by presumably Harlan Kelly is vastly over-redacted:
PUC does not specify who "Melanie" is - but based on my request, it is presumed to be Melanie Lok.
Since the phone number is disclosed at the top, it can be verified who the texts are with.

As you have stated previously, apparently Kelly redacts his own records.
As your office and PUC acknowledges, Kelly unlawfully withheld information in his Walter Wong texts, another city contractor with whom Kelly allegedly unlawfully mixed business and personal friendship (see Kelly-Wong text petition, PUC supplement, and your own response).
As your office is also aware Melanie Lok/Mlok Consulting is a City contractor and unless every matter is her texts is also purely personal, they must be disclosed.

We also need original uncompressed/actually-readable versions of the attachments therein.

Please determine in writing that one or more of the texts, attachments, or parts thereof are public and order them disclosed.

Regards,

Anonymous
Twitter @journo_anon

**IMPORTANT:**
1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.
2. If you are NOT a public official: This communication is confidential and may contain unpublished information or confidential source information, protected by the California Shield Law, Evidence Code sec. 1070. I am a member of the electronic media and regularly publish information about the conduct of public officials.
3. I am not a lawyer. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.
4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sent with ProtonMail Secure Email.
Dear Supervisor of Records and SOTF:

Supervisor Ronen has completely ignored for two months the below records request. Under Admin Code 67.21(d, e), please determine in writing that the records or parts thereof are public and order them disclosed.

Moreover, Ronen committed official misconduct by willfully failing to discharge her duties as an elected official under the Ordinance (Admin Code 67.34).

Evidence: Sup. Ronen sent an email (a "read receipt") to my email address noting that she deleted the request without reading it. Ronen has no right to destroy evidence of a records request she does not want to reply to. See attachment.

Ronen and her Office violated:
- Gov Code 6253(c) for failing to provide a notice of determination of disclosable public records or extension within 10 days, and within 24 days
- SF Admin Code 67.21 for an untimely and incomplete response to a records request
- SF Admin Code 67.34 (Ronen only) for willfully failing to discharge her duties under the Sunshine Ordinance
- SF Admin Code 67.26 for withholding all records in their entirety instead of only withholding the minimum amount
- SF Admin Code 67.27 for withholding records without any written justification

A failure to search for and provide records is equivalent to withholding records from the public (Community Youth Athletic Center v. City of National City).

Regards,

Anonymous
Twitter @journo_anon

IMPORTANT:
1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.
2. If you are NOT a public official: This communication is confidential and may contain unpublished information or confidential source information, protected by the California Shield Law, Evidence Code sec. 1070. I am a member of the electronic media and regularly publish information about the conduct of public officials.
3. I am not a lawyer. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.
4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sent with ProtonMail Secure Email.

On Mon, Mar 8, 2021 at 7:40 PM, Anonymous Records Requester <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:
Supervisor Ronen and her Office:

Your vocal opposition to your peers investigating the SF Parks Alliance is intriguing. The pandemic is a poor excuse to make the government more opaque or ignore more potential corruption.

Next step is the people - not the Board - passing a ballot initiative making it a crime for any public official to destroy or fail to retain any electronic communication about the conduct of public business prior to 1 year after its creation. There will be some excellent reasons for that, which I will unveil at an upcoming BoS meeting at public comment.

Anyway.... this is an immediate disclosure request for:

1) Emails on Ronen personal accounts to or from the San Francisco Parks Alliance, and its predecessor organizations Place Lab and Build Public, (all together “SF Parks Alliance”), excluding any newsletters or advertising
2) Text messages or chats of any form on Ronen personal accounts to or from the SF Parks Alliance
3) Emails on Ronen government accounts to or from the SF Parks Alliance, excluding any newsletters or advertising
4) Emails on Ronen staff/intern personal accounts to or from the SF Parks Alliance, excluding any newsletters or advertising
5) Text messages or chats of any form on Ronen staff/intern personal accounts to or from the SF Parks Alliance
6) Emails on Ronen staff/intern government accounts to or from the SF Parks Alliance, excluding any newsletters or advertising
7) Behest payments on Ronen's behalf to SF Parks Alliance
8) Behest payments on Ronen's behalf from SF Parks Alliance

Produce all emails as exact PDF copies preserving all To, From, Cc, Bcc email addresses, urls, images, attachments. Provide text messages with all date/time stamps, content, urls, images, audio, video, attachments, and participant names. Comply with all prior SOTF decisions in my favor 19044, 19047, 19091, 19097, 19098, 19103, 19108, 19112, 19119, 19120, 19121, 19128, 19131, 19136, which I am hereby giving you notice of.

NOTE: 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. I am not an attorney. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous
Subject: Not read: Your ferris wheel records - Immediate Disclosure Request
Date: Tuesday, March 23, 2021 at 11:07:30 AM Pacific Daylight Time
From: Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>
To: Anonymous Records Requester <arecordsrequestor+readreceipt@protonmail.com>

Your message

To: Ronen, Hillary
Subject: Your ferris wheel records - Immediate Disclosure Request
Sent: Monday, March 8, 2021 7:40:04 PM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada)

was deleted without being read on Tuesday, March 23, 2021 11:07:30 AM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada).

--_002_90bd146d17db477d97fdaa32d6f6308csfgovorg__
Content-Type: text/html; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

<html>
<head>
<meta http-equiv="Content-Type" content="text/html; charset=3Dus-ascii"/>
<meta name="Generator" content="Microsoft Exchange Server">
</head>
<body>
<font size="2"><span style="font-size:11pt;">Your message <br>
<br>&nbsp;&nbsp; To: Ronen, Hillary<br>
&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; Subject: Your ferris wheel records - Immediate Disclosure Request<br>
&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; Sent: Monday, March 8, 2021 7:40:04 PM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada)<br>
<br>&nbsp;was deleted without being read on Tuesday, March 23, 2021 11:07:30 AM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada).</span></font>
</body>
</html>
Dear Chairs and Members,

As a public communication

I noted that the request for reconsideration of Mr. Kohrs’ case is before a committee instead of the full SOTF this Tuesday. Nothing herein is legal advice to any person, including the parties.

SOTF must reconsider its no violation ruling in SOTF 19145 for at least the following reasons:

- It appears at least a few members of SOTF incorrectly concluded that SB 1421 (i.e. Penal Code 832.7(b)), which requires all records related to certain kinds of police conduct be released notwithstanding any other laws, did not apply to off-duty conduct. Since the Police Commission’s own interpretation (via their written policy for SB 1421 releases) explicitly excludes off-duty conduct, the Respondents should not be allowed to contradict themselves and argue at SOTF that off-duty conduct is not included, and SOTF should not need to prove to the contrary.

- That alone should be enough to require a full reconsideration hearing. The vote against Mr. Kohrs was very close, 6 to 4. If even one Member is convinced by the Respondents’ own* interpretation of SB 1421, the outcome may change materially.

- The Police Commission’s most recent resolution determining not to release the records claims that they have an attorney-client privilege that they refuse to waive in the closed session deliberations. The Brown Act does NOT in fact permit closed sessions for the purpose of attorney-client communications (Roberts v City of Palmdale (1993) 5 Cal 4th 363; also see “Open & Public IV” by the League of California Cities, pp. 36) on its own, EXCEPT regarding litigation. Gov Code Section 54956.6 states in relevant part: “Nothing in this chapter shall be construed to prevent a legislative body of a local agency, based on advice of its legal counsel, from holding a closed session to confer with, or receive advice from, its legal counsel regarding pending litigation when discussion in open session concerning those matters would prejudice the position of the local agency in the litigation. ….” For purposes of this chapter, all expressions of the lawyer-client privilege other than those provided in this section are hereby abrogated. This section is the exclusive expression of the lawyer-client privilege for purposes of conducting closed-session meetings pursuant to this chapter. And note that the Police Commission has cited no section of the Brown Act for a proposition to have attorney-client privileged closed sessions outside of litigation matters. Instead, closed sessions have to be held under a specific exemption to open session permitted by Brown Act.

- In this case, it was the personnel closed session citation that was used, not the litigation closed session. And because it was a personnel matter, not a litigation matter, Penal Code 832.7 (b) (SB 1421) explicitly makes this recording publicly disclosed. In fact, the Sunshine Ordinance demands certain boilerplate language to be used to justify each closed session. SOTF should examine the original agenda item to realize that it was NOT an attorney-client privileged litigation closed session, but instead a personnel matter closed session. Personnel matters are closed to protect NOT attorney-client privilege, but the privacy of the employee (who has apparently waived his privacy rights) and the frank deliberation of the Commission members. As this task force knows, there is NO deliberate process privilege in San Francisco (Admin Code 67.24(b)).

- Finally: The Police Commission also violated the law by initially claiming the missing records (deliberation records) did not exist. Only later did the Police Commission state they were withholding them. Unless the Police Commission can cite a specific CPRA exemption for withholding the recording that defeats Penal Code 832.7 (b), then the record must be disclosed. I’ve yet to see what the specific CPRA exemption citation is (in the SOTF case). They keep changing their story.

Regards,

Anonymous
Twitter: @anonym_ad

IMPORTANT:

1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.

2. If you are NOT a public official: This communication is confidential and may contain unpublished information or confidential source information, protected by the California Shield Law, Evidence Code sec 1070. I am a member of the electronic media and regularly publish information about the conduct of public officials.

3. I am not a lawyer. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.

4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sent from ProtonMail for iOS.
Thank you. There are multiple issues:

1) The cited Penal Code 832.7(a) has no relevance to any of these redactions - and this is a recurring abuse by DPA of this exemption. It appears that DPA just slaps the Police Personnel File citation on anything that it cannot find a correct reason to withhold. This is a weekly general meeting of 3 DPA employees, none of whom appear to be police officers. The phone number/url of Microsoft Teams (of which at least one redaction is not even a meeting-specific number) is not a "complaint by members of the public against the personnel of [DPA]" or a "personnel record of peace officers and custodial officers" which is defined as a "file maintained under that [i.e. a peace or custodial officer] individual’s name by his or her employing agency". Words matter. Definitions matter. The narrow interpretation of these definitions as they prohibit public access, as required by Art 1 Sec 3 of the Constitution, matters. The scope of police personnel records exempted by this section are defined in Penal Code 832.8 and 832.5 and generally interpreted by the Supreme Court in Long Beach Police Officers Association v City of Long Beach. It is in fact possible that some other exemption applies - But this is not a police personnel file and its absurd to claim it is. Therefore, Supervisor of Records Herrera: please determine in writing the redactions under PC 832.7(a) are public and order them disclosed pursuant to SF Admin Code 67.21(d). The DPA is full of lawyers who are supposed to be experts on police personnel file law - I should not have to keep fixing, as Herrera dismisses them, the City's lawyers' so-called "minor errors." If DPA misuses the exemption here, why should anyone believe their arguments that all other uses were appropriate?

Herrera is not petitioned for the issues below.

2) Please note that this response, even ignoring metadata, is not compliant with SOTF decision 19121 against the Police Commission. In it, the SOTF determined that producing a copy of a forward of a record - as you have done for both records here - does not constitute a copy of the original record that existed as of the time of receipt of my request, and thus violated the law. Please produce an exact PDF copy of the original record for (d) - you can do that by simply entering Mr. Henderson's Outlook and exporting a PDF.

3) Your (e) is not the ICS/iCalendar metadata requested. The DT metadata tool you mentioned will produce the ICS/iCalendar metadata. It has a lot more in it.

4) The hyperlinks were incorrectly withheld on at least the top of the email. Hyperlinks should work as exact copies - they should be clickable and all information in them (i.e. their URL) disclosed, unless exempt by citation. See SOTF decision 19097 against Public Works. (Moreover, for unknown reasons the email is an image and not the original text, which is likely why the hyperlinks are destroyed).

If DPA is willing to correct all of these errors AND confirm that it will comply with regards to each issue above for all requests, in a signed writing on official letterhead by department head or managerial City employee, no SOTF complaint will be filed. We will file complaints if DPA merely corrects the issues after-the-fact without acknowledging that it must do each of these things correctly for all requesters and requests that follow.

Regards,

Anonymous
Twitter @jurno_anon

**IMPORTANT:**
1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.
2. If you are NOT a public official: This communication is confidential and may contain unpublished information or confidential source information, protected by the California Shield Law, Evidence Code sec. 1070. I am a member of the electronic media and regularly publish information about the conduct of public officials.
3. I am not a lawyer. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.
4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sent with ProtonMail Secure Email.

-------- Original Message --------
On Wednesday, May 26th, 2021 at 11:54 AM, DPA-Legal <DPA.Legal@sfgov.org> wrote:

(Please see attached)

The DPA Public Records Team

One South Van Ness Avenue, Eighth Floor
415-241-7711 phone
415-241-7770 tty

www.sfgov.org/dpa web

sfdpa.nextrequest.com public records portal
Anonymous Records Requester <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>

Wednesday, May 26, 2021 7:05 PM

Heckel, Hank (MYR); Kittler, Sophia (MYR); Bruss, Andrea (MYR); Elsbernd, Sean (MYR); Breed, Mayor London (MYR); Fennell, Tyra (MYR); Supervisor Records (CAT)

RE: 67.21(d) petition - Re: Brown-Breed messages - immediate disclosure request

Screen Shot 2021-05-26 at 6.50.48 PM.png; signature.asc

Those timestamps are the same - they are different timezones. Headers use UTC (Universal time zone), while the print out uses Pacific, since my computer is in California.

Sunday, February 21st, 2021 at 11:21 PM in the printout in California is identical to "Mon, 22 Feb 2021 07:21:07 +0000" in UTC in the email headers. You should check a timezone calculator. Attached is further a screenshot. These emails were also digitally-signed, and thus contain a cryptographic proof when I sent the email (signature.asc). That digital signature will also contain a timestamp.

Please check your fellow Mayoral office email boxes: mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org sophia.kittler@sfgov.org hank.heckel@sfgov.org andrea.bruss@sfgov.org sean.elsbernd@sfgov.org tyra.fennell@sfgov.org

and confirm if any of them have the email. I sent it to each of them.

My records request was sent on Feb 21st (Sunday late night) and thus deemed received Feb 22 (Monday).

If you are not willing to confirm that the Mayor's Office received and is responsible for this request since Feb 22, I will be making a records request to find those copies of my email (it's why we have metadata).

I make these requests specifically to force your office to preserve records about interesting events that many of you enjoy rapidly destroying otherwise. Even if you delay production of records based on rule of reason or COVID or whatever, you still can't destroy records after receiving a records request. Moreover, even if you (Heckel) truly did not receive the request on Feb 22, you certainly received the March 9 copy and apparently did not preserve records at that time.

This is also why, when a person having custody of a record personally receives a records request, that person is responsible under Admin Code 67.21. So even if Hank Heckel did not get the request, the others should have and must have preserved the records.

If your office, most importantly Breed, Kittler, Bruss, Elsbernd, Fennell, and yourself who were specifically emailed, have failed to retain records responsive to this request since Feb 22, I will file further complaints.

Regards,

Anonymous

Twitter @journo_anon

IMPORTANT:

1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.

2. If you are NOT a public official: This communication is confidential and may contain unpublished information or confidential source information, protected by the California Shield Law, Evidence Code sec. 1070. I am a member of the electronic media and regularly publish information about the conduct of public officials.
I am not a lawyer. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.

The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sent with ProtonMail Secure Email.

Thread:
On Wednesday, May 26th, 2021 at 6:27 PM, Anonymous Records Requester <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:

There was an original and an amended request. The amended request replaced the original one and is all that matters. The amended request has the following email headers.
The PDF is also attached. (note the date below is in UTC)

In-Reply-To: <cL92ptQaeBwktq-M4-z997nxY2tGcU2NfnUB04HMca8hCwrKgQETS04pQuAv8izT_rg5WLK3rLUTGdnFQeiprFpvVMjsAox 2QroqmxgemLQ@protonmail.com>
 References: <cL92ptQaeBwktq-M4-z997nxY2tGcU2NfnUB04HMca8hCwrKgQETS04pQuAv8izT_rg5WLK3rLUTGdnFQeiprFpvVMjsAox 2QroqmxgemLQ@protonmail.com>
 X-Pm-Origin: internal
 X-Pm-Content-Encryption: on-compose
 Subject: Re: Brown-Breed messages - immediate disclosure request
 To: "Vallie Brown (Supervisor, BoS, SF)" <Vallie.Brown@sfgov.org>, Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>, Kittler, Sophia (MYR) <sophia.kittler@sfgov.org>, "Hank Heckel (Compliance Officer, Mayor Office, SF)" <hank.heckel@sfgov.org>, Bruss, Andrea (MYR) <andrea.bruss@sfgov.org>, Elsbernd, Sean (MYR) <sean.elsbernd@sfgov.org>, gfta@sfgov.org <gfta@sfgov.org>, jason.blackwell@sfgov.org <jason.blackwell@sfgov.org>, Tyra.fennell@sfgov.org <Tyra.fennell@sfgov.org>
 From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
 Date: Mon, 22 Feb 2021 07:21:07 +0000
 Mime-Version: 1.0
 Content-Type: multipart/mixed;boundary=-----------------------------1c616e877e26c1b1d24421a1a0141702
 Disposition-Notification-To: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor+readreceipt@protonmail.com>
 Message-Id: <NydiyQojv6oLnKlc-eKgy-zlJJ1Gno-Vneagg1ls2foG1hzVi1CPFVrmdkiTsNdKGuGqwB7KnfCDID0VZLVfTptUw2KiumgVWBt3rYr8gP0 =@protonmail.com>
 X-Pm-Recipient-Authentication: Vallie.Brown%40sfgov.org=ppg-mime; mayorlondonbreed%40sfgov.org=ppg-mime; sophia.kittler%40sfgov.org=ppg-mime; hank.heckel%40sfgov.org=ppg-mime; andrea.bruss%40sfgov.org=ppg-mime; sean.elsbernd%40sfgov.org=ppg-mime; gfta%40sfgov.org=ppg-mime; jason.blackwell%40sfgov.org=ppg-mime; Tyra.fennell%40sfgov.org=ppg-mime
 X-Pm-Recipient-Encryption: Vallie.Brown%40sfgov.org=none;
Anonymous
Twitter @journo_anon

**IMPORTANT:**
1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.
2. If you are NOT a public official: This communication is confidential and may contain unpublished information or confidential source information, protected by the California Shield Law, Evidence Code sec. 1070. I am a member of the electronic media and regularly publish information about the conduct of public officials.
3. I am not a lawyer. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.
4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sent with ProtonMail Secure Email.

-------- Original Message --------
On Wednesday, May 26th, 2021 at 6:12 PM, Heckel, Hank (MYR) <hank.heckel@sfgov.org> wrote:

Anonymous,

I have not been able to locate any record of receiving the February 21, 2021 request you reference below in the context of this Supervisor of Records petition. Can you provide a record of when and to where this was sent?

Regards,

Hank Heckel
Legal Compliance Officer
Office of the Mayor
From: Anonymous Records Requester <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 9, 2021 7:04 PM
To: Brown, Vallie (ADM) <vallie.brown@sfgov.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; Kittler, Sophia (MYR) <sophia.kittler@sfgov.org>; Heckel, Hank (MYR) <Hank.Heckel@sfgov.org>; Bruss, Andrea (MYR) <andrea.bruss@sfgov.org>; Elsbernd, Sean (MYR) <sean.elsbernd@sfgov.org>; GFTA (ADM) <gfta@sfgov.org>; Blackwell, Jason (ADM) <jason.blackwell@sfgov.org>; Fennell, Tyra (MYR) <tyra.fennell@sfgov.org>
Cc: Records, Supervisor (CAT) <Supervisor.records@sfcityatty.org>
Subject: 67.21(d) petition - Re: Brown-Breed messages - immediate disclosure request

Supervisor of Records Dennis Herrera:

This is a petition to determine in writing that the records requested below are public and to order Vallie Brown, Grant for the Arts, Office of the City Administrator, Mayor Breed, Sean Elsbernd, Andrea Bruss, Sophia Kittler, Hank Heckel, Mason Lee, Tyra Fennell, and Office of the Mayor to disclose them.

Respondents have failed to respond in any way to a request from Feb 21, 2020 - violating Admin Code 67.21 and Gov Code 6253(c).

SOTF complaints will be filed momentarily as well.

NOTE: 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. I am not an attorney. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In
no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

-------- Original Message --------
On Sunday, February 21st, 2021 at 11:21 PM, Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:

AMENDED:

Vallie Brown and Grant for The Arts/Office of the City Administrator: This is an immediate disclosure request for all Vallie Brown text, chat, or instant messages, or voicemails received, or recorded phone calls or meetings, where any party is: Mayor Breed, Sean Elsbernd, Andrea Bruss, Carmen Chu, Hank Heckel, Mason Lee, Sophia Kittler, Tyra Fennell, or any member of the Office of the Mayor, on all accounts government or personal.

Mayor Breed, Sean Elsbernd, Andrea Bruss, Sophia Kittler, Hank Heckel, Mason Lee, Tyra Fennell: This is an immediate disclosure request for all text, chat, or instant messages, or voicemails received, or recorded phone calls or meetings, where any party is Vallie Brown, on all accounts government or personal.

All parties: provide rolling responses and exact copies of all electronic records.
NOTE: 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

------- Original Message -------

On Sunday, February 21st, 2021 at 10:44 PM, Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:

**Vallie Brown and Grant for The Arts/Office of the City Administrator:** This is an immediate disclosure request for all Vallie Brown text, chat, or instant messages, or voicemails received, or recorded phone calls or meetings, where any party is: Mayor Breed, Sean Elsbernd, Andrea Bruss, Carmen Chu, Hank Heckel, Mason Lee, Sophia Kittler, or any member of the Office of the Mayor, on all accounts government or personal.

**Mayor Breed, Sean Elsbernd, Andrea Bruss, Sophia Kittler, Hank Heckel, Mason Lee:** This is an immediate disclosure request for all text, chat, or instant messages, or voicemails received, or recorded phone calls or meetings, where any party is Vallie Brown, on all accounts government or personal.
All parties: provide rolling responses and exact copies of all electronic records.

**NOTE:** 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous
Buta, Odaya (CAT)

From: 105580-37750790@requests.muckrock.com
Sent: Thursday, June 10, 2021 2:01 AM
To: Supervisor Records (CAT)
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (OEWD)

Office of Economic and Workforce Development
PRA Office
City Hall, Room 448
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

June 10, 2021

This is a follow up to a previous request:

To Whom It May Concern:

I wanted to follow up on the following California Public Records Act request, copied below, and originally submitted on Dec. 5, 2020. Please let me know when I can expect to receive a response.

Thanks for your help, and let me know if further clarification is needed.

View request history, upload responsive documents, and report problems here:

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 105580-37750790@requests.muckrock.com

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 105580
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.

---
On March 10, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (OEWD)
See attached 67.21(d) petition against OEWD.
---

On March 10, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (OEWD)
Anonymous,

On behalf of OEWD please see the attached responsive to your request below.
Regards,

Hank Heckel
Compliance Officer
Office of the Mayor
City and County of San Francisco
---

On March 10, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (OEWD)
Anonymous,

On behalf of OEWD, please see the attached texts responsive to the Universal Search request below. Please note that certain material has been redacted to protect personal privacy as indicated. See Cal. Gov. Code § 6254(c), California Constitution, Art. I.
Regards,

Hank Heckel
Compliance Officer
Office of the Mayor
City and County of San Francisco
---

On Feb. 28, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (OEWD)
OEWD: Please provide as an immediate disclosure request all copies within your office of the emails attached, and all replies and forwards thereto, as exact PDF copies using PDFMaker with all email addresses, to, from, cc, bcc, attachments, date/time stamps.

City employees' attacks on the First Amendment to protect their actions from scrutiny will itself be scrutinized. It is also sad that you tried to use Trump's attacks on the First Amendment to invite the SOTF to suppress free speech. Fortunately you failed. There's no difference when your agency attacks transparency versus when the former President did. Fortunately at least one City employee, Ms. Boomer, seemed to understand.

Sincerely,

Anonymous
On Feb. 27, 2021:
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (OEWD)
OEWD (not Mayor's Office): Your office recently received a request "All City comms with Mr. Kelly's yahoo accounts - immediate disclosure request". Please provide all further responses on this email address.

All of your responses will be available to the public on MuckRock.com

Thank you,
Anonymous

---

On Dec. 5, 2020:
Subject: California Public Records Act Request: Text and Chat Messages - Immediate Disclosure Request - San Francisco Universal Search (OEWD)
To Office of Economic and Workforce Development and its Department Head or Elected Official:

** DO NOT DESTROY ANY RESPONSIVE RECORDS. YOU MUST PRESERVE AND ORDER YOUR EMPLOYEES TO PRESERVE RECORDS DURING THE PENDENCY OF ALL APPEALS. WE WILL APPEAL ALL REDACTIONS OR WITHHOLDINGS. **
Immediate Disclosure Request.

Every department head/elected official must preserve and maintain all correspondence in a professional and businesslike manner (SFAC 67.29-7(a)) and also separately must comply with retention policies (SFAC 67.29-1). Note that if your retention policies do not retain text messages, I will argue before the SOTF and court that this is a failure to maintain **all correspondence** in a professional and businesslike manner.

Relevant precedent: SOTF 19098 - Anonymous v SFPD. Unanimous finding of violation for unlawfully withholding text message metadata (including the to/from/etc. - note SFPD had provided the dates and times, and you must as well), and also for unlawfully printing and scanning electronic records which does not constitute a "copy" of an electronic record. See also prior rulings in my favor in SOTF 19044, 19047, 19091, 19098, 19103, and 19108 which ruled against the City for email, text messages, past and future calendar entries, meeting details, electronic metadata, and attachments.

The Mayor's Office appears to have destroyed their copies of certain text messages. I'd be happy to get them from her, if she preserved every record. Alas she did not, therefore we must now conduct a universal search of the City. You cannot refer me to another department unless you search and determine that you have no copies in your department. If this is causing more work for you, ask your Mayor to stop destroying her public records.

Note there are many anonymous requesters using MuckRock - I am just one of them. If you previously produced some subset of these records to a MuckRock email address, please reference that prior response so you do not duplicate work. If I am unable to get the prior MuckRock response because it is someone else's and they have marked it private, you will however need to provide me a copy here as well.

1. This is an immediate disclosure request for text, chat, or instant messages between the Department Head/Elected Official and either Sean Elsbernd, Andrea Bruss, London Breed, Harlan Kelly, Jr., Naomi Kelly, Hank Heckel, or Walter Wong, including all group messages, and all messages in threads, in any form and any app (including, but not limited to, SMS, MMS, text, iMessage, Teams, Discord, WeChat, QQ, Signal, Telegram, WhatsApp, Facebook, Facebook Messenger, Twitter, Instagram, Hangouts, Meet, Slack, Skype, Viber, Snapchat, Line, Kik, FaceTime, Wickr Me, Chatroulette, Threema, KakaoTalk, Duo, GroupMe, Wire, Voxer, Allo, Tango, Bumble, Grindr, Tinder, Olive, Taimi, but NOT including email), on any government accounts/devices or on personal accounts or devices regarding the conduct of public
business, including all participant names, message text, images, attachments, dates, and times, including any in trash or deleted folders or similar (see Good Government Guide - if the records have not been permanently deleted as of the time you receive this request, you must retrieve them from the so-called trash folders and provide them). Provide rolling responses. Provide exact copies including all metadata. There is no limitation by subject or date. If the total pages to produce numbers over 500, inform me of the rough dates, employees involved, and subject matter, and I may be willing to narrow the initial production, AS LONG AS YOU PRESERVE ALL THE RECORDS.

2. This is a regular records request for text, chat, or instant messages between any non-department head/elected official (i.e. the other dept employees) and either Sean Elsbernd, Andrea Bruss, London Breed, Harlan Kelly, Jr., Naomi Kelly, Hank Heckel, or Walter Wong, including all group messages, and all messages in threads, in any form and any app (including, but not limited to, SMS, MMS, text, iMessage, Teams, Discord, WeChat, QQ, Signal, Telegram, WhatsApp, Facebook, Facebook Messenger, Twitter, Instagram, Hangouts, Meet, Slack, Skype, Viber, Snapchat, Line, Kik, FaceTime, Wickr Me, Chatroulette, Threema, KakaoTalk, Duo, GroupMe, Wire, Viber, Allo, Tango, Bumble, Grindr, Tinder, Olive, Taimi, but NOT including email), on any government accounts/devices or on personal accounts or devices regarding the conduct of public business, including all participant names, message text, images, attachments, dates, and times, including any in trash or deleted folders or similar (see Good Government Guide - if the records have not been permanently deleted as of the time you receive this request, you must retrieve them from the so-called trash folders and provide them). Provide rolling responses. Provide exact copies including all metadata. There is no limitation by subject or date. If the total pages to produce numbers over 500, inform me of the rough dates, employees involved, and subject matter, and I may be willing to narrow the initial production, AS LONG AS YOU PRESERVE ALL THE RECORDS.

Please provide only those copies of records available without any fees. If you determine certain records would require fees, please instead provide the required notice of which of those records are available and non-exempt for inspection in-person if we so choose.

Your non-exhaustive obligations:
- All withholding of any information must be justified in writing by specific statutory authority (SFAC 67.27).
- Every redaction must be keyed by footnote or by other clear reference to the specific justification for that redaction, and only the minimal exempt portion of any record may be withheld (SFAC 67.26).
- You must respond to emailed requests (SFAC 67.21(b)).
- You must notify us of whether or not responsive records exist and/or were withheld for each above request (Gov Code 6253(c), 6255(b)).
- You must state the name and title of each person responsible for withholding any information (Gov Code 6253(d)).
- Do not impose any end-user restrictions upon me (Santa Clara Co. vs Superior Ct, 170 Cal.App 4th 1301); so if you use a third-party website to publish records, please make them completely public without any login or sign-in.

Your agency must do all of the above things in your response, and you cannot wait until we file complaints.

****** We have no duty to, and we will not again, remind the City of its obligations. Instead, we will file complaints for every Sunshine Ordinance or CPRA violation. We will continue to file complaints until the City's procedures are modified to fully comply with the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA, without caveat or exception. ******

I look forward to your lawful response.

NOTE: THE EMAIL ADDRESS SENDING THIS REQUEST IS A PUBLICLY-VIEWABLE MAILBOX. Please be certain you have properly redacted all of your responses. Once you send them to us, there is no going back. All of your responses (including all responsive records) may be instantly and automatically available to the public online via the MuckRock.com FOIA service used to issue this request (though the requester is an anonymous user, not a representative of MuckRock). Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature, if any, in this
email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the City all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

View request history, upload responsive documents, and report problems here:
https://accounts.muckrock.com/accounts/login/?next=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.muckrock.com%2Faccounts%2Flogin%2F%3Fnext%3D%252Faccounts%252Fagency_login%252Foffice-economic-and-workforce-development-14659%252Ftext-and-chat-messages-immediate-disclosure-request-san-francisco-universal-search-oewd-105580%252F%253Femail%253D supervisor.records%252540sfcityatty.org%26url_auth_token%3DAABAqrZ1rRoNmRCL2ZUwPh3k7c%3A1lrGYG%3A08im7chLNMOsSpq5UsolTukblWwY

Filed via MuckRock.com
E-mail (Preferred): 105580-37750790@requests.muckrock.com

For mailed responses, please address (see note):
MuckRock News
DEPT MR 105580
411A Highland Ave
Somerville, MA 02144-2516

PLEASE NOTE: This request is not filed by a MuckRock staff member, but is being sent through MuckRock by the above in order to better track, share, and manage public records requests. Also note that improperly addressed (i.e., with the requester's name rather than "MuckRock News" and the department number) requests might be returned as undeliverable.
Buta, Odaya (CAT)

From: Anonymous Records Requester <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 14, 2021 7:29 PM
To: SOTF, (BOS); Arntz, John (REG); Supervisor Records (CAT)
Subject: Re: SOTF/67.21(d) Ballot custody / election materials complaint
Attachments: signature.asc

Please include the following exhibits in the complaint, which are too large file size to email:
https://assets.documentcloud.org/documents/20889842/exhibit-b.pdf
https://assets.documentcloud.org/documents/20889843/exhibit-c-no_redactions.pdf
https://assets.documentcloud.org/documents/20889841/exhibit-d.pdf

Regards,
Anonymous
Twitter @journo_anon

**IMPORTANT:**
1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.
2. If you are NOT a public official: This communication is confidential and may contain unpublished information or confidential source information, protected by the California Shield Law, Evidence Code sec. 1070. I am a member of the electronic media and regularly publish information about the conduct of public officials.
3. I am not a lawyer. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.
4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sent with ProtonMail Secure Email.

------- Original Message -------
On Monday, June 14th, 2021 at 7:26 PM, Anonymous Records Requester <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:

Dear SOTF,

Please file a complaint Anonymous v Dept of Elections and John Arntz. (Supervisor of Records - this is also a 67.21(d) petition to determine in writing the withheld info below to be public and order it disclosed).

Violations: 67.29-7(b) failure to keep and preserve mandatory ballot custody records, 67.26 non-minimum withholding and unkeyed redactions, 67.27 failure to justify withholding in writing

The Sunshine Ordinance imposes a specific requirement on the Dept of Elections to keep certain minimum election records - this positive requirement to create a record is similar to the requirement in Prop G to create a daily calendar or in CPRA to create a list of enterprise systems, and there is further an additional requirement to "preserve" such records. These requirements are imposed by Admin Code
67.29-7(b). I requested the Admin Code 67.29-7(b) material for the Nov 2020 election on June 1 2021, and records were timely produced on June 1 and June 11 by DoE. Request and response are Exhibit A.

The requirement states: "The Department of Elections shall keep and preserve all records and invoices relating to the design and printing of ballots and other election materials and shall keep and preserve records documenting who had custody of ballots from the time ballots are cast until ballots are received and certified by the Department of Elections."

Violation of Admin Code 67.29-7(b):
- In the attached Exhibit B, for at least 4 ballot boxes from District 6 and 2 boxes from District 2, only the departure is signed for, and the receipt/verification at City Hall is not signed for. This differs from all other ballot boxes listed on similar forms where both sides are verified at least once.
- Various custody transfer forms are missing various form elements, including from original record "CTF_Canvass_Transfer_of_Ballots_20_docs.pdf"
- The inspector from precinct 7842 is not identified.
- This is a repeated pattern - many forms identify the custodian of the ballots only on one side of the transfer in the chain of custody.
- Like other Sunshine Ordinance requirements, this rule is not satisfied by tracking most ballots - the custody of every ballot is equally important.

Violation of Admin Code 67.27: There are numerous redactions throughout the responsive records. This withholding of information was not justified in writing by a legal exemption. Thus, all withholding is challenged and should be ordered disclosed.

Violation of Admin Code 67.26: Redactions are not keyed to justifications required by 67.27 (as no justification or keys at all were provided). Moreover, sometimes but not always who had custody of the ballots and/or their official signature has been redacted. It is unclear why such signatures are sometimes provided (Exhibit C), and sometimes redacted (Exhibit D). Regardless, there is no reason why officials' signatures or identities in a chain of custody should be redacted. Since no redactions are justified, all are challenged and should be ordered disclosed.

Regards,

Anonymous
Twitter @journo_anon

IMPORTANT:
1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.
2. If you are NOT a public official: This communication is confidential and may contain unpublished information or confidential source information, protected by the California Shield Law, Evidence Code sec. 1070. I am a member of the electronic media and regularly publish information about the conduct of public officials.
3. I am not a lawyer. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.
4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sent with ProtonMail Secure Email.
Dear SOTF,

Please file a complaint Anonymous v Dept of Elections and John Arntz. (Supervisor of Records - this is also a 67.21(d) petition to determine in writing the withheld info below to be public and order it disclosed).

Violations: 67.29-7(b) failure to keep and preserve mandatory ballot custody records, 67.26 non-minimum withholding and unkeyed redactions, 67.27 failure to justify withholding in writing

The Sunshine Ordinance imposes a specific requirement on the Dept of Elections to keep certain minimum election records - this positive requirement to create a record is similar to the requirement in Prop G to create a daily calendar or in CPRA to create a list of enterprise systems, and there is further an additional requirement to "preserve" such records. These requirements are imposed by Admin Code 67.29-7(b). I requested the Admin Code 67.29-7(b) material for the Nov 2020 election on June 1 2021, and records were timely produced on June 1 and June 11 by DoE. Request and response are Exhibit A.

The requirement states: "The Department of Elections shall keep and preserve all records and invoices relating to the design and printing of ballots and other election materials and shall keep and preserve records documenting who had custody of ballots from the time ballots are cast until ballots are received and certified by the Department of Elections."

Violation of Admin Code 67.29-7(b):
- In the attached Exhibit B, for at least 4 ballot boxes from District 6 and 2 boxes from District 2, only the departure is signed for, and the receipt/verification at City Hall is not signed for. This differs from all other ballot boxes listed on similar forms where both sides are verified at least once.
- Various custody transfer forms are missing various form elements, including from original record "CTF_Canvass_Transfer_of_Ballots_20_docs.pdf"
- The inspector from precinct 7842 is not identified.
- This is a repeated pattern - many forms identify the custodian of the ballots only on one side of the transfer in the chain of custody.
- Like other Sunshine Ordinance requirements, this rule is not satisfied by tracking most ballots - the custody of every ballot is equally important.

Violation of Admin Code 67.27: There are numerous redactions throughout the responsive records. This withholding of information was not justified in writing by a legal exemption. Thus, all withholding is challenged and should be ordered disclosed.

Violation of Admin Code 67.26: Redactions are not keyed to justifications required by 67.27 (as no justification or keys at all were provided). Moreover, sometimes but not always who had custody of the ballots and/or their official signature has been redacted. It is unclear why such signatures are sometimes provided (Exhibit C), and sometimes redacted (Exhibit D). Regardless, there is no reason why officials' signatures or identities in a chain of custody should be redacted. Since no redactions are justified, all are challenged and should be ordered disclosed.

Regards,
Anonymous
Twitter @journo_anon

IMPORTANT:
1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in
certainty any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.
2. If you are NOT a public official: This communication is confidential and may contain unpublished information or
confidential source information, protected by the California Shield Law, Evidence Code sec. 1070. I am a member of the
electronic media and regularly publish information about the conduct of public officials.
3. I am not a lawyer. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties,
express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author
be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.
4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or
offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sent with ProtonMail Secure Email.
From: twitter.com/journo_anon
06/01/2021

Subject: California Public Records Act Request: 67.29-7(b) materials for Nov 2020 election - Immediate...

To Whom It May Concern:

Pursuant to the CPRA and Sunshine Ordinance, I hereby make the following 2 distinct records requests. Respond to each with its own lawful response.

(1) all "records and invoices relating to the design and printing of ballots and other election materials" for the Nov 2020 elections

(2) all "records documenting who had custody of ballots from the time ballots are cast until ballots are received and certified by the Department of Elections" for the Nov 2020 elections

As you may know you are required to "keep and preserve" such records pursuant to Admin Code 67.29-7(b).

Provide rolling responses (each record must be provided no later than end of business day it is reviewed - Admin Code 67.25(d)).

Thank you in advance for your anticipated cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

twitter.com/journo_anon

From: Department of Elections
06/01/2021

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: 67.29-7(b) materials for Nov 2020 election - Imme...

Greetings,

Thank you for contacting the San Francisco Department of Elections. Please see attached the response to item #1. The Department must take more time to respond to item #2 and intends to respond within a reasonable timeframe.

Thank you,

Matthew Selby
Campaign Services and Records Custodian Division Manager
San Francisco Department of Elections
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 48
San Francisco, CA 94102
O: (415) 554-4376
M: (415) 553-0601
sfelections.org

[Title: Facebook - Description: Click on this link to visit our Facebook page.]
<https://na01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https://www.facebook.com/sfelections&data=02|01|candidate-filings@sos.ca.gov|51fb71b8c6a646e12eb608d56d8995c2|0da7a3ac19f5470c8986593433d564de|1|0|636535360055507640&data=JAr/YP3PfBWUmlpRUkJpD1ptQOZwCnGF%2BhcbMHKIA6
Good Morning,

Thank you for contacting the San Francisco Department of Elections. I have sent a separate link to access the requested data to the email requests@muckrock.com. The passcode to access the file is 324501 and the link sent is set to expire on 6/18/2021. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Best,

Shirley Yu
Campaign Services Division
San Francisco Department of Elections
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 48
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-4375
sfelections.org
This message is being sent to you by the City Cybersecurity Team.

One or more files have been sent to you:

Please visit the Workspace<https://SFSecureShare.sfgov.org:443/anonymous/d0f03730-2278-407b-b68b-4c1a1c5609c6/> to retrieve files on our SFSecureShare.sfgov.org site.

You may be prompted to register an account if authentication is required.

These links will expire on 6/18/2021 3:27:23 PM

For help or assistance for this service, please contact the City HelpDesk at (628)652-5000 or dtis.helpdesk@sfgov.org
Hi Ms. Yu,

Your link requires agreement to a Terms of Service. I won't agree to any extra-statutory terms such as your "Acceptable Use Policy" in order to get public records, and I cannot be required to do so (Santa Clara Co. v. First Amendment Coalition, 170 Cal. App. 4th 1301 (2009)).

Please provide the records without any registration, login, or acceptance of terms. You could simply post them on your own website, or email them in chunks, or upload them directly to MuckRock using the link below.

Thanks,
twitter.com/journo_anon

---

From: Department of Elections  06/11/2021

Subject: None

Good Morning,

Please see the attachment for item #1 and #2.

Best,
Shirley Yu
Campaign Services Division
San Francisco Department of Elections
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 48
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)554-4375

1.zip
Download

2.zip
Download

---

From: twitter.com/journo_anon  06/11/2021

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: 67.29-7(b) materials for Nov 2020 election - Immed...

Thank you.

---

From: twitter.com/journo_anon  06/11/2021

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: 67.29-7(b) materials for Nov 2020 election - Immed...

The file "2.zip" that you uploaded of over 8GB appears to be corrupted. When downloaded and attempted to be opened it does not work.

> unzip 2.zip
Archive: 2.zip
warning [2.zip]: 4558784799 extra bytes at beginning or within zipfile
(attempting to process anyway)
error [2.zip]: start of central directory not found;
zipfile corrupt.
(please check that you have transferred or created the zipfile in the
appropriate BINARY mode and that you have compiled UnZip properly)

From: Department of Elections  06/11/2021
Subject: None

Attachment response to item 2.

VDABD_Log_Part_2_Redacted.pdf

- View  - Embed  - Download

UPS_Authorization__Redacted.pdf

- View  - Embed  - Download

Inspector_Custody_Transfer_Form_Part_5_Redacted.pdf

- View  - Embed  - Download

Inspector_Custody_Transfer_Form_Part_4_Redacted.pdf

- View  - Embed  - Download

WH_Pink_Transfer_Log_Part_2_Redacted.pdf

- View  - Embed  - Download

WH_Pink_Transfer_Log_Part_3_Redacted.pdf

- View  - Embed  - Download

BDVDA_Log_Redacted.pdf

- View  - Embed  - Download

CTF_SH_to_WH_Ballots_110_docs_Batch_1_of_6_Redacted.pdf

- View  - Embed  - Download

CTF_SH_to_WH_Ballots_131_docs_Batch_4_of_6_Redacted.pdf

- View  - Embed  - Download

KH_Forms_Redacted.pdf
Hello,

I have uploaded each individual document that was in the 2.zip folder. Please let me know if there's anything I need to follow up on.

Thanks,

Shirley Yu
Campaign Services Division
San Francisco Department of Elections
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 48
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-4375
sfelections.org

[Title: Facebook - Description: Click on this link to visit our Facebook page.]
<https://na01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https://www.facebook.com/sfelections&data=02%7C01%7Ccampaign-filings@sos.ca.gov%7C51fb71b8c6a646e12eb608d56d8995c2%7C0da7a3ac19f5470c8986593433d564de1%7C0636535360055507640&data=JAr%2FYP3PfBWhmWiRukD1ptQOZwCnGE%2BhcbMHKIA6W0A%3D&reserved=0> [Title: Twitter - Description: Click on this link to visit our Twitter page.]
<https://na01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https://www.twitter.com/sfelections&data=02%7C01%7Ccampaign-filings@sos.ca.gov%7C51fb71b8c6a646e12eb608d56d8995c2%7C0da7a3ac19f5470c8986593433d564de1%7C0636535360055507640&data=2U5/NBwWBF9otZrn%2BHlpoimqVqu8BDpHk7ZFrQsCID%3D&reserved=0>

Follow the San Francisco Department of Elections on Facebook<https://na01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.facebook.com%2Fsfelections&data=02%7C01%7Ccampaign-filings%40sos.ca.gov%7C51fb71b8c6a646e12eb608d56d8995c2%7C0da7a3ac19f5470c8986593433d564de%7C1%7C0%7C636535360055507640&data=JAr%2FYP3PfBWhmWiRukD1ptQOZwCnGE%2BhcbMHKIA6W0%2FA%3D&reserved=0> and Twitter<https://na01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.twitter.com%2Fsfelections&data=02%7C01%7Ccampaignt-filings%40sos.ca.gov%7C51fb71b8c6a646e12eb608d56d8995c2%7C0da7a3ac19f5470c8986593433d564de%7C1%7C0%7C636535360055507640&data=2U5%2FNBwWBF9otZrn%2BHlpoimqVqu8BDpHk7ZFrQsCID%3D&reserved=0>!
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CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF ELECTIONS

John Arntz, Director

Precinct: 7842

EQUIPMENT ACCESS CODES ACKNOWLEDGMENT FORM
Consolidated General Election, November 3, 2020

Dear Inspector:

You are being entrusted with the access codes shown below in order to operate voting equipment and carry out your official duties on Election Day. Under no circumstances should you share these codes with any unauthorized or unidentified persons. Do not make copies of this document and do not share it with anyone else without authorization from Department of Elections personnel.

Keep these codes safe, along with other vital elections materials, such as Roster of Voters and official ballots, from the moment they are issued to you by the Department of Elections until the moment you transfer the custody of all vital materials on Election Night.

Ballot-Scanning Machine Login: Username: lovely  Password: [redacted]

Ballot-Marking Device Login: Pin: [redacted]

Ballot Activation Codes: Standard Ballot: 17842 (Precinct Number);
EDU Ballot: 27842 (Precinct Number)

By signing below you acknowledge that the integrity of election data and voting equipment is protected by law and declare you understand that failure to protect the above access codes can have serious consequences. Tampering with voting equipment, interfering with voting equipment, permitting unauthorized access to voting equipment, or altering voting equipment software code may constitute crimes punishable by imprisonment under state law (California Elections Code §18564).

______________________________  ________________________________  Oct 27, 2020
Inspector Name                  Inspector Signature                Date
From: Anonymous Records Requester <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 15, 2021 10:32 PM
To: Heckel, Hank (MYR); Supervisor Records (CAT)
Cc: MayorSunshineRequests, MYR (MYR)
Subject: 67.21(d) petition - RE: Jesse Mainardi and my twitter
Attachments: signature.asc

Supervisor of Records Herrera:

Please determine in writing that the records below are public records, and order Mayor Breed and her office to comply with my request.

It would appear they do have records that they consider not to be public records- which is precisely where you come in under 67.21(d).

However, my issuance of public records requests to (and complaints against) Breed (namely using these emails which contain my Twitter handle) are most certainly only about the conduct of public business. There is no non-City-business relationship I have with Breed or her attorneys. To my knowledge, I have never had any interaction with Breed or her attorneys that is not about the conduct of public business, so whatever forwarding of my Twitter handle they have sent to Breed's ethics lawyers is certainly related to City business.

Regards,

Anonymous
Twitter @journo_anon

IMPORTANT:
1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.
2. If you are NOT a public official: This communication is confidential and may contain unpublished information or confidential source information, protected by the California Shield Law, Evidence Code sec. 1070. I am a member of the electronic media and regularly publish information about the conduct of public officials.
3. I am not a lawyer. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.
4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sent from ProtonMail for iOS

On Tue, Jun 15, 2021 at 10:18 PM, Heckel, Hank (MYR) <hank.heckel@sfgov.org> wrote:

Anonymous,
We do not have any records that relate to City business and accordingly have no public records to provide.

Regards,

Hank Heckel
Compliance Officer
Office of the Mayor
City and County of San Francisco

From: Anonymous Records Requester <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 3, 2021 5:07 PM
To: Heckel, Hank (MYR) <hank.heckel@sfgov.org>
Cc: MayorSunshineRequests, MYR (MYR) <mayorsunshinerequests@sfgov.org>
Subject: RE: Jesse Mainardi and my twitter

As you know under CPRA Gov Code 6253(c) the "reasons therefor" must be provided.

Do you have records but you claim them not to be public records? Or you don't have any records at all?

If the former, we will be appealing this for a determination that the records are in fact public records under 67.21(d) and 67.21(e).

Regards,

Anonymous

Twitter @journo_anon

IMPORTANT:
1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.

2. If you are NOT a public official: This communication is confidential and may contain unpublished information or confidential source information, protected by the California Shield Law, Evidence Code sec. 1070. I am a member of the electronic media and regularly publish information about the conduct of public officials.

3. I am not a lawyer. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.

4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sent with ProtonMail Secure Email.

------- Original Message -------
On Thursday, June 3rd, 2021 at 3:24 PM, Heckel, Hank (MYR) <hank.heckel@sfgov.org> wrote:

Anonymous,

We have no responsive public records to provide in response to your request below.

Regards,

Hank Heckel

Compliance Officer

Office of the Mayor

City and County of San Francisco
From: Anonymous Records Requester <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Friday, May 14, 2021 12:57 PM
To: Heckel, Hank (MYR) <hank.heckel@sfgov.org>; Elsbernd, Sean (MYR) <sean.elsbernd@sfgov.org>; MayorSunshineRequests, MYR (MYR) <mayorsunshinerequests@sfgov.org>
Cc: Joe Fitz (PRESS, KQED) <jrodriguez@kqed.org>
Subject: Jesse Mainardi and my twitter

Hi: Please provide all mentions of my twitter handle "journo_anon" between anyone in your office (incl. Breed) and one-time (perhaps current?) Breed attorney Jesse Mainardi. Some of those records may not be privileged.

Regards,

Anonymous

Twitter @journo_anon

**IMPORTANT:**

1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.

2. If you are NOT a public official: This communication is confidential and may contain unpublished information or confidential source information, protected by the California Shield Law, Evidence Code sec. 1070. I am a member of the electronic media and regularly publish information about the conduct of public officials.

3. I am not a lawyer. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.

4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sent with ProtonMail Secure Email.
Dept Head Lambert: Please be certain to preserve the original unredacted records. I am appealing these redactions and you may be ordered later on to unredact the information. If you destroy or fail to retain the original unredacted records during the pendency of my appeals, I will allege violation of 67.29-7(a) and/or willful violation and official misconduct. I will also rerequest the originals after the COVID emergency orders terminate and/or a court finds them invalid.

Supervisor of Records: Please determine in writing that some or all of the 6255 redactions in the documents and the unjustified withholdings of the rightmost columns in the records for this request are public and order them disclosed.

SOTF: Please file a new complaint Anonymous v SF Public Library, Michael Lambert, Margot Shaub, Ashley Carskaddon. Violation: 67.26 non-minimum withholding, 67.27 failure to provide written justification for withholding, 67.24(g and i) impermissible balancing test.

The SFPL has withheld a full column of information of Site Names and Addresses under the catch-all Gov Code 6255(a). Respondents will have to prove to SOTF with specificity why the public interest in non-disclosure clearly outweighs public interest in disclosure. These are apparently govt (taxpayer) -paid services and locations that the public isn't allowed to know exist. These are not being kept hidden to protect the public interest, but instead to protect the Mayor's political interests. To make this obvious, the redactions literally say "Enter a reason..." (none is provided) -- and there is in fact no legitimate reason to redact the information.

The SFPL has also withheld the rightmost columns of the spreadsheet. Those withholdings by the Public Library have no justification whatsoever and must be disclosed.

I am aware of some of the withheld content by examining a different requester's public records responses. That content is also permanently archived in various web archiving platforms if the City attempts to retract that information from the other requester or pressure them into somehow destroying the information online.

Finally, I am preserving my rights to argue that the use of Gov Code 6255 is itself unlawful under Admin Code 67.24(g and i), based on pending challenges to the validity and/or currency of the Mayor's emergency orders purporting to allow the City to contravene the voter’s explicit intent in prohibiting Gov Code 6255 as an exemption in the City. The City has opened up, as the Mayor likes to brag - thus as a corollary, COVID is no longer a reason (if it ever was) to arbitrarily withhold public information without a specific exemption. This is simply an abuse of the Mayor's emergency authority to get rid of a voter-enacted govt transparency law for her own benefit.

Regards,

Anonymous
Twitter @journo_anon

IMPORTANT:
1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.
2. If you are NOT a public official: This communication is confidential and may contain unpublished information or confidential source information, protected by the California Shield Law, Evidence Code sec. 1070. I am a member of the electronic media and regularly publish information about the conduct of public officials.
3. I am not a lawyer. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.
4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sent from ProtonMail for iOS

On Fri, Jun 18, 2021 at 12:16 PM, City and County of San Francisco Public Records <sanfrancisco@public-records-requests.com> wrote:

City and County of San Francisco Public Records

Documents have been released for record request #21-2848 along with the following message:

Dear Anonymous,

We have conducted a diligent search for records responsive to your June 5, 2021 request. We have located responsive records, which are available to you through NextRequest, Record #21-2848.

We redacted certain portions of these records that contain information which is exempt from disclosure per (Cal. Gov.)
This concludes your public records request.

Sincerely,

Margot Shaub
Library Commission Affairs Analyst
San Francisco Public Library

REQUEST:

Hi

Ms. Carskaddon and SFPL:

Can you please produce the email you received on March 31, 2021 with the subject line containing "Daily Allocation"

No special metadata/headers is needed thank you.

- Re.Secure 3.31 Daily Allocation 09.45AM-redacted.pdf
- Re.Secure 3.31 Daily Allocation 09.52AM-redacted.pdf
- Re.Secure 3.31 Daily Allocation 10.03AM-redacted.pdf
• Re. Secure 3.31 Daily Allocation 10.20AM-redacted.pdf

**View Request 21-2848**

https://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/requests/21-2848

Document links are valid for one month. After July 18, you will need to sign in to view the document(s).

Questions about your request? Reply to this email or sign in to contact staff at City and County of San Francisco.

Technical support: See our help page.
Site 10 is all we have that is a fivkeys site, other have no availability.

Cheers,

Ely L. Barrientos (he, him, his)
COVID Command Center
Alternative Housing System, Guest Placement
HSA DOC Room 203
ely.barrientos@sfdph.org

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail is intended for the recipient only. If you receive this e-mail in error, notify the sender and destroy the e-mail immediately. Disclosure of the Personal Health Information (PHI) contained herein may subject the disclosure to civil or criminal penalties under state and federal privacy laws.
**Daily Allocation Summary**

Hello,

Moving forward please add HSBplacement@sfdph.org to all communications. Also, we are reconciling our contact list, please include the title, first/last name, email, and work number.

Below is the summary from today’s meeting. Site staff please confirm when the guest’s intake is processed, if any issues arise and beds are available, Team Leads please note projected needs during our allocation meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allocation</th>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Site #</th>
<th>Site Name / Address</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>CBO</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 SFHOT</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Site Managers DPH</td>
<td>Niesha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hotel Number Hotel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>DPH Contact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CCC Program Manager CCC</td>
<td>Teresa</td>
<td>Services</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cal. Gov. Code (SEC) 6255(a) Enter a Reason...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 HSOC</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>Site Managers Community Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Care Coordinator</td>
<td>Tara</td>
<td>Services</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CBO Leadership Episcopalian Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>CCC Program Manager (fka Site Leads)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>Site #</td>
<td>Site Name / Address</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Intra/Transfer</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dolores Street</td>
<td>Shift Leads/Supervisors</td>
<td>Dolores Street</td>
<td>Arturo Arriaga</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 HTP</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>CCC Program Manager</td>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>Robert Etter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Site Managers</td>
<td>Dolores Street</td>
<td>Yesenia Lara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Care Coordinator</td>
<td>Dolores Street</td>
<td>Yanira Ramirez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DPH Charge Nurse</td>
<td>DPH</td>
<td>Tia Palacios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 SCRT</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>Site Managers</td>
<td>Episcopal Community Services</td>
<td>Will Hernandez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 SFHOT</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>CBO Leadership</td>
<td>Episcopal Community Services</td>
<td>Julie Lemos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CCC Program Manager</td>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>Robert Etter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CBO Leadership</td>
<td>Episcopal Community Services</td>
<td>Rod Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CBO Contact</td>
<td>Episcopal Community Services</td>
<td>Missy Martinez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 HSOC</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>St. Vincent De Paul</td>
<td>CBO Leadership</td>
<td>St. Vincent De Paul</td>
<td>Lessy Bell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>Site Managers</td>
<td>St. Vincent De Paul</td>
<td>Sharonda Adams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>Care Coordinator</td>
<td>St. Vincent De Paul</td>
<td>Joe Martinez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>HSH Program Manager</td>
<td>HSH</td>
<td>Cathy Perez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Hospital</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Director of Housing</td>
<td>Five Keys</td>
<td>Meg O’Connell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 I&amp;Q</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deputy Director of Housing</td>
<td>Five Keys</td>
<td>Alysha Cooper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 SCRT</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HSH Program Manager</td>
<td>HSH</td>
<td>Louis Brooks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 SFHOT</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intake Coord.</td>
<td>Five Keys</td>
<td>Sabrina Garcia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>Site S Director</td>
<td>Five Keys</td>
<td>Kai Lin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cheers,

Ely L. Barrientos (he, him, his)
COVID Command Center
Alternative Housing System, Guest Placement
HSA DOC Room 203
ely.barrientos@sfdph.org | Personal Info.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail is intended for the recipient only. If you receive this e-mail in error, notify the sender and destroy the e-mail immediately. Disclosure of the Personal Health Information (PHI) contained herein may subject the disclosure to civil or criminal penalties under state and federal privacy laws.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Page (# of occurrences)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cal. Gov. Code (SEC) 6255(a) Enter a Reason...</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Buta, Odaya (CAT)

From: Anonymoose 🦌🔍 <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 6, 2021 8:33 AM
To: SOTF, (BOS); Supervisor Records (CAT)
Subject: 67.21(d) / Two new SOTF Complaints - vs Parks & Rec Dept and Commission
Attachments: 20210706_Ginsburg_ParksAndRec - Final Complaint.pdf; signature.asc

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

SOTF: please file TWO complaints, attached:
- Anonymous v GM Phil Ginsburg and Recreation & Park Department
- Anonymous v President Mark Buell and Recreation & Park Commission

Allegations (list all): CPRA Gov Code 6253(c) failure to respond within 10 days under CPRA, SFAC 67.21(b) incomplete and untimely response, SFAC 67.25 incomplete and untimely response to an immediate disclosure request, SFAC 67.25(d) failure to provide rolling response, SFAC 67.26 non-minimal withholding, SFAC 67.27 unjustified withholding, SFAC 67.21(k) (County of Santa Clara v. California First Amendment Coalition, 170 Cal. App. 4th 1301 (2009)) and CPRA Gov Code 6253.3 requiring NextRequest account and agreement to terms of use and privacy policy, SFAC 67.29-7(a) failure to maintain and disclose correspondence, SFAC 67.29-5 failure to keep and disclose a compliant Prop G calendar, SFAC 67.34 willful violation and official misconduct

Since June 8, 2021, Rec and Park completely refuses to turn over or even respond to requests for Ginsburg and Commissioners' communications and meetings with Parks Alliance. This violates numerous provisions of the Ordinance. And because Ginsburg read my email and isn't responding (which we know because he sent an email read receipt to me) - he's acting willfully and committing official misconduct.

Supervisor of Records: Three requests regarding communications between Ginsburg/Commissioners and SF Park Alliance have gone ignored since June 8, 2021, see attached. Please determine in writing these records to be public and order them disclosed. See attached complaint to SOTF which is incorporated into this 67.21(d) petition.

Regards,

Anonymous
Twitter @journo_anon

IMPORTANT:
1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.
2. If you are NOT a public official: This communication is confidential and may contain unpublished information or confidential source information, protected by the California Shield Law, Evidence Code sec. 1070. I am a member of the electronic media and regularly publish information about the conduct of public officials.
3. I am not a lawyer. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.
4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.
July 6, 2021

Re: Parks and Rec / Parks Alliance Complaints

Dear SOTF:

Please file two complaints Anonymous v General Manager Phil Ginsburg and Recreation and Park Department; and Anonymous v President Mark Buell and Recreation and Park Commission:

Allegations: CPRA Gov Code 6253(c) failure to respond within 10 days under CPRA, SFAC 67.21(b) incomplete and untimely response, SFAC 67.25 incomplete and untimely response to an immediate disclosure request, SFAC 67.25(d) failure to provide rolling response, SFAC 67.26 non-minimal withholding, SFAC 67.27 unjustified withholding, SFAC 67.21(k) and CPRA Gov Code 6253.3 requiring NextRequest account and agreement to terms of use and privacy policy, SFAC 67.29-7(a) failure to maintain and disclose correspondence, SFAC 67.29-5 failure to keep and disclose a compliant Prop G calendar, SFAC 67.34 willful violation and official misconduct

On June 8, 2021, during the Board of Supervisors meeting, Supervisors Chan and Peskin asked pointed questions of Mr. Ginsburg regarding his alleged knowledge of SF Parks Alliance’s letter to Supervisor Chan re: Richmond District playground, alleged inequity in park resource allocation, and more.

That same day before close-of-business, I filed an “immediate disclosure request” (SF Admin Code 67.25) by email to phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org and tiffany.lin-wilson@sfgov.org, attached as Exhibit A, regarding Mr. Ginsburg’s communications, meetings, and telephone calls with SF Parks Alliance. Mr. Ginsburg (or someone using his account) read my request approximately 20 minutes later, which I know because his email account sent me an auto-reply email read receipt (Exhibit B).

As of this letter to you, no response was ever provided by the Department or Mr. Ginsburg to the emailed request. Under the Mayor’s COVID orders\(^1\) and the CPRA,

\(^1\)As always, I do not concede that the Mayor’s COVID orders suspending Sunshine are valid, and
the Department and Mr. Ginsburg had a maximum deadline of 10 days to respond (or
to declare an additional 14 day extension). The Department and Mr. Ginsburg thus
violated Govt Code 6253(c).

To ensure that the email was not lost, I also filed similar requests on the same day
using NextRequest (numbers 21-2834 and 21-2835, which the Department has restricted
access to and cannot be viewed publicly: https://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/
The NextRequest requests received replies on June 9 stating that they would substan-
tively respond on or before June 18. No further response on the NextRequest requests
was ever received as of July 5. These requests covered both Ginsburg’s and the Com-
missioners’ communications with Parks Alliance.

Violations: Please take as proven every allegation not specifically denied by Respond-
dents

1. SFAC 67.21(b), SFAC 67.25, SFAC 67.25(d), CPRA Gov Code 6253(c) (all respon-
dents) – All timeliness/rolling response requirements were violated. Requests made June
8, 2021 had no responses indicating disclosable public records and reasons and no incre-
mental response as of July 5, 2021. Furthermore, in order to conduct a proper search,
Respondents must properly instruct their contractor (SF Parks Alliance) to search and
produce to the City (and the City must then produce to me) any records to which the
City has an interest in or right to possess according to any contract with Parks Alliance,
which are in the constructive, if not actual, possession of the City. It is unclear whether
these contracts are managed by the Department or Commission, or both.

2. SFAC 67.26, 67.27 (all respondents) – The failure or refusal of the Respondents to
search and produce the records is equivalent to withholding all records in their entirety
(Community Youth Athletic Center v. City of National City, “The effect of the City’s
inability or unwillingness to locate the records had the same effect as withholding re-
quested information from the public.”). This complete withholding is non-minimal and
unjustified in writing. If and when the City eventually responds, these violations may
continue as well.

3. SFAC 67.21(k) and CPRA Gov Code 6253.3 (all respondents) – The Respondents have
made my requests inaccessible even to myself unless I create a NextRequest account and
login, which I cannot be required to do. Extra-statutory end user agreements (namely
NextRequest’s terms of use and privacy policy) cannot be a precondition to records
access (COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA v. California First Amendment Coalition (2009),
“As a matter of first impression in California, we conclude that end user restrictions
are incompatible with the purposes and operation of the CPRA.’). My requests and

(cont.)
reserve the right to dispute them elsewhere.
responsive records must be made accessible (at least to me) on NextRequest without any restrictions whatsoever. Alternatively, one can also come to this conclusion via Gov Code 6253.3 which prohibits the City from allowing “another party [NextRequest] to control the disclosure of information that is otherwise subject to disclosure pursuant to this chapter.” Due to the configuration this Department has chosen, NextRequest prevents me from accessing the information without agreeing to private agreements. The easiest solution would be, like Public Works for example, to make public records requests and responsive records on their NextRequest portal to be by default publicly accessible.

4. SFAC 67.29-7(a) (against Ginsburg only) – “The Mayor and all Department Heads shall maintain and preserve in a professional and businesslike manner all documents and correspondence, including but not limited to letters, e-mails, drafts, memorandum, invoices, reports and proposals and shall disclose all such records in accordance with this ordinance.” Ginsburg is a Department Head. He testified before the Board of Supervisors that he was aware of SF Parks Alliance’s feelings regarding Sup. Chan’s investigation of Parks Alliance. I have sought such communications and either he failed to preserve them or failed to disclose them, or both. It is also possible he has destroyed records or failed to retain them after receiving my request.

5. SFAC 67.29-5 (against Ginsburg only) – Ginsburg is required to record and keep a daily calendar of all meetings, including phone calls. Now long after 3 business days after whatever meeting or call could have occurred between Ginsburg and SFPA, Ginsburg has not disclosed the meeting, its attendees, its general statement of issues discussed, date, time, location, etc. It is also possible he has not even recorded it. Regardless he has certainly not disclosed it as also required by 67.29-5.

6. SFAC 67.34 (willful violation and official misconduct against Ginsburg only) – We know that Ginsburg read my request due to his transmission of an email read receipt to my email account. Yet he has refused to respond at all to a request that he knows exists and targets specifically the alleged communications between himself and a major City contractor of what Supervisors allege are threats against a fellow Supervisor.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

Exhibits A and B enclosed
All 2021 Parks Alliance communications - immediate disclosure request

From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
To: phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org <phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org>  
Lin-Wilson, Tiffany (REC) <tiffany.lin-wilson@sfgov.org>
Date: Tuesday, June 8th, 2021 at 2:41 PM

GM Ginsburg and Parks & Rec:

The following are 3 distinct records requests. **PRESERVE ALL RESPONSIVE RECORDS. We will appeal all withholdings.**

1. Provide any communications of any form (email, letters, chats, texts, etc.) between Ginsburg and any of SF Parks Alliance, its employees, its officers, its attorneys, or its board members (together "SFPA") dated January 1, 2021 to present. Any communications between SFPA and OTHER department employees that were then forwarded to Ginsburg are also responsive. Respond in rolling fashion (SFAC 67.25(D)) - you are required by law to provide records the end of business day those records are reviewed without waiting until the end. Provide EXACT copies of all emails, email addresses, To, From, Cc, Bcc, attachments, formatting, hyperlinks, and content.

2. Provide any meetings between Ginsburg and any SFPA person(s) in 2021. You are required by law to have already recorded all meetings **(including telephone calls!)** that you had (Admin Code 67.29-5). Respond in rolling fashion (SFAC 67.25(D)) - you are required by law to provide records the end of business day those records are reviewed without waiting until the end. Provide EXACT copies of all emails, email addresses, To, From, Cc, Bcc, attachments, formatting, hyperlinks, and content.

3. Provide any prep materials your department produced for your hearing before the Supervisors today.

Your testimony today claims you were aware of the Parks Alliance's feelings re: the letter. Let's find that evidence.

Regards,

Anonymous
Twitter @iourno_anon

**IMPORTANT:**
1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.
2. If you are NOT a public official: This communication is confidential and may contain unpublished information or confidential source information, protected by the California Shield Law, Evidence Code sec. 1070. I am a member of the electronic media and regularly publish information about the conduct of public officials.
3. I am not a lawyer. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.
4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sent with ProtonMail Secure Email.
Fw: All 2021 Parks Alliance communications - immediate disclosure request

From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
To: phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org <phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org>
      Lin-Wilson, Tiffany (REC) <tiffany.lin-wilson@sfgov.org>
Date: Tuesday, June 8th, 2021 at 2:49 PM

Ginsburg and your Department:

Please be sure you provide (and preserve) all records not only on government property but also on personal property (per City of San Jose v Superior Court).

Regards,

Anonymous
Twitter @journo_anon

IMPORTANT:
1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.
2. If you are NOT a public official: This communication is confidential and may contain unpublished information or confidential source information, protected by the California Shield Law, Evidence Code sec. 1070. I am a member of the electronic media and regularly publish information about the conduct of public officials.
3. I am not a lawyer. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.
4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sent with ProtonMail Secure Email.

----- Original Message ----- 
On Tuesday, June 8th, 2021 at 2:41 PM, Anonymous Records Requester <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:

GM Ginsburg and Parks & Rec:

The following are 3 distinct records requests. **PRESERVE ALL RESPONSIVE RECORDS. We will appeal all withholdings.**

1. Provide any communications of any form (email, letters, chats, texts, etc.) between Ginsburg and any of SF Parks Alliance, its employees, its officers, its attorneys, or its board members (together "SFPA") dated January 1, 2021 to present. Any communications between SFPA and OTHER department employees that were then forwarded to Ginsburg are also responsive. Respond in rolling fashion (SFAC 67.25(D)) - you are required by law to provide records the end of business day those...
records are reviewed without waiting until the end. Provide EXACT copies of all emails, email addresses, To, From, Cc, Bcc, attachments, formatting, hyperlinks, and content.

2. Provide any meetings between Ginsburg and any SFPA person(s) in 2021. You are required by law to have already recorded all meetings (including telephone calls!) that you had (Admin Code 67.29-5). Respond in rolling fashion (SFAC 67.25(D)) - you are required by law to provide records the end of business day those records are reviewed without waiting until the end. Provide EXACT copies of all emails, email addresses, To, From, Cc, Bcc, attachments, formatting, hyperlinks, and content.

3. Provide any prep materials your department produced for your hearing before the Supervisors today.

Your testimony today claims you were aware of the Parks Alliance's feelings re: the letter. Let's find that evidence.

Regards,

Anonymous
Twitter @journo_anon

**IMPORTANT:**

1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.
2. If you are NOT a public official: This communication is confidential and may contain unpublished information or confidential source information, protected by the California Shield Law, Evidence Code sec. 1070. I am a member of the electronic media and regularly publish information about the conduct of public officials.
3. I am not a lawyer. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.
4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sent with ProtonMail Secure Email.
EXHIBIT B
Read: All 2021 Parks Alliance communications - immediate disclosure request

From: phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org <phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org>
To: Anonymous Records Requester <arecordsrequestor+readreceipt@protonmail.com>
Date: Tuesday, June 8th, 2021 at 3:06 PM

multipart/alternative

--_002_5de44befd62481c907ab8a8cb110cacsfgovorg_
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Your message

To: Ginsburg, Phil (REC)
Subject: All 2021 Parks Alliance communications - immediate disclosure request
Sent: Tuesday, June 8, 2021 2:41:15 PM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada)

was read on Tuesday, June 8, 2021 3:06:14 PM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada).

--_002_5de44befd62481c907ab8a8cb110cacsfgovorg_
Content-Type: text/html; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

<html>
<head>
<meta http-equiv=3D"Content-Type" content=3D"text/html; charset=3Dus-ascii"/>
<meta name=3D"Generator" content=3D"Microsoft Exchange Server">
<!-- converted from text --><style>!-- .EmailQuote { margin-left: 1pt; padding-left: 4pt; border-left: #800000 2px solid; } --></style>
</head>
<body>
<br><span style=3D"font-size:11pt;">Your message <br>

&nbsp;&nbsp;To: Ginsburg, Phil (REC)<br>
&amp;nbsp;&nbsp;Subject: All 2021 Parks Alliance communications - immediate disclosure request<br>
&amp;nbsp;&nbsp;Sent: Tuesday, June 8, 2021 2:41:15 PM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada)<br>
<br>
&amp;nbsp;was read on Tuesday, June 8, 2021 3:06:14 PM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada).</span></font>
</body>
</html>
Exhibit C – NextRequest
[External Message Added] City and County of San Francisco public records request #21-2835

From: sanfrancisco@public-records-requests.com <sanfrancisco@public-records-requests.com>
To: arecordsrequestor+sfpaletter2@pm.me <arecordsrequestor+sfpaletter2@pm.me>
Date: Wednesday, June 9th, 2021 at 9:35 PM

City and County of San Francisco Public Records

A message was sent to you regarding record request #21-2835:

Our department will identify and compile the requested information. The Sunshine Ordinance requires departments to respond as soon as possible or within 10 calendar days from receipt of any records requests. Therefore, we will contact you on or before 6/18/2021, as permitted by San Francisco Administrative Code § 67.21(b) and California Government Code § 6253(c). Please note that during the current public health emergency, the department is not required to provide copies of records by this deadline but must notify the requester whether the records exist.

View Request 21-2835
http://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/requests/21-2835
[External Message Added] City and County of San Francisco public records request #21-2834

From: sanfrancisco@public-records-requests.com <sanfrancisco@public-records-requests.com>
To: arecordsrequestor+sfpaletter@pm.me <arecordsrequestor+sfpaletter@pm.me>
Date: Wednesday, June 9th, 2021 at 9:35 PM

A message was sent to you regarding record request #21-2834:

Our department will identify and compile the requested information. The Sunshine Ordinance requires departments to respond as soon as possible or within 10 calendar days from receipt of any records requests. Therefore, we will contact you on or before 6/18/2021, as permitted by San Francisco Administrative Code § 67.21(b) and California Government Code § 6253(c). Please note that during the current public health emergency, the department is not required to provide copies of records by this deadline but must notify the requester whether the records exist.

View Request 21-2834
http://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/requests/21-2834
Request #21-2835

Access to this request is currently limited. If you are the requester or staff you can:

- Sign in
- Create/Find Account
Request #21-2834

Access to this request is currently limited. If you are the requester or staff you can:

Sign in  or  Create/Find Account
Supervisor of Records: This is a 67.21(d) to petition to determine in writing some or all records or parts thereof in the 2 attached requests are public and order them disclosed. In request #2 they have actively withheld certain records under apparently all of the cited exemptions and they are not more specific than that. There are also parts of records withheld in the second request in the numbered items.

SOTF: Please file a new complaint Anonymous v Chesa Boudin and District Attorney’s Office.

Allegations: SFAC 67.21, 67.26, 67.27, 67.25, 67.24, Gov Code 6253(c), Gov Code 6254.5

This complaint regards two requests both attached.

On the second request (comms with Dion Lim and Radley Balko):
For context Lim and Balko are both journalists who wrote about Boudin’s actions in a particular alleged crime. What Boudin, Lim, or Balko did or did not do is not relevant to the Sunshine issues, except that any release of info from Boudin/his office to Lim or Balko (who are not City employees) would waive all purported exemptions in that information. Namely, the Respondents appear to have discussed information apparently about witnesses or victims in this case with at least Balko on at least pages 61-62 of the public records released.

This had an untimely response, but also had numerous additional problems. Remember the Respondents bear the burden to prove with specificity that an exemption applies.

1. Gov Code 6254.5 - For all information that was provided to some other member of the public who has no special position in the investigation (namely these two reporters and their employers), all privileges in that information were waived.
2. SF Admin Code 67.26 - the participant names of the texts/chats have been withheld. You have ruled that the From and To of text messages must be disclosed. SOTF 19098 Anonymous v SFPD. It is unclear who is speaking to Lim/Balko - is it Boudin or his subordinate?
3. SF Admin Code 67.21 - a copy of a word document attachment communicated outside of the City was not provided. Instead screenshots of this document, which clearly contains hyperlinks impossible to provide via screenshot were provided. More importantly, because this Word file was itself communicated outside of the City, all privileges in the entirety of the file as previously transmitted are waived and I must receive the entirety of the original file, including all history and metadata in that Word file, whose name starts "Dion Lim Misrepresentatio..." on page 69.
4. SF Admin Code 67.26 - the DA’s office also transmitted various hyperlinks in their chat messages that were not provided to me (ex. page 63, 65)
5. SF Admin Code 67.27 - Respondents withheld records on subrequest 3 based on 8 different justifications: "We are withholding records under the exemptions stated above that would otherwise be responsive to your third request." I do not believe all of these justifications apply and they appear to be just scattershot.
6. SF Admin Code 67.24(a) and 67.26 - The Respondents withheld records to subrequest 3 based on: "Also, preliminary drafts, notes, or interagency or intra-agency memoranda may be exempt from disclosure under Cal. Govt. Code § 6254(a)." This is not allowed. Only a very small subset of such info is exempt under local draft
exemption Admin Code 67.24(a). Namely in order to be exempt they must be "preliminary draft or department memorandum" AND "not normally kept on file and would otherwise be disposed of" AND then, only "the recommendation of the author" of such a document may be withheld within that document.

7. **SF Admin Code 67.27** - The Respondents also withheld records to subrequest 3 based on: "In addition, “official information,” which is acquired in confidence by a public employee in the course of his or her duty and not open, or officially disclosed, is privileged against disclosure per Cal. Evid. Code 1040”. This statement neither specifies which exemption is being used, and also over-states that is exempt. The Official Information privilege does not in fact exempt all "official information." Instead, there are two specific exemptions for subsets of official information: and they must choose which (or both) they are using: Evidence Code 1040(b)(1) and Evidence Code 1040(b)(2). Admin Code 67.27 requires you to choose specific exemptions. In (b)(1) they must prove what state or federal law prohibits disclosure. In (b)(2) they must prove that a balancing test *in the interest of justice* prevails for non-disclosure. But neither (b)(1) nor (b)(2) nor both combined simply exempt ALL information acquired in confidence by a public employee, as the City incorrectly believes. (Note that I am not disputing the *applicability* of the balancing test in (b)(2) due to the Mayor’s COVID orders in this instance; though I reserve the right to elsewhere challenge the validity of. What I am saying is if that is what they want to use, they need to cite that test and prove with specificity that it applies to all information so exempted.)

8. **SF Admin Code 67.21 and 67.26** - Each, individual, email needs to be provided as an exact copy. The To, From, Cc, Bcc need to be provided with non-private email addresses.

9. **SF Admin Code 67.21 and 67.26** - At the end of the records appears to be some sort of formal letter transmitted to ABC7. I am owed an exact copy of that original file transmitted to ABC7 (and whatever mechanism was used to transmit that file). Any exemption for metadata (for example, any purported history that may otherwise be attorney work-product privileged if it was NOT in a file transmitted outside of the City) in the specific copy of the file sent to ABC7 is waived by transmission to ABC7.

---

**On the first request (comms with judges and Mayor’s Office):**

The District Attorney’s office has decided to go radio silent on my request and simply refuses to respond. At this moment there is no substantive response other than a lie that they would respond in 10 days (they did not).

**Violations of Gov Code 6253(c), Admin Code 67.21(b), Admin Code 67.25(b) and/or Admin Code 67.25(d):** In each case, Chesa Boudin and his Office violated Gov Code 6253(c) for failing to provide a determination of disclosable public records and reasons within 10 days and for unreasonably delaying provision of records to my requests. (The prior argument is based on a presumption that the Mayor’s emergency COVID orders suspending certain timeliness requirements of the Ordinance are valid, but is not a concession that they are in fact valid, or continue to be in effect at any given time. In the alternative, Respondents violated Admin Code 67.21(b) and/or 67.25(b) for failing to provide records within 10 days.).

**Violations of Admin Code 67.26 and 67.27:** The failure or refusal of the Respondents to search and produce the records is equivalent to withholding all records in their entirety (Community Youth Athletic Center v. City of National City, “The effect of the City’s inability or unwillingness to locate the records had the same effect as withholding requested information from the public.”). This complete withholding is non-minimal and unjustified in writing. If and when the City eventually responds, these violations may continue as well.

---

Regards,

Anonymous
Twitter @journo_anon

**IMPORTANT:**

1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.
2. If you are NOT a public official: This communication is confidential and may contain unpublished information or confidential source information, protected by the California Shield Law, Evidence Code sec. 1070. I am a member of the electronic media and regularly publish information about the conduct of public officials.

3. I am not a lawyer. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.

4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sent with ProtonMail Secure Email.
Subject: California Public Records Act Request: Boudin-Judge communications - Immediate disclosure...

Provide any communications (including any group conversations) of any form on personal or govt property between DA Boudin or any DA employee and any person who is a local, state, or federal judge at the time of the communication, Chief Scott, Mayor London Breed, Andy Lynch, Jeff Creten, Sean Elsbet, or Andrea Bruss. You may exclude any communication that is formally served on an adversarial party, publicly posted by a Court, or publicly posted on the Internet.

Search at least the following: email, chat, letters, text message, instant message, direct message, private message in all apps or social networks. Preserve all original records pending the final adjudication of all appeals - we may appeal all withholdings.

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Boudin-Judge communications - Immediate disclos...

Thank you for your request. As a preliminary matter, the purpose of the immediate disclosure request is to expedite the City's response to a "simple, routine, or otherwise readily answerable request." Admin. Code 67.25(a). The Sunshine Ordinance specifies that for more extensive or demanding requests, the maximum deadlines for responding to a request apply. Id. Accordingly, a requester's mere designation of a request as an immediate disclosure request does not automatically make it so. Rather, Admin. Code 67.25(b) makes clear that the City can invoke an extension of 10 days provided the reasons for the extension are set forth and as long as the requester is notified by the close of business the day following the request.

Processing your request requires searching for, collecting, and examining a voluminous amount of possibly responsive and non-privileged records. We are invoking our extension and will respond within 10 days.

Best,
SFDA Public Records

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Boudin-Judge communications - Immediate disclos...

Thank you for your request. As a preliminary matter, the purpose of the immediate disclosure request is to expedite the City's response to a "simple, routine, or otherwise readily answerable request." Admin. Code 67.25(a). The Sunshine Ordinance specifies that for more extensive or demanding requests, the maximum deadlines for responding to a request apply. Id. Accordingly, a requester's mere designation of a request as an immediate disclosure request does not automatically make it so. Rather, Admin. Code 67.25(b) makes clear that the City can invoke an extension of 10 days provided the reasons for the extension are set forth and as long as the requester is notified by the close of business the day following the request.

Processing your request requires searching for, collecting, and examining a voluminous amount of possibly responsive and non-privileged records. We are invoking our extension and will respond within 10 days.

Best,
SFDA Public Records
From: Muckrock Staff  

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Boudin-Judge communications - Immediate disclos... Email

To Whom It May Concern:

I wanted to follow up on the following California Public Records Act request, copied below, and originally submitted on June 18, 2021. Please let me know when I can expect to receive a response.

Thanks for your help, and let me know if further clarification is needed.
July 16, 2021

114094-50404735@requests.muckrock.com

Re: Your Public Record Act request received on June 14, 2021.

To Whom it May Concern:

This letter is in response to your Public Record Act request received by our office via email on June 14, 2021, making the following request:

“1. Provide exact copies of any communications (of any form, in any or no app, on govt or personal property, with all attachments) between Boudin and Radley Balko or Dion Lim in 2021
2. Provide exact copies of any communications (of any form, in any or no app, on govt or personal property, with all attachments) between other DA employees and Radley Balko or Dion Lim in 2021
3. Provide evidence of the following: "But in phone interviews, both the victim and Mulholland tell me they were informed by Boudin’s office that Lim’s story is inaccurate, that the juvenile not only still faces charges but that she also had a court date last week." Such evidence includes: (a) communications between your office and the alleged victim or Mulholland, (b) all filings by your office in the juvenile's case, (c) all communications between Boudin or other DA employees and the judge or clerk in the juvenile's case, (d) all communications between Boudin or other DA employees and the juvenile's attorneys. Obviously you may redact any info identifying persons IF an appropriate citation is provided for each such redaction.
4. Any calendar events showing Boudin or other DA employees meeting with any of the alleged victim, Mulholland, the charged juvenile, or any of their attorneys. As you know, all (physical or virtual/telephonic) meetings of Boudin must be recorded pursuant to SFAC 67.29-5.”

Under the Public Records Act and the Sunshine Ordinance, a “public record” is broadly defined to include “any writing containing information relating to the conduct of the public’s business prepared, owned, used or retained by any state or local agency, regardless of the physical form or characteristics.” Cal. Govt. Code §6252(e). If the department has no records responsive to the specific request, the department has no duty to create or recreate one.


The investigatory records of a law enforcement agency are exempt from disclosure under the California Public Records Act. Cal. Govt. Code§ 6254(f). Case law specifically holds that a District Attorney's investigatory records cannot be subject to compelled disclosure, whether the investigation is opened or closed, under conflicting laws. Rivero v. Superior Court (1997) 54 Cal. App. 4th 1048, 1059-1060.
Also, preliminary drafts, notes, or interagency or intra-agency memoranda may be exempt from disclosure under Cal. Govt. Code § 6254(a). In addition, “official information,” which is acquired in confidence by a public employee in the course of his or her duty and not open, or officially disclosed, is privileged against disclosure per Cal. Evid. Code 1040 and Cal. Govt. Code § 6254(k).

Additionally, release of records regarding a juvenile would be a violation of Welfare and Institutions code 831. Additionally, the right to privacy protected by Cal. Govt. Code §§ 6250, 6254(c); Cal. Const., Art. I, §§ 1, 3(b); Admin. Code §67.1(g); Admin. Code Chapter 12M prevents these records from release.

The California Constitution includes an individual right to privacy. Both state and local law recognize as a general principle that the right to personal privacy sometimes precludes disclosure of public records or information contained in those records. Cal. Govt. Code §§ 6250, 6254(c); Cal. Const., Art. I, §§ 1, 3(b); Admin. Code §67.1(g); Admin. Code Chapter 12M. These authorities may protect private information or records from disclosure even absent a statutory or constitutional provision addressing the specific information or type of record in question.

Please see the attached responsive records to your first, second, and third request. Under the right to privacy statutes stated above, we have redacted personal cell phone numbers and emails from the records. We are withholding records under the exemptions stated above that would otherwise be responsive to your third request. We do not have any responsive records to your fourth request.

Sincerely,

San Francisco District Attorney’s Public Records
Hi Rachel,

Perhaps you are mistaken— my previous email reads “family” meaning her son. He provided me a statement from his mother.

Here is also the portion of our previous email that was not addressed. Could you please respond with context surrounding the other suspects who are not minors and the circumstances pertaining to them. Again, not the minor.

> It is our understanding that one suspect in this case is a minor. "California Welfare and Institutions Code" does not prohibit the DA's office from discussing the other parts of the case involving individuals who are over 18.

Many Thanks,

Dion Lim | Anchor/Reporter | ABC7 KGO-TV Bay Area
415-517-8264 | abc7news.com

On May 21, 2021, at 4:00 PM, Marshall, Rachel (DAT) <rachel.marshall@sfgov.org> wrote:

Hi Dion,

Your information is inaccurate.

We have spoken to the victim repeatedly, including today, and she told us that she has never spoken to you directly. She has spoken with us and confirmed she would like her face blurred, which we learned has not been done on your social media accounts.

Thank you,

Rachel

--

Rachel Marshall
Director of Communications & Policy Advisor
Assistant District Attorney
Office of San Francisco District Attorney Chesa Boudin
Rachel.Marshall@sfgov.org
San Francisco District Attorney
350 Rhode Island Street, North Building, Suite 400N
Hi Rachel,

It is our understanding that one suspect in this case is a minor. "California Welfare and Institutions Code" does not prohibit the DA's office from discussing the other parts of the case involving individuals who are over 18.

The victim's family and I have been corresponding and they are aware of my prior Tweets and what they would like to be included or excluded in our story.

Please be mindful of the victim's most up-to-date requests to ABC7 going forward.

Be Well,

Dion Lim | Anchor/Reporter | ABC7 KGO-TV Bay Area
415-517-8264 | abc7news.com

From: Marshall, Rachel (DAT) <rachel.marshall@sfgov.org>
Sent: Friday, May 21, 2021 1:23 PM
To: Lim, Dion F. (KGO-TV) <Dion.F.Lim@abc.com>; Boudin, Chesa (DAT) <chesa@sfgov.org>
Cc: Mulligan, Jeff A. (KGO-TV) <Jeff.A.Mulligan@abc.com>; Tuggle, Heather <Heather.Tuggle@abc.com>
Subject: Re: Dion Lim: Safeway Attempted Carjacking Incident Update

Hi Dion,

Pursuant to the California Welfare and Institutions Code, we are legally prohibited from discussing anything related to a juvenile case, and this should not be interpreted as confirming or denying anything about the case status or the claims you made. Additionally, my understanding is that you spoke with an ADA in our juvenile unit a while back regarding privacy concerns with this case and that you agreed to blur out the face of the victim in this case per the victim's request. We were advised that it has not been blurred on your social media accounts. Please be mindful of the victim's request in any update.
Hi Rachel,

We are running an update to a story I covered a few months ago involving a 75-year old woman who was assaulted and targeted in an attempted carjacking at a Safeway store in the Richmond District.

We realize the suspects involved include minors-- but we are not asking for information on the suspects themselves, rather information on the status of the case.

It has come to our attention your office dropped the case due to a lack of DNA evidence.

Was DNA evidence needed despite multiple cell phone videos provided by witnesses and surveillance from the store itself? There were also witnesses who gave statements to law enforcement after the incident happened.

Many Thanks,

Dion Lim | Anchor/Reporter | ABC7 KGO-TV Bay Area
Hi Rachel,

It is our understanding that one suspect in this case is a minor. "California Welfare and Institutions Code" does not prohibit the DA's office from discussing the other parts of the case involving individuals who are over 18.

The victim's family and I have been corresponding and they are aware of my prior Tweets and what they would like to be included or excluded in our story.

Please be mindful of the victim's most up-to-date requests to ABC7 going forward.

Be Well,

Dion Lim | Anchor/Reporter | ABC7 KGO-TV Bay Area
415-517-8264 | abc7news.com

Hi Dion,

Pursuant to the California Welfare and Institutions Code, we are legally prohibited from discussing anything related to a juvenile case, and this should not be interpreted as confirming or denying anything about the case status or the claims you made. Additionally, my understanding is that you spoke with an ADA in our juvenile unit a while back regarding privacy concerns with this case and that you agreed to blur out the face of the victim in this case per the victim's request. We were advised that it has not been blurred on your social media accounts. Please be mindful of the victim’s request in any update.

Thank you.

--
Rachel Marshall
Director of Communications & Policy Advisor
From: "Lim, Dion F. (KGO-TV)" <Dion.F.Lim@abc.com>
Date: Friday, May 21, 2021 at 11:12 AM
To: "Marshall, Rachel (DAT)" <rachel.marshall@sfgov.org>, "Boudin, Chesa (DAT)" <chesa@sfgov.org>
Cc: "Mulligan, Jeff A. (KGO-TV)" <Jeff.A.Mulligan@abc.com>, "Tuggle, Heather" <Heather.Tuggle@abc.com>
Subject: Dion Lim: Safeway Attempted Carjacking Incident Update

Hi Rachel,

We are running an update to a story I covered a few months ago involving a 75-year old woman who was assaulted and targeted in an attempted carjacking at a Safeway store in the Richmond District.

We realize the suspects involved include minors-- but we are not asking for information on the suspects themselves, rather information on the status of the case.

It has come to our attention your office dropped the case due to a lack of DNA evidence.

Was DNA evidence needed despite multiple cell phone videos provided by witnesses and surveillance from the store itself? There were also witnesses who gave statements to law enforcement after the incident happened.

Many Thanks,

Dion Lim | Anchor/Reporter | ABC7 KGO-TV Bay Area
415-517-8264 | abc7news.com
Hi Rachel,

We are running an update to a story I covered a few months ago involving a 75-year old woman who was assaulted and targeted in an attempted carjacking at a Safeway store in the Richmond District.

We realize the suspects involved include minors-- but we are not asking for information on the suspects themselves, rather information on the status of the case.

It has come to our attention your office dropped the case due to a lack of DNA evidence.

Was DNA evidence needed despite multiple cell phone videos provided by witnesses and surveillance from the store itself? There were also witnesses who gave statements to law enforcement after the incident happened.

Many Thanks,

Dion Lim | Anchor/Reporter | ABC7 KGO-TV Bay Area
415-517-8264 | abc7news.com
Hi Rachel,

Working on a piece for today’s newscasts about the incident involving Fanly Chen over the weekend.

Community leaders and members of the media seemed to be under the impression Chesa would be appearing to speak to the Ms. Chen in person and to possibly empathize with her frustrations and pain. Chesa did not show up to the store today.

Can you please elaborate on why Chesa was not there and what he was attending to instead?

Note: we are not looking for comment on the suspect, as he is a minor-- but solely on the circumstances surrounding Chesa’s decision not to be in attendance.

Thanks,
Dion Lim | Anchor/Reporter | ABC7 KGO-TV Bay Area
415-517-8264 | abc7news.com
From: "Lim, Dion F. (KGO-TV)" <Dion.F.Lim@abc.com>
Date: May 3, 2021 at 12:50:55 PM PDT
To: Rachel Marshall <rachel.marshall@sfgov.org>, chesa@sfglv.org
Subject: DION Lim: ABC7 Story Request

Hello Rachel,

I’m seeking comment from Chesa/your office for a story I’m working on today.

Sidney Hammond is one example of someone who committed offenses such as robbery and then released only to then commit an assault weeks later.

While I can not comment or confirm if this person has mental health issues— nor do I expect or want confirmation or comment on his health— what are some of the measures being put into the place to ensure those who are/might be in need of medical assistance (for something such as mental health) are treated versus let back out into the general public to re-offend?

Many Thanks,

Dion Lim | Anchor/Reporter | ABC7 KGO-TV Bay Area
415-517-8264 | abc7news.com
Hello Rachel,

I’m seeking comment from Chesa/your office for a story I’m working on today.

Sidney Hammond is one example of someone who committed offenses such as robbery and then released only to then commit an assault weeks later.

While I can not comment or confirm if this person has mental health issues—nor do I expect or want confirmation or comment on his health—what are some of the measures being put into the place to ensure those who are/might be in need of medical assistance (for something such as mental health) are treated versus let back out into the general public to re-offend?

Many Thanks,

Dion Lim | Anchor/Reporter | ABC7 KGO-TV Bay Area
415-517-8264 | abc7news.com
Hi Rachel,

Checking in to learn more about Mr. Dewayne Kemp.

He was arrested and is currently in custody after an attack on two older Asian Americans along Broadway in San Francisco earlier this month.

It appears Kemp was sentenced to 5 years in federal prison but then was placed on probation. In June of 2020 his probation was terminated. Less than 10 months later he was arrested for this incident along Broadway which resulted in one victim to lose consciousness.

We have a hard deadline of 3pm.

Many Thanks,

Dion Lim | Anchor/Reporter | ABC7 KGO-TV Bay Area
415-517-8264 | abc7news.com
Thanks Rachel-- have a great weekend.

Regards,

Dion Lim | Anchor/Reporter | ABC7 KGO-TV Bay Area
415-517-8264 | abc7news.com

---

Hi Dion,

Our office has charged Mr. Claros in this recent incident with six counts (four felonies and two misdemeanors), including attempted robbery with a gun.

We filed a motion for his detention, which was granted by a judge.

Mr. Claros is on felony probation from a 2018 incident.

Given that this is a pending case, we are limited in what else we can share at this time.

Thank you,

Rachel
Hi Rachel,

We are looking for comment from Chesa on a 22-year old man named Carlos Claros. He was recently arrested for robbery, carrying a concealed firearm, possession of a firearm by a felon etc.

He appears to have quite a lengthy record including multiple strong-armed robberies including one where 3 minors were assaulted, drug possession and being in possession of a stolen car.

Can Chesa/someone at the DA's office explain the reasoning why Mr. Claros was on probation despite his extensive criminal history and Mr. Boudin's words to the victims in this recent incident?

Thank you for your help. We are turning this for our afternoon/evening newscasts and have a hard deadline of 3:15pm.

Dion Lim | Anchor/Reporter | ABC7 KGO-TV Bay Area
415-517-8264 | abc7news.com
Hi Rachel,

Looking for comment to the question below. Our deadline is a hard 2:30pm. Thanks in advance.

Chesa Boudin has reported overall crime to be down across the city. Despite this messaging, residents in his neighborhood are currently angered and frustrated over a recent string of crimes. This includes an incident involving a woman in her 60’s who was attacked and robbed in broad daylight by men who ambushed her while on a walk several days ago.

This was only a few houses down from where Mr. Boudin lived and a few blocks from his current residence.

Knowing these crimes can happen anywhere and to anyone-- and because this one happened so close to where Mr. Boudin lives and one of his loved ones could have been targeted-- what would he like to see happen when the perpetrators are apprehended and what is he doing to combat the problem?

Dion Lim | Anchor/Reporter | ABC7 KGO-TV Bay Area
415-517-8264 | abc7news.com
From: Marshall, Rachel (DAT) <rachel.marshall@sfgov.org>  
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 2:53 PM  
To: Lim, Dion F. (KGO-TV) <Dion.F.Lim@abc.com>  
Subject: Re: Inquiry Into Roman Banks

Hi Dion,

Our office filed charges against Mr. Banks for the Twin Peaks burglary and he was released on his own recognizance. That case remains pending. In Mr. Banks’s more recent case, our office has filed more than 10 felony charges against him and we sought his detention without bail. The court set bail of $100,000 over our objection and Mr. Banks then posted bail. His preliminary hearing is set for April 15.

Thanks so much,

Rachel

--

Rachel Marshall  
Director of Communications & Policy Advisor  
Assistant District Attorney  
Office of San Francisco District Attorney Chesa Boudin  
Rachel.Marshall@sfgov.org  
San Francisco District Attorney  
350 Rhode Island Street, North Building, Suite 400N  
San Francisco, CA 94103  
Desk: (628) 652-4193

The information contained in this electronic message may be confidential and may be subject to the attorney-client privilege and/or the attorney work-product doctrine. It is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this electronic message in error, please delete the original message from your e-mail system. Thank you.
From: "Lim, Dion F. (KGO-TV)" <Dion.F.Lim@abc.com>
Date: Monday, April 12, 2021 at 2:21 PM
To: "Marshall, Rachel (DAT)" <rachel.marshall@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: Inquiry Into Roman Banks

Thanks very much. I'll be on the lookout.

Dion Lim | Anchor/Reporter | ABC7 KGO-TV Bay Area
415-517-8264 | abc7news.com

From: Marshall, Rachel (DAT) <rachel.marshall@sfgov.org>
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 2:16 PM
To: Lim, Dion F. (KGO-TV) <Dion.F.Lim@abc.com>
Subject: Re: Inquiry Into Roman Banks

Hi Dion,

I will have an answer for you shortly.

Rachel

--

Rachel Marshall
Director of Communications & Policy Advisor
Assistant District Attorney
Office of San Francisco District Attorney Chesa Boudin
Rachel.Marshall@sfgov.org
San Francisco District Attorney
350 Rhode Island Street, North Building, Suite 400N
San Francisco, CA 94103
Desk: (628) 652-4193

The information contained in this electronic message may be confidential and may be subject to the attorney-client privilege and/or the attorney work-product doctrine. It is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this electronic message in error, please delete the original message from your e-mail system. Thank you.

From: "Lim, Dion F. (KGO-TV)" <Dion.F.Lim@abc.com>
Date: Monday, April 12, 2021 at 10:42 AM
To: "Marshall, Rachel (DAT)" <rachel.marshall@sfgov.org>
Subject: Inquiry Into Roman Banks

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

Hi Rachel,
I'm looking for some information about an individual named Roman Banks. He appears to have been part of a car burglary near Twin Peaks in December then was part of a hot prowl burglary a couple months later involving Asian senior citizens and a weapon.

Can you shed some light as to why he was released after the Twin Peaks incident and his other priors?

Deadline is around 2:30 this afternoon.

Many Thanks,

Dion Lim | Anchor/Reporter | ABC7 KGO-TV Bay Area
415-517-8264 | abc7news.com
Thanks very much. I'll be on the lookout.

Dion Lim | Anchor/Reporter | ABC7 KGO-TV Bay Area
415-517-8264 | abc7news.com

Hi Dion,

I will have an answer for you shortly.

Rachel

Rachel Marshall
Director of Communications & Policy Advisor
Assistant District Attorney
Office of San Francisco District Attorney Chesa Boudin
Rachel.Marshall@sfgov.org
San Francisco District Attorney
350 Rhode Island Street, North Building, Suite 400N
San Francisco, CA 94103
Desk: (628) 652-4193

The information contained in this electronic message may be confidential and may be subject to the attorney-client privilege and/or the attorney work-product doctrine. It is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this electronic message in error, please delete the original message from your e-mail system. Thank you.
Hi Rachel,

I'm looking for some information about an individual named Roman Banks. He appears to have been part of a car burglary near Twin Peaks in December then was part of a hot prowl burglary a couple months later involving Asian senior citizens and a weapon.

Can you shed some light as to why he was released after the Twin Peaks incident and his other priors?

Deadline is around 2:30 this afternoon.

Many Thanks,

Dion Lim | Anchor/Reporter | ABC7 KGO-TV Bay Area
415-517-8264 | abc7news.com
Hi Rachel,

I'm looking for some information about an individual named Roman Banks. He appears to have been part of a car burglary near Twin Peaks in December then was part of a hot prowl burglary a couple months later involving Asian senior citizens and a weapon.

Can you shed some light as to why he was released after the Twin Peaks incident and his other priors?

Deadline is around 2:30 this afternoon.

Many Thanks,

Dion Lim | Anchor/Reporter | ABC7 KGO-TV Bay Area
415-517-8264 | abc7news.com
Thanks very much— hope to speak with you again soon.

Dion Lim  |  Anchor/Reporter  |  ABC7 KGO-TV Bay Area
415-517-8264  |  abc7news.com

On Mar 26, 2021, at 2:42 PM, Marshall, Rachel (DAT) <rachel.marshall@sfgov.org> wrote:

Hi Dion,

ADA Reinstead referred your inquiry to me.

Our office is prosecuting Zion Young and Fagamalama Pasene for murder charges. The case was on for trial today but the court continued the trial to April 16.

Hope that helps.

Rachel

--

Rachel Marshall
Director of Communications & Policy Adviser
Assistant District Attorney
Office of San Francisco District Attorney Chesa Boudin
Rachel-Marshall@sfgov.org
San Francisco District Attorney
350 Rhode Island Street, North Building, Suite 400N
San Francisco, CA 94103
Desk: (628) 652-4193

The information contained in this electronic message may be confidential and may be subject to the attorney-client privilege and/or the attorney work-product doctrine. It is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this electronic message in error, please delete the original message from your e-mail system. Thank you.
Hello Dane,

This is Dion Lim, anchor/reporter at ABC7 News.

I've been talking with the Chew family and conducted an interview with them today. They recommended I reach out to you.

I'm looking for some details as to where the case stands now.

Can you please give me a call at the number below? I'm on deadline for this afternoon.

Much Appreciated,

Dion Lim | Anchor/Reporter | ABC7 KGO-TV Bay Area
415-517-8264 | abc7news.com

abc7
Thank you for your reply.

I believe Ms. Martinez has been reaching out to the Da's office to obtain a restraining order against her assailant. Can you shed some light into why she was not able to get one-- and are you able to help her get one quickly?

Despite her perpetrator being in custody she is quite traumatized knowing he raped a woman and is afraid for her safety if he gets out.

I believe a restraining order would allow her to return to some sense of normalcy.

Many Thanks,

Dion Lim | Anchor/Reporter | ABC7 KGO-TV Bay Area
415-517-8264 | abc7news.com

Hi Dion,

Yes, I am the assigned ADA. I took over the matter when he picked up the new case while out of custody, currently handling both. We are working with Ms. Martinez and she has made recent contact with our office.

Best regards,

Courtney Burris
Assistant District Attorney
Child Assault Sex Assault Unit
District Six Liaison Team
San Francisco District Attorney’s Office
350 Rhode Island St. Suite 400N, San Francisco California
(415) 553-1801
Hi Courtney,

Looking for confirmation you are working with a woman named Miriam Martinez involved in a kidnapping and false imprisonment case from September of 2020.

Have you spoken with her or attempted contact recently? I believe the email for Ms. Martinez’s Victims Services Advocate, Amanda Esquivel is no longer working.

Thanks,

Dion Lim | Anchor/Reporter | ABC7 KGO-TV Bay Area
415-517-8264 | abc7news.com
Hi Courtney,

Looking for confirmation you are working with a woman named Miriam Martinez involved in a kidnapping and false imprisonment case from September of 2020.

Have you spoken with her or attempted contact recently? I believe the email for Ms. Martinez's Victims Services Advocate, Amanda Esquivel is no longer working.

Thanks,

Dion Lim | Anchor/Reporter | ABC7 KGO-TV Bay Area
415-517-8264 | abc7news.com
Hello:

Seeking comment from Chesa on a story set to air tomorrow pertaining to a man in custody named Allan Stewart.

Has Chesa been in contact with the victims of the September felony kidnapping and false imprisonment-- and the assault and rape later in November?

Can Chesa elaborate more on the decision of allowing Stewart to wear an ankle monitor versus keeping him behind bars despite his extensive criminal history?

Thank you,

Dion Lim | Anchor/Reporter | ABC7 KGO-TV Bay Area
415-517-8264 | abc7news.com
Hi Rachel,

Looking for reaction from Chesa to the New York Times piece where he is quoted as stating Antoine Watson was "in some sort of temper tantrum".

Can he please elaborate on his definition of "temper tantrum"?

Does he find the actions of Mr. Watson (banging his hand on a nearby car) in line with the term "temper tantrum" and an appropriate reason for his actions in pushing and killing Mr. Ratanapakdee?

Our piece is airing tonight.

Thanks,

Dion Lim | Anchor/Reporter | ABC7 KGO-TV Bay Area
415-517-8264 | abc7news.com

abc7
Note: we are going on the air in about 25 minutes.

Thanks Much,

Dion Lim
ABC7 News
Anchor/Reporter
415-517-8264
IG: www.instagram.com/DionLimTV
THE BOOK: https://amzn.to/2WXPk8t

Hello:

Looking to see if we can get a reaction to documents we have received showing the DA dropped Jerry Lyons' stolen vehicle arrest from October of 2020.

Thank you,

Dion Lim
ABC7 News
Anchor/Reporter
415-517-8264
IG: www.instagram.com/DionLimTV
THE BOOK: https://amzn.to/2WXPk8t
Hello:

Looking to see if we can get a reaction to documents we have received showing the DA dropped Jerry Lyons' stolen vehicle arrest from October of 2020.

Thank you,

Dion Lim
ABC7 News
Anchor/Reporter
415-517-8264
IG: www.instagram.com/DionLimTV
THE BOOK: https://amzn.to/2WXPkJt
THE CHRONICLE: https://bit.ly/2Z3Bi0D
Hi Rachel,

Looking to see if I can get a response from Chesa on the mayor and Catherine Stefani asking SFPD to pull robbery, burglary, gang arrests to see how many cases include suspects who were deferred to other agencies or dropped.

Thanks Much,

Dion Lim
ABC7 News
Anchor/Reporter
415-517-8264
Burke, Robyn (DAT)

From: Lim, Dion F. (KGO-TV) <Dion.F.Lim@abc.com>
Sent: Monday, January 4, 2021 2:14 PM
To: Marshall, Rachel (DAT)
Subject: Fw: MEDIA ADVISORY: SFPOA Calls for Independent Oversight Panel to Review DA Charging Decisions & Conflicts of Interest

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

Also: any response from the DA’s office on this?

Dion Lim
ABC7 News
Anchor/Reporter
415-517-8264
IG: www.instagram.com/DionLImTV
THE BOOK: https://amzn.to/2WXPk8t

MEDIA ADVISORY
TODAY
Monday, January 4, 2021

Contact:
Tom Saggau
(408) 209-6813
tom@saggau-derollo.com

Dustin DeRollo
(408) 499-6195
dustin@saggau-derollo.com

SFPOA Calls for Independent Oversight Panel to Review DA Charging Decisions & Conflicts of Interest

Demand comes following two people killed by a repeat offender

Chesa Boudin refused to charge for past crimes
San Francisco, CA—Following the New Year’s Eve double vehicle homicide of Hanako Abe and Elizabeth Platt by Troy McAlister, a violent repeat offender who was released after a plea bargain by the District Attorney, the San Francisco Police Officers Association is demanding the creation of an Independent Oversight Panel to review Chesa Boudin’s criminal charging decisions.

Furthermore, based on preliminary information that Chesa Boudin, as a public defender, may have represented McAlister in a 2015-armed robbery case, the SFPOA is requesting that the District Attorney’s Office go under a thorough independent review of potential conflicts of interests in criminal cases, including a full analysis of individuals and cases that are still active of former Office of the Public Defender employees who are now employed by Chesa Boudin. Additionally, the SFPOA requests that all records related to the court proceedings for the 2015 armed-robbery case be released publicly, including the plea deal.

“Two people were killed on New Year’s Eve because Chesa Boudin refused to do his job, which is to hold criminals and victimizers accountable,” said Tony Montoya, President of the San Francisco Police Officers’ Association. “Now, rather than accept any responsibility for the deadly impacts of his failures, he’s blamed no less than three other public agencies for his own mistake. It’s arrogant, juvenile and pathetic.”

In March of 2020, McAlister and Boudin’s office came to a sentencing agreement for a 2015-armed robbery with a firearm that resulted in McAlister not serving another day in prison, he was released immediately on parole. Since that time, McAlister has been arrested multiple times by SFPD and potentially other law enforcement agencies operating in San Francisco. Chesa Boudin has failed to file criminal charges in each of these cases.

“From secret Grand Jury proceedings to sweetheart deals for career criminals being cut by Mr. Boudin behind closed doors, the public deserves transparency and accountability from their District Attorney,” Montoya continued. “It’s time for a public, independent review of the District Attorney’s actions and for a full accounting of conflicts of interest in his office before anyone else gets killed by another career criminal.”

What:
Interviews with SFPOA President Tony Montoya on calls for DA oversight

Who:
Tony Montoya, President, SFPOA
Tracy McCray, Vice President, SFPOA
When:
TODAY 2:00 PM to 3:00 PM; 3:30 PM to 7:00 PM. Please call to arrange an appointment time.

Where:
Via Zoom or call to arrange a COVID compliant interview.

###
Rachel,

Thanks for your help facilitating last night's 11:30 Zoom interview.

Wanted to circle back and see if Chesa will be commenting on today's response from DCPD and SFPD's POA that they acted in accordance to protocol when dealing with Mr. McAlister.

Thanks,

Dion Lim
ABC7 News
Anchor/Reporter
415-517-8264
IG: www.instagram.com/DionLimTV
THE BOOK: https://amzn.to/2WXPk8t

Great, thanks!

--

Rachel Marshall
Director of Communications & Policy Adviser
Assistant District Attorney
Office of San Francisco District Attorney Chesa Boudin
Rachel.Marshall@sfgov.org
San Francisco District Attorney
350 Rhode Island Street, North Building, Suite 400N
San Francisco, CA 94103
Desk: (628) 652-4193

The information contained in this electronic message may be confidential and may be subject to the attorney-client privilege and/or the attorney work-product doctrine. It is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this electronic message in error, please delete the original message from your e-mail system. Thank you.
From: "Walsh, Ed" <Ed.Walsh@abc.com>
Date: Sunday, January 3, 2021 at 10:37 PM
To: "Marshall, Rachel (DAT)" <rachel.marshall@sfgov.org>
Cc: JR Stone Abc Stone <JR.Stone@abc.com>, "Stuerenberg, Shari M. (KGO-TV)"
     <Shari.M.Stuerenberg@abc.com>, "Lim, Dion F. (KGO-TV)" <Dion.F.Lim@abc.com>
Subject: RE: 11:30 pm. live Zoom interview link

If you could have him log in by around 11:20 p.m. or earlier that would be great, so we can make sure the connection is OK.

Thanks again

Rachel Marshall
Director of Communications & Policy Adviser
Assistant District Attorney
Office of San Francisco District Attorney Chesa Boudin
Rachel.Marshall@sfgov.org
San Francisco District Attorney
350 Rhode Island Street, North Building, Suite 400N
San Francisco, CA 94103
Desk: (628) 652-4193

The information contained in this electronic message may be confidential and may be subject to the attorney-client privilege and/or the attorney work-product doctrine. It is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this electronic message in error, please delete the original message from your e-mail system. Thank you.
This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Thanks for doing this.

This is the Zoom link for the 11:30 p.m. live interview with Chesa Boudin.

---

Ed Walsh • Assignment Editor

Follow Breaking News on Twitter: @ABC7NewsBayArea
Hi Rachel,

It's best if he logs in a few minutes before hand so we can test his signal and adjust his shot if needed.

Please try for 11:25 if he can.

Dion Lim
ABC7 News
Anchor/Reporter
415-517-8264
IG: www.instagram.com/DionLimTV
THE BOOK: https://amzn.to/2WXPk8t

From: Marshall, Rachel (DAT) <rachel.marshall@sfgov.org>
Sent: Sunday, January 3, 2021 10:34 PM
To: Walsh, Ed <Ed.Walsh@abc.com>
Cc: Stone, JR <JR.Stone@abc.com>; Stuerenberg, Shari M. (KGO-TV) <Shari.M.Stuerenberg@abc.com>; Lim, Dion F. (KGO-TV) <Dion.F.Lim@abc.com>
Subject: Re: 11:30 pm. live Zoom interview link

Just to clarify—the DA should log in right at 11:30?

--

Rachel Marshall
Director of Communications & Policy Adviser
Assistant District Attorney
Office of San Francisco District Attorney Chesa Boudin
Rachel.Marshall@sfgov.org
San Francisco District Attorney
350 Rhode Island Street, North Building, Suite 400N
San Francisco, CA 94103
Desk: (628) 652-4193

The information contained in this electronic message may be confidential and may be subject to the attorney-client privilege and/or the attorney work-product doctrine. It is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this electronic message in error, please delete the original message from your e-mail system. Thank you.
To: "Marshall, Rachel (DAT)" <rachel.marshall@sfgov.org>
Cc: JR Stone Abc Stone <JR.Stone@abc.com>, "Stuerenberg, Shari M. (KGO-TV)" <Shari.M.Stuerenberg@abc.com>, "Lim, Dion F. (KGO-TV)" <Dion.F.Lim@abc.com>
Subject: 11:30 pm. live Zoom interview link

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

Thanks for doing this.

This is the Zoom link for the 11:30 p.m. live interview with Chesa Boudin.

---

Ed Walsh • Assignment Editor
<3334ucquYhhsM/dgJuqfJ/fA/FDk7444
Z:8748,1k870;6548m8k748,c:8096c:
Follow Breaking News on Twitter @ABC7NewsBayArea
Hi Dion,

Your information is inaccurate.

We have spoken to the victim repeatedly, including today, and she told us that she has never spoken to you directly. She has spoken with us and confirmed she would like her face blurred, which we learned has not been done on your social media accounts.

Thank you,

Rachel

--

Rachel Marshall
Director of Communications & Policy Advisor
Assistant District Attorney
Office of San Francisco District Attorney Chesa Boudin
Rachel.Marshall@sfgov.org
San Francisco District Attorney
350 Rhode Island Street, North Building, Suite 400N
San Francisco, CA 94103
Desk: (628) 652-4193

The information contained in this electronic message may be confidential and may be subject to the attorney-client privilege and/or the attorney work-product doctrine. It is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this electronic message in error, please delete the original message from your e-mail system. Thank you.

Hi Rachel,

It is our understanding that one suspect in this case is a minor. "California Welfare and Institutions Code" does not prohibit the DA's office from discussing the other parts of the case involving individuals who are over 18.
The victim's family and I have been corresponding and they are aware of my prior Tweets and what they would like to be included or excluded in our story.

Please be mindful of the victim's most up-to-date requests to ABC7 going forward.

Be Well,

Dion Lim | Anchor/Reporter | ABC7 KGO-TV Bay Area

415-517-8264 | abc7news.com

From: Marshall, Rachel (DAT) <rachel.marshall@sfgov.org>
Sent: Friday, May 21, 2021 1:23 PM
To: Lim, Dion F. (KGO-TV) <Dion.F.Lim@abc.com>; Boudin, Chesa (DAT) <chesa@sfgov.org>
Cc: Mulligan, Jeff A. (KGO-TV) <Jeff.A.Mulligan@abc.com>; Tuggle, Heather <Heather.Tuggle@abc.com>
Subject: Re: Dion Lim: Safeway Attempted Carjacking Incident Update

Hi Dion,

Pursuant to the California Welfare and Institutions Code, we are legally prohibited from discussing anything related to a juvenile case, and this should not be interpreted as confirming or denying anything about the case status or the claims you made. Additionally, my understanding is that you spoke with an ADA in our juvenile unit a while back regarding privacy concerns with this case and that you agreed to blur out the face of the victim in this case per the victim’s request. We were advised that it has not been blurred on your social media accounts. Please be mindful of the victim’s request in any update.

Thank you.

--

Rachel Marshall
Director of Communications & Policy Advisor
Assistant District Attorney
Office of San Francisco District Attorney Chesa Boudin
Rachel.Marshall@sfgov.org
San Francisco District Attorney
350 Rhode Island Street, North Building, Suite 400N
San Francisco, CA 94103
Desk: (628) 652-4193

The information contained in this electronic message may be confidential and may be subject to the attorney-client privilege and/or the attorney work-product doctrine. It is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this electronic message in error, please delete the original message from your e-mail system. Thank you.
Hi Rachel,

We are running an update to a story I covered a few months ago involving a 75-year old woman who was assaulted and targeted in an attempted carjacking at a Safeway store in the Richmond District.

We realize the suspects involved include minors— but we are not asking for information on the suspects themselves, rather information on the status of the case.

It has come to our attention your office dropped the case due to a lack of DNA evidence.

Was DNA evidence needed despite multiple cell phone videos provided by witnesses and surveillance from the store itself? There were also witnesses who gave statements to law enforcement after the incident happened.

Many Thanks,

Dion Lim | Anchor/Reporter | ABC7 KGO-TV Bay Area

415-517-8264 | abc7news.com
Hi Dion,

Pursuant to the California Welfare and Institutions Code, we are legally prohibited from discussing anything related to a juvenile case, and this should not be interpreted as confirming or denying anything about the case status or the claims you made. Additionally, my understanding is that you spoke with an ADA in our juvenile unit a while back regarding privacy concerns with this case and that you agreed to blur out the face of the victim in this case per the victim’s request. We were advised that it has not been blurred on your social media accounts. Please be mindful of the victim’s request in any update.

Thank you.

--

Rachel Marshall
Director of Communications & Policy Advisor
Assistant District Attorney
Office of San Francisco District Attorney Chesa Boudin
Rachel.Marshall@sfgov.org
San Francisco District Attorney
350 Rhode Island Street, North Building, Suite 400N
San Francisco, CA 94103
Desk: (628) 652-4193

The information contained in this electronic message may be confidential and may be subject to the attorney-client privilege and/or the attorney work-product doctrine. It is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this electronic message in error, please delete the original message from your e-mail system. Thank you.

From: "Lim, Dion F. (KGO-TV)" <Dion.F.Lim@abc.com>
Date: Friday, May 21, 2021 at 11:12 AM
To: "Marshall, Rachel (DAT)" <rachel.marshall@sfgov.org>, "Boudin, Chesa (DAT)" <chesa@sfgov.org>
Cc: "Mulligan, Jeff A. (KGO-TV)" <Jeff.A.Mulligan@abc.com>, "Tuggle, Heather" <Heather.Tuggle@abc.com>
Subject: Dion Lim: Safeway Attempted Carjacking Incident Update

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

Hi Rachel,
We are running an update to a story I covered a few months ago involving a 75-year old woman who was assaulted and targeted in an attempted carjacking at a Safeway store in the Richmond District.

We realize the suspects involved include minors-- but we are not asking for information on the suspects themselves, rather information on the status of the case.

It has come to our attention your office dropped the case due to a lack of DNA evidence.

Was DNA evidence needed despite multiple cell phone videos provided by witnesses and surveillance from the store itself? There were also witnesses who gave statements to law enforcement after the incident happened.

Many Thanks,

Dion Lim | Anchor/Reporter | ABC7 KGO-TV Bay Area

415-517-8264 | abc7news.com
Burke, Robyn (DAT)

From: Marshall, Rachel (DAT)
Sent: Monday, May 3, 2021 2:54 PM
To: Lim, Dion F. (KGO-TV)
Subject: Re: DION Lim: ABC7 Story Request

Dion,

Our office is charging Mr. Hammond with multiple felonies and misdemeanors for the assault that occurred on April 30, 2021 and we will seek his detention at arraignment. He has a pending case for allegedly stealing eggs from a local market and then pushing a store employee on his way out. There were no injuries in connection with that case.

The DA’s Office is continually seeking increased tools to promote public safety.

---

From: "Lim, Dion F. (KGO-TV)" <Dion.F.Lim@abc.com>
Date: Monday, May 3, 2021 at 12:51 PM
To: "Marshall, Rachel (DAT)" <rachel.marshall@sfgov.org>, "chesa@sfglvc.org" <chesa@sfglvc.org>
Subject: DION Lim: ABC7 Story Request

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

Hello Rachel,

I’m seeking comment from Chesa/your office for a story I’m working on today.

Sidney Hammond is one example of someone who committed offenses such as robbery and then released only to then commit an assault weeks later.

While I can not comment or confirm if this person has mental health issues— nor do I expect or want confirmation or comment on his health— what are some of the measures being put into the place to ensure those who are/might be in need of medical assistance (for something such as mental health) are treated versus let back out into the general public to re-offend?

Many Thanks,

Dion Lim | Anchor/Reporter | ABC7 KGO-TV Bay Area
415-517-8264 | abc7news.com
Hi Dion,

Our office has charged Mr. Claros in this recent incident with six counts (four felonies and two misdemeanors), including attempted robbery with a gun.

We filed a motion for his detention, which was granted by a judge.

Mr. Claros is on felony probation from a 2018 incident.

Given that this is a pending case, we are limited in what else we can share at this time.

Thank you,

Rachel
Hi Dion,

DA Boudin cares about everyone in San Francisco being and feeling safe, whether they live in his own community or any other. He has filed more than 5,000 new prosecutions since taking office and is focused on continuing to promote public safety.

Rachel
---

Rachel Marshall
Director of Communications & Policy Advisor
Assistant District Attorney
Office of San Francisco District Attorney Chesa Boudin
Rachel.Marshall@sfgov.org
San Francisco District Attorney
350 Rhode Island Street, North Building, Suite 400N
San Francisco, CA 94103
Desk: (628) 652-4193

The information contained in this electronic message may be confidential and may be subject to the attorney-client privilege and/or the attorney work-product doctrine. It is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this electronic message in error, please delete the original message from your e-mail system. Thank you.

Hi Rachel,

Looking for comment to the question below. Our deadline is a hard 2:30pm. Thanks in advance.

Chesa Boudin has reported overall crime to be down across the city. Despite this messaging, residents in his neighborhood are currently angered and frustrated over a recent string of crimes. This includes an incident involving a woman in her 60's who was attacked and robbed in broad daylight by men who ambushed her while on a walk several days ago.
This was only a few houses down from where Mr. Boudin lived and a few blocks from his current residence.

Knowing these crimes can happen anywhere and to anyone-- and because this one happened so close to where Mr. Boudin lives and one of his loved ones could have been targeted-- what would he like to see happen when the perpetrators are apprehended and what is he doing to combat the problem?

Dion Lim | Anchor/Reporter | ABC7 KGO-TV Bay Area

415-517-8264 | abc7news.com
Hi Dion,

Our office filed charges against Mr. Banks for the Twin Peaks burglary and he was released on his own recognizance. That case remains pending. In Mr. Banks’s more recent case, our office has filed more than 10 felony charges against him and we sought his detention without bail. The court set bail of $100,000 over our objection and Mr. Banks then posted bail. His preliminary hearing is set for April 15.

Thanks so much,

Rachel

Rachel Marshall
Director of Communications & Policy Advisor
Assistant District Attorney
Office of San Francisco District Attorney Chesa Boudin
Rachel.Marshall@sfgov.org
San Francisco District Attorney
350 Rhode Island Street, North Building, Suite 400N
San Francisco, CA 94103
Desk: (628) 652-4193

The information contained in this electronic message may be confidential and may be subject to the attorney-client privilege and/or the attorney work-product doctrine. It is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this electronic message in error, please delete the original message from your e-mail system. Thank you.

Thanks very much. I'll be on the lookout.

Dion Lim | Anchor/Reporter | ABC7 KGO-TV Bay Area
415-517-8264 | abc7news.com
Hi Dion,

I will have an answer for you shortly.

Rachel

--

Rachel Marshall
Director of Communications & Policy Advisor
Assistant District Attorney
Office of San Francisco District Attorney Chesa Boudin
Rachel.Marshall@sfgov.org
San Francisco District Attorney
350 Rhode Island Street, North Building, Suite 400N
San Francisco, CA 94103
Desk: (628) 652-4193

This information contained in this electronic message may be confidential and may be subject to the attorney-client privilege and/or the attorney work-product doctrine. It is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this electronic message in error, please delete the original message from your email system. Thank you.

From: "Lim, Dion F. (KGO-TV)" <Dion.F.Lim@abc.com>
Date: Monday, April 12, 2021 at 10:42 AM
To: "Marshall, Rachel (DAT)" <rachel.marshall@sfgov.org>
Subject: Inquiry Into Roman Banks

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

Hi Rachel,

I'm looking for some information about an individual named Roman Banks. He appears to have been part of a car burglary near Twin Peaks in December then was part of a hot prowl burglary a couple months later involving Asian senior citizens and a weapon.

Can you shed some light as to why he was released after the Twin Peaks incident and his other priors?

Deadline is around 2:30 this afternoon.

Many Thanks,
Hi Dion,

I will have an answer for you shortly.

Rachel

---

Rachel Marshall
Director of Communications & Policy Advisor
Assistant District Attorney
Office of San Francisco District Attorney Chesa Boudin
Rachel.Marshall@sfgov.org
San Francisco District Attorney
350 Rhode Island Street, North Building, Suite 400N
San Francisco, CA 94103
Desk: (628) 652-4193

The information contained in this electronic message may be confidential and may be subject to the attorney-client privilege and/or the attorney work-product doctrine. It is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this electronic message in error, please delete the original message from your e-mail system. Thank you.

---

Hi Rachel,

I'm looking for some information about an individual named Roman Banks. He appears to have been part of a car burglary near Twin Peaks in December then was part of a hot prowl burglary a couple months later involving Asian senior citizens and a weapon.

Can you shed some light as to why he was released after the Twin Peaks incident and his other priors?

Deadline is around 2:30 this afternoon.
Many Thanks,

Dion Lim | Anchor/Reporter | ABC7 KGO-TV Bay Area
415-517-8264 | abc7news.com
Burke, Robyn (DAT)

From: Burris, Courtney (DAT)
Sent: Friday, March 5, 2021 4:29 PM
To: Lim, Dion F. (KGO-TV)
Subject: RE: Dion Lim: ABC7 News Story Request

Hi Dion,

Yes, I am the assigned ADA. I took over the matter when he picked up the new case while out of custody, currently handling both. We are working with Ms. Martinez and she has made recent contact with our office.

Best regards,

Courtney Burris
Assistant District Attorney
Child Assault Sex Assault Unit
District Six Liaison Team
San Francisco District Attorney’s Office
350 Rhode Island St. Suite 400N, San Francisco California
(415) 553-1801

From: Lim, Dion F. (KGO-TV) <Dion.F.Lim@abc.com>
Sent: Friday, March 5, 2021 12:59 PM
To: Burris, Courtney (DAT) <courtney.burris@sfgov.org>
Subject: Dion Lim: ABC7 News Story Request

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

Hi Courtney,

Looking for confirmation you are working with a woman named Miriam Martinez involved in a kidnapping and false imprisonment case from September of 2020.

Have you spoken with her or attempted contact recently? I believe the email for Ms. Martinez’s Victims Services Advocate, Amanda Esquivel is no longer working.

Thanks,

Dion Lim | Anchor/Reporter | ABC7 KGO-TV Bay Area
415-517-8264 | abc7news.com
Hi Radley. This is Kasie Lee in San Francisco. I’m so sorry I missed your call. Do you have time today to touch base?

Thanks for getting back to me. I’m traveling today. How about tomorrow?

Tomorrow works, too.

Anytime. I’m flexible.

Terrific. How about 1pm your time?

Sounds good.
Hi Radley. Is now still a good time?

Sorry about that. Can you talk in a half hour?

Yep that's perfect

"If you'd like I'll just inform you - and perhaps you can forward this to your mom, that I have double sourcing that all charges in her case against the perpetrators have been dropped. The DA’s office is citing lack of DNA guidance despite multiple cameras recording the incident and positive IDs on all suspects. They are all back on the streets."

To which I responded

‘That is truly pathetic. I did not know that they had found the other perpetrators, just the one 16 year old. Give a bunch of thieves some gloves and let them loose to do whatever they want and to enjoy the stolen money and the nearly thousand dollars it cost me to re-key the house and fix my broken glasses and get a new drivers license etc. and the $5,000 plus to fix the car, although the insurance company is out of pocket for that’

She then texted to my son:

"Off the record on my end entirely, .... I am not surprised. I cover many cases that are frankly more heinous than what happened to your mother and even those are dropped at times for lack of evidence or other more trivial issues. My sourcing streams say law enforcement is quite frustrated on this one. I will double check on who exactly was..."
I am going to send you the texts that the reporter sent to my son, and which prompted my 'quote'. I am copying them from the texts.

"If you'd like I'll just inform you - and perhaps you can forward this to your mom, that I have double sourcing that all charges in her case against the perpetrators have been dropped. The DA's office is citing lack of DNA guidance despite multiple cameras recording the incident and positive IDs on all suspects. They are all back on the streets."

To which I responded

' That is truly pathetic. I did not know that they had found the other perpetrators, just the one 16 year old. Give a bunch of thieves some gloves and let them loose to do whatever they want and to enjoy the stolen money and the nearly thousand dollars it cost me to re-key the house and fix my broken glasses and get a new drivers license etc. and the $5,000 plus to fix the car, although the insurance company is out of pocket for that'

She then texted to my son:

"Off the record on my end entirely, .... I am not surprised. I cover many cases that are frankly more heinous than what happened to your mother and even those are dropped at times for lack of evidence or other more trivial issues. My sourcing streams say law enforcement is quite frustrated on this one. I will double check on who exactly was apprehended. Though since I am not doing this as a story I cant look into this much more - and juveniles are challenging to find information on. Totally crazy but sadly this happens more times
She then texted to my son:

"Off the record on my end entirely, .... I am not surprised.
I cover many cases that are frankly more heinous than what happened to your mother and even those are dropped at times for lack of evidence or other more trivial issues. My sourcing streams say law enforcement is quite frustrated on this one.
I will double check on who exactly was apprehended. Though since I am not doing this as a story I can't look into this much more - and juveniles are challenging to find information on. Totally crazy but sadly this happens more times than not these days. In Oakland I was on a case last week involving an 11 year old who has multiple assaults on seniors on his record and every time he gets released back to his mother. Same goes to 16 year olds.
Will keep you posted. I'll circle back with my sources this afternoon (*This was Friday) and get back more details if there are any of note"

Then she goes on a bit later:

"I told my editorial team about what happened and they're very fired up and have me following up on this case after all. It looks like another source is not certain all of the suspects were apprehended but confirm the case was dropped entirely.
I am going to ask the DA's office what happened. I don't think they'll be forthcoming but I'd like to hold someone accountable for letting the case go with no consequence.
While your mother does not want to be on camera or be involved in any way- it would strengthen the case for community service or for the case to be revived if you or someone who knows her would speak.
Even if it were anonymously - or if I could paraphrase and convey your reaction without
knows her would speak.

Even if it were anonymously - or if I could paraphrase and convey your reaction without revealing your name or identity in any way it would add impact to an otherwise one-dimensional piece. I’d like others to understand the ramifications of what is happening in our criminal justice system"

She goes on:
"OK so here is what I have learned from my sources which are high-level law-enforcement and within the DAs office. This is the direct quote I’m allowed to use from the DA source 'I spoke with someone within the DAs office who has filed hundreds of cases and it is illogical not to file this case given the state of the evidence'

Law enforcement triple confirm the three suspects were apprehended. One was a minor. The woman who was the getaway driver apparently was able to get your mother’s credit card. The getaway driver’s mother was later caught making some kind of cash transfer using your mom’s card onto an app.

Police issued a warrant for that mother’s arrest but the DA refused it citing she was not part of the original investigation.

The DA cited he needed ‘video of the actual cash transfer’ - despite there being a digital record of the fraud on the app and probably on your mom’s bank statements/Cc statement.

The district attorney also asked the investigators for the black hoodie the suspect was wearing as evidence. Completely disregarding the fact there was surveillance and witness video"

And more:
"I just have one quick question. The DAs office gave me a statement that they ‘do not confirm or deny’ the dropping of the charges - even though I know for a rock solid fact they were dropped. They are also trying to say I blurred your Mom’s
And more:

"I just have one quick question. The DAs office gave me a statement that they 'do not confirm or deny' the dropping of the charges - even though I know for a rock solid fact they were dropped. They are also trying to say I blurred your Mom's face in the story at her request - but did not delete the initial Tweet I made where your mom's face is not blurred out.

In order to have more ammunition to rebut the DAs office and hold them accountable - may I tell the DAs office that you and I have spoken that you are OK with my initial tweet as long as I continue to blur her face out in any additional coverage?

A high level source WITHIN the DA's office also sent this to me: 'I spoke with someone within the DA's office who has filed hundreds of cases and says it is illogical not to file this case given the state of evidence'. It's a quote he/she is allowing me to use."
“Truly pathetic” Sources tell me charges were dropped in the case of this 75-year old woman who was dragged by her hair & assaulted in an attempted carjacking in the Richmond in March.

I wanted to know why & reached out to Rachel Marshall...

(1/4) https://t.co/orB73tb3UJ

Dion Lim
twitter.com

Safeway Carjacking Good Samaritan

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

Hello, my name is Harry Mulholland and I’ve been told by Romy Booth that
Hello, my name is Harry Mulholland and I've been told by Romey Booth that you've been trying to contact me about the attempted carjacking and assault at Safeway in the Richmond a few months ago. This is my personal email, and my phone number is [Personal Info]. I'm happy to help out with the case.

Hi Radley. Just checking in. Were you able to connect with the victim? Is it okay if I share your contact info with Rachel Marshall, our communications director?

Please do. I spoke with Mullholland. I haven't yet heard back from the victim. Emailed her yesterday.

One question: Mullholland says he thought the police report was supposed to be...
Please do. I spoke with Mullholland. I haven’t yet heard back from the victim. Emailed her yesterday.

One question: Mullholland says he thought the police report was supposed to be sealed, and felt a little violated that Lim was able to get his name and number. Is it true that his name and involvement weren’t supposed to be public information?

Correct. Not public information.

Law section
legislature.ca.gov

Law section
legislature.ca.gov
Those two sections govern confidentiality of information from juvenile cases, including police reports.

Thanks. Still haven’t heard from the victim. Does she know I’m trying to get in touch? Given that the DA’s office can’t officially comment, I’m not sure I can write this unless she’s up for talking to me.

Right. I can call her later today.

I’m trying not to be too involved. She said she wanted to clear this up and asked me to pass on her email. I’ll follow up on that to see if that’s what she still wants.
It's a 2 page form that can be filed with the court

It would just be for the limited information of verifying veracity of abc7 report
I was told that’s a pretty involved process, and that I’d be unlikely to be successful. But I’ll give it a shot.

I can maybe write something based on my interview with the witness. Depends on what my editors say. But the victim would obviously be preferable. Just maybe check to see she got my email. Could also be that she’s wary of talking to another journalist, which is understandable.

I'm sorry I forgot about the time difference. Feel free to call at your convenience.
I was told that’s a pretty involved process, and that I’d be unlikely to be successful. But I’ll give it a shot.

I can maybe write something based on my interview with the witness. Depends on what my editors say. But the victim would obviously be preferable. Just maybe check to see she got my email. Could also be that she’s wary of talking to another journalist, which is understandable.

Ok
Right

Mon, Jun 7, 5:52 PM

Sorry I forgot about the time difference. Feel free to call at your convenience
Also to answer your question about whether any other suspects ever identified: police later requested a warrant for an adult they suspected was the driver of the car. But there was not enough evidence to prove that the suspect was actually the driver so SFDA could not sign off on the warrant.

And finally, think best not to quote us but can try to steer you towards some juvenile advocacy folks if you want a quote on the importance of juvenile confidentiality.
Hi Radley, good to chat yesterday. Here is the document you asked to see.

Also to answer your question about whether any other suspects ever identified: police later requested a warrant for an adult they suspected was the driver of the car. But there was not enough evidence to prove that the suspect was actually the driver so SFDA could not sign off on the warrant.
Dion Lim Distorts NYT Quote on ABC TV Story on
March 2, 2021

- Ms. Lim quoted from a New York Times story in which DA Boudin described Antoine Watson’s behavior prior to the murder of Vicha Ratanapakdee. Ms. Lim falsely suggested that DA Boudin was referencing the murder itself when he used the term “temper tantrum” and quoted victim family member saying “temper tantrum, you can hit the car, you cannot hit or kill human”
- Ms. Lim tweeted: “‘TEMPER TANTRUM’: that’s how District Attorney Chesa Boudin described to the @nytimes the man police say killed 84-year old Vicha Ratanapakdee.”
- NYT piece actually was describing Mr. Watson’s conduct before the murder.
  - It said: “In the hours before the attack, Mr. Watson had a string of setbacks. He left his home because of a family dispute and got in a traffic accident in San Francisco at 2 a.m. He was cited by the San Francisco police for running a stop sign and reckless driving and then slept that night in his car. On that morning a number of security cameras in the area captured Mr. Watson banging a car with his hand, according to Mr. Boudin, the district attorney. “It appears that the defendant was in some sort of a temper tantrum,” Mr. Boudin said.”
- When DA Boudin reiterated on Twitter and in statements that the comment was regarding the conduct before the attack, Ms. Lim accused him of “backtracking” (see New York Magazine interview)

Dion Lim Falsely Accuses DA Boudin at Press Conference on March 12, 2021

- In her ABC TV coverage of a press conference to condemn violence against the AAPI community, Ms. Lim broadcast herself, while on camera, directing DA Boudin to look at her, falsely insinuating he was not
- TV coverage played press conference clip of Ms. Lim saying “it sounds like you’re blaming the police”
Dion Lim Exposes a Victim & Reveals Juvenile Charges

- Dion Lim posted a video of a carjacking, despite the victim’s request for privacy
  - Upon the victim’s request (communicated to her through an ADA) she blurred the victim’s image on the ABC website but left the original videos with the victim’s image on her social media accounts
  - When DA spokesperson Rachel Marshall raised this issue to Dion in an email, which Ms. Lim posted on Twitter, she doubled-down, insisting she knew what the victim wanted based on her correspondence with the victim’s family and tried to suggest the DA hadn’t talked to the victim recently (note that subsequent emails explained that DA’s Office had talked to the victim that same day)
- Ms. Lim revealed charges alleged against a minor, along with her home town—privileged information protected by statute to preserve the confidentiality of juvenile proceedings
- Ms. Lim later claimed in a story that aired on ABC7 that all charges were dropped, claiming unnamed sources had confirmed.
  - DA’s Office had not confirmed or denied, as they explained they are prohibited by law from commenting on a juvenile case.

Part III: Unmitigated Bias Against DA Boudin

Dion Lim Distorts NYT Quote on ABC TV Story on March 2, 2021

- Ms. Lim quoted from a New York Times story in which DA Boudin described Antoine Watson’s behavior prior to the murder of Vicha Ratanapakdee. Ms. Lim falsely suggested that DA Boudin was referencing the murder itself when he used the term “temper tantrum” and quoted victim family member saying “temper tantrum, you can hit the car, you cannot hit or kill human”
- Ms. Lim tweeted: “’TEMPER TANTRUM’: that’s how Boudin is trying to characterize this and...
Dion Lim Distorts NYT Quote on ABC TV Story on March 2, 2021

- Ms. Lim quoted from a New York Times story in which DA Boudin described Antoine Watson’s behavior prior to the murder of Vicha Ratanapakdee. Ms. Lim falsely suggested that DA Boudin was referencing the murder itself when he used the term “temper tantrum” and quoted victim family member saying “temper tantrum, you can hit the car, you cannot hit or kill human”
- Ms. Lim tweeted: “TEMPER TANTRUM”; that’s how District Attorney Chesa Boudin described to the @nytimages the man police say killed 84-year old Vicha Ratanapakdee."
- NYT piece actually was describing Mr. Watson’s conduct before the murder.
  - It said: “In the hours before the attack, Mr. Watson had a string of setbacks. He left his home because of a family dispute and got in a traffic accident in San Francisco at 2 a.m. He was cited by the San Francisco police for running a stop sign and reckless driving and then slept that night in his car. On that morning a number of security cameras in the area captured Mr. Watson banging a car with his hand, according to Mr. Boudin, the district attorney. “It appears that the defendant was in some sort of a temper tantrum,” Mr. Boudin said.”
- When DA Boudin reiterated on Twitter and in statements that the comment was regarding the conduct before the attack, Ms. Lim accused him of “backtracking” (see New York Magazine interview)

Dion Lim Falsely Accuses DA Boudin at Press Conference on March 12, 2021

- In her ABC TV coverage of a press conference to condemn violence against the AAPI community, Ms. Lim broadcast herself, while on camera, directing DA Boudin to look at her, falsely insinuating he was not
- TV coverage played press conference clip of Ms. Lim saying “it sounds like you’re blaming the police” without playing the comments preceding Ms. Lim’s
Dion Lim Misrepresentations...

- TV coverage played press conference clip of Ms. Lim saying “it sounds like you’re blaming the police” without playing the comments preceding Ms. Lim’s opinion nor any response from DA Boudin to her accusation
  - Ms. Lim’s TV story claimed that the family of Vicha Ratanapakdee informed her that DA Boudin had canceled a vigil attendance because they did not want photos or videos taken.
    - No fact-checking was done or opportunity provided to comment on this false accusation.
- In news coverage, Ms. Lim claimed, “Before another question could be asked, Marshall ended the conference.”
  - Misleading: the conference was significantly longer than scheduled and had ended. Ms. Lim spent more time asking questions than any other reporter present.

Dion Lim Makes the Inflammatory Suggestion that DA Boudin’s Comments Resembled Those of an Atlanta Sheriff

- Despite taking DA Boudin’s “temper tantrum” comments out of context, Ms. Lim continued to raise this comment frequently, including to draw comparisons to an Atlanta Sheriff alleged to have made anti-Asian remarks and to have described the Atlanta shooter as having a bad day
  - [New York Magazine](http://nytimes.com) reference: “The statement from the sheriff’s spokesperson unfortunately echoes some recent comments from San Francisco district attorney Chesa Boudin. He was quoted in the New York Times in February regarding 84-year-old Vicha Ratanapakdee, a Thai man who was pushed and killed by a suspect and was caught on camera in a story I broke. The DA was quoted as saying that the suspect was having a “temper tantrum.” I also reported his comments, then he backtracked saying he was just describing the suspect’s mental state before the attack.”
  - [Twitter](https://twitter.com) reference
Dion Lim Selectively Chooses Facts in Coverage of Roman Banks

- On April 12, 2021, DA Spokesperson Rachel Marshall responded to Ms. Lim’s inquiry re: charges filed against Roman Banks and why he was released, explaining in an email, “Our office filed charges against Mr. Banks for the Twin Peaks burglary and he was released on his own recognizance. That case remains pending. In Mr. Banks’s more recent case, our office has filed more than 10 felony charges against him and we sought his detention without bail. The court set bail of $100,000 over our objection and Mr. Banks then posted bail.”
- Ms. Lim nonetheless tweeted “Banks was released in the Twin Peaks burglary on his own recognizance & was arrested for 10 felony charges in the recent case. He’s out on $100K bail. Watching closely to see if charges get dropped & when the charges got filed.”
  - Does not mention DA’s office filed 10 felony charges (only arrest)
  - Does not mention DA objected to bail being set and had sought his detention

Biases Revealed in Comparing Ms. Lim’s Coverage of Crimes Outside of SF

- Despite frequently reporting or tweeting or posting the names of suspects in San Francisco cases, Ms. Lim has emphasized her restraint in doing so in reference to cases outside of San Francisco.
  - For example, on March 15, 2021, she tweeted that she was “waiting to hear back from the Alameda County DA” before releasing a suspect’s name so as not to “compromise” an investigation
    - According to SFDA’s Office, not once has the DA’s Office ever been contacted with a similar request
  - To the contrary, on March 16, 2021, Ms. Lim tweeted out confidential information about a juvenile case.
Biases Revealed in Comparing Ms. Lim’s Coverage of Crimes Outside of SF

- Despite frequently reporting or tweeting or posting the names of suspects in San Francisco cases, Ms. Lim has emphasized her restraint in doing so in reference to cases outside of San Francisco.
  - For example, on March 15, 2021, she tweeted that she was “waiting to hear back from the Alameda County DA” before releasing a suspect’s name so as not to “compromise” an investigation.
  - According to SFDA’s Office, not once has the DA’s Office ever been contacted with a similar request.
  - To the contrary, on March 16, 2021, Ms. Lim tweeted out confidential information about a juvenile case—privileged information protected by statute and limited to specific sources.
- Ms. Lim does not mention uncharged/unfiled cases or releases of defendant in reference to DAs in other counties.
  - For example, in a February 5, 2021 ABC TV story, Ms. Lim’s story implies DA Boudin was responsible for the tragic killing of Sheria Musyoka and asks the victim’s wife who she blames, clearly edits out some airtime and then has her answer “I blame the DA” (obviously referencing DA Boudin).
  - Ms. Lim then tweeted out that quote and mentioned that Mr. Lyons had an uncharged case from San Francisco.
  - Ms. Lim’s coverage did not mention Mr. Lyons’s other uncharged, recent arrests out of neighboring counties nor did she suggest that other county DA was responsible (see story in Examiner that references other criminal convictions and probations our of county, not mentioned by Ms. Lim).

- As another example, Ms. Lim mentioned in a March 13, 2021 ABC TV story that Mr. Boyle...
Dion Lim Misrepresentations...

responsible for the tragic killing of Sheria Musyoka and asks the victim’s wife who she blames, clearly edits out some airtime and then has her answer “I blame the DA” (obviously referencing DA Boudin)

• Ms. Lim then tweeted out that quote and mentioned that Mr. Lyons had an uncharged case from San Francisco
  • Ms. Lim’s coverage did not mention Mr. Lyons’s other uncharged, recent arrests out of neighboring counties nor did she suggest that other county DA was responsible (see story in Examiner that references other criminal convictions and probation out of county, not mentioned by Ms. Lim)

• As another example, Ms. Lim mentioned in a March 12, 2021 ABC TV story that Mr. Bailey had a prior in which he had been released in San Francisco
  • Ms. Lim mentions that Mr. Bailey had numerous recent felony arrests and priors out of Oakland—not San Francisco—but nonetheless focuses her story on why he was not held in custody longer in one San Francisco case, and never raises any questions about why he had been released in any his recent cases in Oakland

• As an additional example, Ms. Lim covered a story on ABC TV on February 5, 2021 about an Oakland case
  • She also never named the suspect (arrested in Alameda County) nor did she ever raise questions about any of his recent priors and his releases in Alameda County.

• As yet another example, when a recent attack happened in Oakland in May, Ms. Lim never once blamed or even mentioned the DA there.
Hi Dion, it’s Kasie Lee. I just wanted to give an update. The victim’s phone was off when I called earlier, and I sent an email to follow up. I’ll let you know as soon as I hear back from her. I appreciate you reaching out this morning.

Hi Kasie, thanks so much for getting back to me. I’m really glad we talked and that you now have my number. I appreciate you checking with the victim, keep me posted!

No problem. I’m happy to facilitate. We have heard back from the victim. She is ok with the video but is requesting that her face be blurred. She also is concerned that the back of the car has an English flag that
No problem. I'm happy to facilitate. We have heard back from the victim. She is ok with the video but is requesting that her face be blurred. She also is concerned that the back of the car has an English flag that makes it identifiable. Would it be possible to also blur that?

Got it! My team said they blurred out her face this morning and the web link has been updated. I'm told the story will not air again on television.

We can blur out the flag if she really thinks it's important to blur out— but I think it's a minor detail compared to her face. If you think she'll be more comfortable just let me know and I'll tell the editors.

Thank you. I'll relay that and I'm...
Got it! My team said they blurred out her face this morning and the web link has been updated. I’m told the story will not air again on television.

We can blur out the flag if she really thinks it’s important to blur out— but I think it’s a minor detail compared to her face. If you think she’ll be more comfortable just let me know and I’ll tell the editors.

Thank you. I’ll relay that, and I’m sure she appreciates it.

Yesterday 5:04 PM

Great— I told the team to blur the sticker and we should be all set. Good luck with the case. Please keep me posted if you’re able to!

Yesterday 7:27 PM

Thanks again.
Dear ABC7 News / KGO-TV,

I am writing in regard to an armed carjacking case that took place on Friday, June 18, 2021 in San Francisco. Our Victim Services Division, along with the Coalition of Community Safety and Justice, has been working closely with the victim since the incident. While working with the victim, we learned that ABC 7 reporter Dion Lim published private information and statements attributed to the victim on her social media accounts that the victim would like immediately removed.

As you can imagine, being a victim of an armed carjacking is an extremely traumatic experience. This is also an open, pending investigation, and the suspect has yet to be apprehended. Putting personal information about the victim along with his statements to the police into the public sphere potentially endangers the victim and his family and, indeed, the victim is fearful as a result of this.

The victim maintains that he did not know how Dion Lim received his telephone number but contacted him out of the blue. He agreed to an interview only to promote awareness and to remind his fellow neighbors to be vigilant. He did not consent to ABC 7 sharing personal details about him publicly or to have specific quotes attributed to him. He did not agree to have his story shared on any social media accounts. He thought the story would be shared on ABC 7’s website only. He reached out to the Chinese interpreter who Dion Lim used to interview him and requested that the social media posts be removed; however, the interpreter later responded that the information shared is the same as that provided in the police report so ABC 7 and Dion Lim will not be removing anything. As you know, the police report has not been made public; we are also unclear of why ABC 7 and Dion Lim would have a copy of a police report in an open, pending investigation. The victim also advised us that Dion Lim told them that she read the police report.

The victim has requested the following:

1. In the article by Dion Lim posted on ABC 7’s website, please remove the sentence about the victim returning to his Sunset home after dropping off his wife at work. Who the victim resides with is not newsworthy, and he does not wish for this information to be made public. He believes this places his family in danger.

2. On Dion Lim’s Twitter account, please remove the tweet with the direct quote, “He doesn’t want me sharing his name because the suspect asked him details about his family and who lives with him.” The victim did not provide consent for this quote to be attributed to him, does not believe the quote does anything to promote public safety, and would like for it to be removed from all platforms.
3. On Dion Lim’s social media accounts in which the statement, “I had no choice, if I don’t do anything maybe I will die, He will kill me,” the victim strongly requests that they be taken down. He only wanted to send a message to the public that vigilance is important; however, he believes the quote itself is extremely provocative, and sharing it is completely against his wishes.

We hope that you can be sympathetic to the victim's valid concerns and respect the victim's above-stated wishes.

Best regards,

David Campos
Chief of Staff
Office of the District Attorney
See below:

------- Original Message-------
On Tuesday, August 24th, 2021 at 2:16 PM, Anonymoose 🦌🔍 <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:

**Mayor Breed, DPW Head Short, DEM Head Carroll and SFPD Chief Scott:**

This is notice that I am alleging that each of the agencies and officials on the To line here are violating not only CPRA/Sunshine by not timely producing these records, but also by denying my attendance as required by SFAC 67.4 to gatherings of passive meeting bodies by refusing to provide any information at all, or for the agencies that did respond, by unlawfully redacting the conference call/Zoom/URL information. Note this goes beyond a CPRA timeliness/completeness issue: by refusing to provide me the information before the meetings occurred, you have violated SFAC 67.4 because I have "inquired" about these meetings by way of this August 11 request and I have been denied the required information and opportunity to attend where physically practical as required by law. The public can practically attend all virtual/conference call meetings. It's also arguable I can attend physical meetings that have enough space to accommodate me. Note that the only times passive meetings can be closed to the public is under the regular Brown Act-defined closed session options.

**In 40 days:** an Ethics Complaint will be filed against each of you. Note that it will not be possible for you to cure your failure to produce the required info from now until whenever you do respond, and complaints regarding your refusal to allow me to attend those meetings will be made no matter what.

SOTF complaints are also being filed immediately via separate emails.

**Supervisor of Records:** This is a 67.21(d) petition against all of the 4 above agencies to determine in writing the below information to be public and order it to be disclosed.

Regards,

Anonymous
Twitter @journo_anon

**IMPORTANT:**

1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.
2. If you are NOT a public official: This communication is confidential and may contain unpublished information or confidential source information, protected by the California Shield Law, Evidence Code sec. 1070. I am a member of the electronic media and regularly publish information about the conduct of public officials.
3. I am not a lawyer. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or
fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.

4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sent with ProtonMail Secure Email.

----- Original Message -----
On Wednesday, August 11th, 2021 at 12:40 PM, Anonymoose 🦌🔍 <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:

This request is amended as follows. I had some typos.

"Dear Mayor Breed, City Attorney Herrera, DEM Head Carroll, DPW Head Degrafinried, and SFPD Head Scott:

Disclose FOR EACH OF YOU each meeting on your calendars or on your aides' calendars in the following 3 months [from today] where Breed, Herrera, Carroll, Degrafinried, or Scott is about homeless/HSOC/street conditions or COVID. All of those fall under 67.3(d) & 67.4. Please read SFAC 67.3(d) and 67.4 very carefully. This is an amazing rule that I don’t see it being used often! Please ALSO follow the rules in SOTF 19112 and SOTF 19103 creating baseline requirements for Scott and Breed to disclose their own future calendars generally. I will file complaints for every violation. Remember, if you argue these topics are not public health, safety, or welfare or relating to services for the homeless, I will prove that from your own prior public statements, that they are.

If someone who is NOT a City employee is meeting with the mayor to "discuss with or advise the Mayor or any Department Head on fiscal, economic, or policy issues" OR even employees alone are "reviewing, developing, modifying, or creating City policies or procedures relating to the public health, safety, or welfare or relating to services for the homeless" you MUST disclose the time, place, and nature of the meeting, and you must allow the public to attend passively so don't censor the Zoom/conference call/etc!
"

Regards,

Anonymous
Twitter @journo_anon

IMPORTANT:
1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.
2. If you are NOT a public official: This communication is confidential and may contain unpublished information or confidential source information, protected by the California Shield Law, Evidence Code sec. 1070. I am a member of the electronic media and regularly publish information about the conduct of public officials.
3. I am not a lawyer. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all
warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.

4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sent with ProtonMail Secure Email.

------- Original Message -------
On Wednesday, August 11th, 2021 at 12:39 PM, Anonymoose 🦌🔍 <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:

Dear Mayor Breed, City Attorney Herrera, DEM Head Carroll, DPW Head Degrafinried, and SFPD Head Scott:

Disclose FOR EACH OF YOU each meeting on your calendars or on your aides' calendars in the follow 3 months (from today) per the rules above where Breed, Herrera, Carroll, Degrafinried, or Scott is about homeless/HSOC/street conditions or COVID. All of those fall under 67.3(d) & 67.4. Please read SFAC 67.3(d) and 67.4 very carefully. This is an amazing rule that I don't see it being used often! Please ALSO follow the rules in SOTF 19112 and SOTF 19103 creating baseline requirements for Scott and Breed to disclose their own future calendars generally. I will file complaints for every violation. Remember, if you argue these topics are not public health, safety, or welfare or relating to services for the homeless, I will prove that from your own prior public statements, that they are.

If someone who is NOT a City employee is meeting with the mayor to "discuss with or advise the Mayor or any Department Head on fiscal, economic, or policy issues" OR even employees alone are "reviewing, developing, modifying, or creating City policies or procedures relating to the public health, safety, or welfare or relating to services for the homeless" you MUST disclose the time, place, and nature of the meeting, and you must allow the public to attend passively so don't censor the Zoom/conference call/etc!

---

(a) All gatherings of passive meeting bodies shall be accessible to individuals upon inquiry and to the extent possible consistent with the facilities in which they occur.

(1) Such gatherings need not be formally noticed, except on the City's website whenever possible, although the time, place and nature of the gathering shall be disclosed upon inquiry by a member of the public, and any agenda actually prepared for the gathering shall be accessible to such inquirers as a public record.

(2) Such gatherings need not be conducted in any particular space for the accommodation of members of the public, although members of the public shall be permitted to observe on a space available basis consistent with legal and practical restrictions on occupancy.

(c) "Passive meeting body" shall mean:
(1) Advisory committees created by the initiative of a member of a policy body, the Mayor, or a department head;

(2) Any group that meets to discuss with or advise the Mayor or any Department Head on fiscal, economic, or policy issues;

(3) Social, recreational or ceremonial occasions sponsored or organized by or for a policy body to which a majority of the body has been invited.

(4) "Passive meeting body" shall not include a committee that consists solely of employees of the City and County of San Francisco created by the initiative of a member of a policy body, the Mayor, or a department head;

(5) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (4) above, "Passive meeting body" shall include a committee that consists solely of employees of the City and County of San Francisco when such committee is reviewing, developing, modifying, or creating City policies or procedures relating to the public health, safety, or welfare or relating to services for the homeless;

Regards,

Anonymous
Twitter @journo_anon

IMPORTANT:
1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.

2. If you are NOT a public official: This communication is confidential and may contain unpublished information or confidential source information, protected by the California Shield Law, Evidence Code sec. 1070. I am a member of the electronic media and regularly publish information about the conduct of public officials.

3. I am not a lawyer. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.

4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sent with ProtonMail Secure Email.
Dear Sup. Preston: 40 days after this email, an additional ethics complaint will also be filed against you per Ethics complaint form instructions.

Dear Supervisor of Records Herrera: You must determine in writing pursuant to SFAC 67.21(d) that the records requested or parts thereof are public and order them disclosed.

Dear SOTF:

Please file complaint:  
Anonymous v Supervisor Dean Preston and the Office of Supervisor Preston

Allegations: CPRA Gov Code 6253(c) failure to provide determination of disclosable public records and reasons or 14-day extension within 10 days, SFAC 67.21 untimely and incomplete response, SFAC 67.26 non-minimal withholding, SFAC 67.27 withholding without written justification

On July 27 and July 28 I emailed the attached request to prestonstaff@sfgov.org and dean.preston@sfgov.org, respectively (the attachment on MuckRock is in UTC not Pacific time). No response was ever received as of this August 24, 2021 complaint. The failure to locate and provide responsive records is equivalent to withholding them in entirety from the public (“The effect of the City's inability or unwillingness to locate the records had the same effect as withholding requested information from the public. ” Community Youth Athletic Center v. City of National City, 220 Cal.App.4th 1385, 1425 (Cal. Ct. App. 2013)). Therefore this response is a withholding is both non-minimal and unjustified in writing.

Please find one or more of these violations and order the Respondents to comply and disclose.

Regards,

Anonymous
Twitter @journo_anon

IMPORTANT:
1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.
2. If you are NOT a public official: This communication is confidential and may contain unpublished information or confidential source information, protected by the California Shield Law, Evidence Code sec. 1070. I am a member of the electronic media and regularly publish information about the conduct of public officials.
3. I am not a lawyer. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.
4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sent with ProtonMail Secure Email.
Sup. Preston and Preston’s Office:

Pursuant to the California Public Records Act and Sunshine Ordinance, I hereby request the following records:

1. every communication of every form or app (including but not limited to email, text, iMessage, and any direct, private, chat, Twitter, or group messages, or any messaging app), electronic or physical, on personal or government property, between any member of your office including yourself and all legislative aides/staff/interns on one hand and SFPD on the other hand re: the arrest or detention of Christin Evans by SFPD and all followup re: her release or your involvement therein. Provide exact copies of every record preserving all date/timestamps, email addresses, participant names, audio, images, video, To/From/Cc/Bcc

2. every communication of every form or app (including but not limited to email, text, iMessage, and any direct, private, chat, Twitter, or group messages, or any messaging app), electronic or physical, on personal or government property, in the constructive possession of any member of your office including yourself and all legislative aides/staff/interns ABOUT the arrest or detention of Christin Evans by SFPD and all followup re: her release or your involvement therein. Provide exact copies of every record preserving all date/timestamps, email addresses, participant names, audio, images, video, To/From/Cc/Bcc

PRESERVE ALL ORIGINALS OF RESPONSIVE RECORDS - we will appeal all violations of Sunshine/CPRAs.

The requested documents will be made available to the general public, and this request is not being made for commercial purposes.

Thank you in advance for your anticipated cooperation in this matter. I look forward to receiving your response to this request within 10 calendar days, as the statute requires.

Sincerely,

anonymous

Don't forget this request from yesterday...

Sup. Preston and Preston's Office:

Pursuant to the California Public Records Act and Sunshine Ordinance, I hereby request the following records:

1. every communication of every form or app (including but not limited to email, text, iMessage, and any direct, private, chat, Twitter, or group messages, or any messaging app), electronic or physical, on personal or government property, between any member of your office including yourself and all legislative aides/staff/interns on one hand and SFPD on the other hand re: the arrest or detention of Christin Evans by SFPD and all followup re: her release or your involvement...
therein. Provide exact copies of every record preserving all date/timestamps, email addresses, participant names, audio, images, video, To/From/Cc/Bcc

2. every communication of every form or app (including but not limited to email, text, iMessage, and any direct, private, chat, Twitter, or group messages, or any messaging app), electronic or physical, on personal or government property, in the constructive possession of any member of your office including yourself and all legislative aides/staff/interns ABOUT the arrest or detention of Christin Evans by SFPD and all followup re: her release or your involvement therein. Provide exact copies of every record preserving all date/timestamps, email addresses, participant names, audio, images, video, To/From/Cc/Bcc

PRESERVE ALL ORIGINALS OF RESPONSIVE RECORDS - we will appeal all violations of Sunshine/CPRAs.

The requested documents will be made available to the general public, and this request is not being made for commercial purposes.

Thank you in advance for your anticipated cooperation in this matter. I look forward to receiving your response to this request within 10 calendar days, as the statute requires.

Sincerely,
anonymous

twitter.com/journo_anon    July 28, 2021

Notes are visible to you and other editors of this request.

Contact information overridden:
email
dean.preston@sfgov.org

From: Muckrock Staff    08/09/2021
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Preston/SFPD re: Christin Evans - Immediate disclo...

To Whom It May Concern:

I wanted to follow up on the following California Public Records Act request, copied below, and originally submitted on July 28, 2021. Please let me know when I can expect to receive a response.

Thanks for your help, and let me know if further clarification is needed.

From: Muckrock Staff    08/24/2021
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Preston/SFPD re: Christin Evans - Immediate disclo...

To Whom It May Concern:

I wanted to follow up on the following California Public Records Act request...
I wanted to follow up on the following California Public Records Act request, copied below, and originally submitted on July 28, 2021. Please let me know when I can expect to receive a response.

Thanks for your help, and let me know if further clarification is needed.
Buta, Odaya (CAT)

From: Anonymoose 🐘🔍 <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 25, 2021 10:59 PM
To: SOTF, (BOS); Supervisor Records (CAT)
Cc: Boudin, Chesa (DAT); chesaboudin.da@sfgov.org; District Attorney, (DAT); Campos, David (DAT); Chatfield, Kate (DAT)
Subject: File SOTF complaint /67.21(d) petition against DA - my ref S09340B
Attachments: 20210825_Boudin-Complaint.pdf; signature.asc

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

SOTF: Please file a complaint: Anonymous v DA Chesa Boudin, Kate Chatfield, and the District Attorney's Office
In an effort to reduce the number of complaints, I'm putting all of these 3 requests in a single complaint, and if SOTF wants to split it up at committee that is its prerogative.
Alleged violations: CPRA Gov Code 6253(c), 6253(d); SFAC 67.21, 67.25(d), 67.26, 67.27

Supervisor of Records Herrera: This is also a 67.21(d) petition to determine in writing that the Twitter block list of Kate Chatfield at the time I requested it on July 6 2021 was a public record (because Chatfield used that account to conduct public business), and order it disclosed. This is also a 67.21(d) petition to determine the other records not produced in the requests discussed in the attachment are public in whole or in part, and order them disclosed. The attached complaint is incorporated into this petition.

DA Boudin: In 40 days, an Ethics Complaint will be filed as well.

Regards,

Anonymous
Twitter @journo_anon

IMPORTANT:
1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.
2. If you are NOT a public official: This communication is confidential and may contain unpublished information or confidential source information, protected by the California Shield Law, Evidence Code sec. 1070. I am a member of the electronic media and regularly publish information about the conduct of public officials.
3. I am not a lawyer. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.
4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sent with ProtonMail Secure Email.
Re: DA’s violations across multiple requests

August 25, 2021

Dear SOTF:

Please file a complaint Anonymous v DA Chesa Boudin, Kate Chatfield, and the District Attorney’s Office. Please accept as admitted any paragraph below not specifically denied by the Respondents. Under the Sunshine Ordinance, there is a presumption that the records requested are public, and it is Respondents who bear the entire burden to prove they are not.

1. Allegation 1: CPRA Gov Code 6253(d) - Failure to state the name and title of ALL persons responsible for the denial of information. All denial of access to information in these requests below was signed “San Francisco District Attorney’s Public Records” and lacks the name and title of the person responsible for denying access. See SOTF 19144 Anonymous v Dept of Police Accountability for prior ruling on this matter.

2. Part A - July 6, 2021 Request about Kate Chatfield’s Twitter

3. On July 6, 2021, Chatfield, who is the Sr. Director of Legislation and Policy in the DA’s Office, was documented in the news to have been in some dispute or controversy regarding Twitter commentary she made about an apparent opponent of Chesa Boudin.¹

4. She then locked her Twitter account to the public, and also specifically additionally blocked my own Twitter account, @journo_anon, for unknown reasons. As far as I know, I have never Tweeted at her or commented about or to her prior to July 6, 2021, but I monitor her account as I do dozens of other public officials. (This complaint is NOT about whether or not Chatfield can block me; it is about the...
Anonymous

Re: DA’s violations across multiple requests

public records associated with that act.)

5. At that time, Chatfield listed her official role as Sr. Director of Legislation and Policy in the DA’s Office as part of her Twitter bio, and she conducted public business using this Twitter account, including advocating for Boudin’s legislative and policy work, as her role entails. This is implicitly admitted by Respondents based on their production of public business tweets as public records in Paragraph 11.

6. On July 6, 2021, immediately after realizing I was blocked, and also realizing the public could no longer see Chatfield’s writing about public business made on Twitter, I made the attached request by email to both kate.chatfield@sfgov.org AND separately to districtattorney@sfgov.org for Chatfield Twitter block list and recent Tweets/DM about public business.2

7. Allegation 2: CPRA Gov Code 6253(c) - Respondents unlawfully failed to respond within 10 days informing me of the existence of disclosable public records and reasons therefor or declare an up-to 14-day extension for the July 6, 2021 request.

8. Around July 18, Chatfield unblocked me and unlocked her account to the general public as well, and removed the prior listing of her official role in the DA’s Office from her Twitter bio.

9. On July 21 (more than 10 days), Respondents stated "We are consulting with an outside agency who has a vested interest in this request. We will respond as soon as possible." This also fails to give a date certain within 14 days of the extension, if that was what they wished to do (though an extension was not lawful since this was after 10 days, regardless). It is unclear how any other agency could have a “vested interest” (defined by Oxford Languages as “a personal stake or involvement in an undertaking or state of affairs, especially one with an expectation of financial gain”) in Kate Chatfield’s Twitter account. Instead what they likely mean is they were asking for advice from Herrera, and think that advice can take arbitrarily long, instead of the 10 + 14 days allowed by the CPRA.

10. No further response occurred until August 25, apparently coincidentally the same day I called Respondents out on Twitter for unlawfully ignoring approximately 11 records requests from me and multiple others tracked on MuckRock.

11. On August 25, the responses in Exhibit B were provided, which was a single page of records. Producing a single page of records after 50 days also constitutes an unreasonable delay. Respondents also refused to provide any Direct Messages

2Note MuckRock timestamps are in UTC, not Pacific
about public business, or the block/mute list, or discussion about the blocking that occurred within the DA’s office.

12. **Allegation 3: SFAC 67.21** - Respondents unlawfully failed to produce copies of Chatfield’s Twitter mute/block list. At the time of my request, Chatfield used her Twitter account to conduct public business. The fact that she later tried to scrub that from the Internet is of no consequence. (Note that DA Boudin produced his own Twitter blocked list, but Chatfield would not produce her block list.)

13. **Allegation 4: SFAC 67.21** - Respondents unlawfully failed to produce a complete and exact copy of the Tweets that they admit are public records. Their partial copies fail, at least, to reproduce the three URLs written by Chatfield on July 1 of news articles at the SF Chronicle (x2) and the Guardian. URLs communicated by public employees are no different than any other writing and must be produced; see prior rulings on this matter in SOTF 19097 Anonymous v Nuru and regarding exact copies of electronic records in SOTF 19098 Anonymous v SFPD, 19121 Anonymous v Police Commission, and others.

14. **Allegation 5: SFAC 67.21** - Respondents unlawfully failed to produce the remaining elements of my request (“direct messages to and from Kate Chatfield’s Twitter account in the last 2 weeks” (where such messages are about public business, per City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017)) and “communications about Chatfield blocking or locking on Twitter, including but not limited to such communications with reporters” (all such communications in the constructive possession of the DA’s office are about public business, since they would reflect the PR/damage control the Office did in response to Chatfield’s comments and blocking/locking))

15. **Allegation 6 and 7: SFAC 67.26 and 67.27** - The failure to locate and produce the records or parts thereof above is equivalent to the withholding of them in entirety from the public,\(^3\) which is both non-minimal withholding and unjustified withholding.

16. **Part B - July 22, 2021 Request about Shirin Sahar**

17. On July 22, 2021, I made a request for “exact copies (including all email addresses, date/time stamps, attachments, hyperlinks, audio, images, video, and formatting, To/Cc/Bcc/From) of communications of any form or app between anyone in your office (including but not limited to Boudin) and Shirin Sinnar for the last 6 weeks” by email to districtattorney@sfgov.org.\(^3\)

\(^3\)“The effect of the City’s inability or unwillingness to locate the records had the same effect as withholding requested information from the public.” *Community Youth Athletic Center v. City of National City*, 220 Cal.App.4th 1385, 1425 (Cal. Ct. App. 2013)
18. No response was received until August 25, when 9 pages of emails were provided with some redactions. While those redactions were justified, the name and title of the person responsible for denying access was not provided.

19. **Allegation 8: CPRA Gov Code 6253(c)** - Respondents unlawfully failed to respond within 10 days informing me of the existence of disclosable public records and reasons therefor or declare an up-to 14-day extension for the July 22, 2021 request.

20. **Allegation 9: SFAC 67.21** - Respondents unlawfully failed to provide an exact and complete copy of each public record responsive to my request - namely each email. Instead they provide only later emails in threads. Producing forwards of emails instead of the original email has been previously found by SOTF be illegal because it does not constitute an exact copy that earlier email, SOTF 19121 Anonymous v Police Commission. In the past, Respondents have in fact produced complete copies of each email as PDFs, and it is unclear why Respondents have switched to producing emails unlawfully now. An email reply/forward is a distinct record compared to the earlier email being replied to or forwarded. Any person can alter the “inline” copy of the earlier email if they wish to, and failing to produce each of the earlier emails also prevents us from knowing the full To/From/Cc/Bcc of those earlier emails (such as the email of Mon, Jun 7, 2021 at 11:25 AM from Russom, Kelsey (DAT) <kelsey.russom@sfgov.org> whose body alone is included in some other email in this production).

21. **Part C - June 12, 2021 Request about Media Communications**

22. I made a request on June 12 about communications with various media organizations to see if Respondents favor media that is friendly to them and fails to provide info to media that is not friendly (as I have demonstrated in a different complaint re: Radley Balko and Dion Lim). As of this letter 74 days later, no response of any form has been received.

23. **Allegation 10: CPRA Gov Code 6253(c)** - Respondents unlawfully failed to respond within 10 days informing me of the existence of disclosable public records and reasons therefor or declare an up-to 14-day extension for the June 12, 2021 request. As the SOTF discussed in Anderies v Boudin, the failure to search for records at the time of the request is particularly egregious when officials delete their records.

24. **Allegation 11: SFAC 67.25(d)** - Providing zero records after 74 days, Respondents failed to provide rolling response, which I had requested.

25. **Allegation 12 and 13: SFAC 67.26 and 67.27** - The failure to locate and produce the records or parts thereof above is equivalent to the withholding of
Anonymous

Re: DA’s violations across multiple requests

them in entirety from the public,\(^4\) which is both non-minimal withholding and unjustified withholding.

26. **Allegation 14: SFAC 67.29-7(a)** - If any records were not preserved at the time each of the above requests were made, and were instead destroyed or failed to be retained after the receipt of a request, then Boudin violated 67.29-7.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

---

\(^4\)"The effect of the City’s inability or unwillingness to locate the records had the same effect as withholding requested information from the public." *Community Youth Athletic Center v. City of National City*, 220 Cal.App.4th 1385, 1425 (Cal. Ct. App. 2013)
From: twitter.com/journo_anon

Subject: California Public Records Act Request: Kate Chatfield Twitter - Immediate disclosure request

Kate Chatfield and DA's Office:

Pursuant to the California Public Records Act and Sunshine Ordinance, I hereby request the following records, in a rolling response:

- the full blocked and muted Twitter lists AS THEY EXIST WHEN YOU RECEIVE THIS REQUEST WITHOUT MODIFICATION for Kate Chatfield (@ChatfieldKate), just as you previously produced for Boudin's accounts

- direct messages to and from Kate Chatfield's Twitter account in the last 2 weeks (note SOTF 19098, even if you do not intentionally use DMs to discuss work, records about that work still qualify per City of San Jose v Superior Court)

- all tweets sent by @ChatfieldKate in the last week

- communications about Chatfield blocking or locking on Twitter, including but not limited to such communications with reporters

Search all personal property and government property.
YOU MUST PRESERVE ALL RECORDS AS THEY EXIST WHEN YOUR RECEIVE THIS REQUEST. WE MAY APPEAL ANY INCOMPLETE RESPONSE OR WITHHOLDINGS.

Remember to justify all withholdings and key all redactions.

Thank you in advance for your anticipated cooperation in this matter. I look forward to receiving your response to this request within 10 calendar days, as the statute requires.

Sincerely,

twitter.com/journo_anon (a member of the public that Ms. Chatfield blocked for who knows what reason)

From: twitter.com/journo_anon

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Kate Chatfield Twitter - Immediate disclosure request

Kate Chatfield and DA's Office:

Pursuant to the California Public Records Act and Sunshine Ordinance, I hereby request the following records, in a rolling response:

- the full blocked and muted Twitter lists AS THEY EXIST WHEN YOU RECEIVE THIS REQUEST WITHOUT MODIFICATION for Kate Chatfield (@ChatfieldKate), just as you previously produced for Boudin's accounts

- direct messages to and from Kate Chatfield's Twitter account in the last 2 weeks (note SOTF 19098, even if you do not intentionally use DMs to discuss work, records about that work still qualify per City of San Jose v Superior Court)

- all tweets sent by @ChatfieldKate in the last week
- communications about Chatfield blocking or locking on Twitter, including but not limited to such communications with reporters.

Search all personal property and government property. YOU MUST PRESERVE ALL RECORDS AS THEY EXIST WHEN YOUR RECEIVE THIS REQUEST. WE MAY APPEAL ANY INCOMPLETE RESPONSE OR WITHHOLDINGS.

Remember to justify all withholdings and key all redactions.

Thank you in advance for your anticipated cooperation in this matter. I look forward to receiving your response to this request within 10 calendar days, as the statute requires.

Sincerely,

twitter.com/journo_anon (a member of the public that Ms. Chatfield blocked for who knows what reason)

---

**From: Muckrock Staff**

07/19/2021

---

**From: San Francisco District Attorney's office**

07/21/2021

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Kate Chatfield Twitter - Immediate disclosure request

Dear Anonymous,

Thank you for checking-in. We are consulting with an outside agency who has a vested interest in this request. We will respond as soon as possible.

Best,

SFDA Public Records

---

**From: Muckrock Staff**

08/05/2021

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Kate Chatfield Twitter - Immediate disclosure request

To Whom It May Concern:

I wanted to follow up on the following California Public Records Act request, copied below, and originally submitted on July 6, 2021. Please let me know when I can expect to receive a response.

Thanks for your help, and let me know if further clarification is needed.
From: Muckrock Staff  
08/20/2021

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Kate Chatfield Twitter - Immediate disclosure requ...

To Whom It May Concern:

I wanted to follow up on the following California Public Records Act request, copied below, and originally submitted on July 6, 2021. Please let me know when I can expect to receive a response.

Thanks for your help, and let me know if further clarification is needed.

From: San Francisco District Attorney’s office  
08/25/2021

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Kate Chatfield Twitter - Immediate disclosure requ...

Dear Anonymous,

Attached, Please find the response and responsive records to your request.
Best,
SFDA Public Records
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[View]  [Embed]  [Download]

[Anon PRA 8.25.2021 K.Chatfield Twitter](#)  
[View]  [Embed]  [Download]

[~WRD2813](#)  
[Download]
August 25, 2021

Anonymous
115324-91055718@requests.muckrock.com

Re: Your Public Record Act request received on July 6, 2021.

To whom it may concern:

This letter is in response to your Public Record Act request received by our office via email on July 6, 2021, making the following request:

“- the full blocked and muted Twitter lists AS THEY EXIST WHEN YOU RECEIVE THIS REQUEST WITHOUT MODIFICATION for Kate Chatfield (@ChatfieldKate), just as you previously produced for Boudin’s accounts

- direct messages to and from Kate Chatfield’s Twitter account in the last 2 weeks (note SOTF 19098, even if you do not intentionally use DMs to discuss work, records about that work still qualify per City of San Jose v Superior Court)

- all tweets sent by @ChatfieldKate in the last week

- communications about Chatfield blocking or locking on Twitter, including but not limited to such communications with reporters.”

Under the Public Records Act and the Sunshine Ordinance, a “public record” is broadly defined to include “any writing containing information relating to the conduct of the public’s business prepared, owned, used or retained by any state or local agency, regardless of the physical form or characteristics.” Cal. Govt. Code §6252(e). If the department has no records responsive to the specific request, the department has no duty to create or recreate one.

There are no responsive public records regarding your first, second, and fourth requests. Please see the attached responsive records for your third request.

Sincerely,
San Francisco District Attorney’s Public Records
Surrounded by his top Chinese American staff members, SF District Attorney Chesa Boudin met with Asian press as the city suffered.

He criticized the current recall campaigns against him and refocused his focus on public safety.

@sanfranciscojournal: "There are two things that are certainly unrelated."

"How could this..."

@sanfranciscojournal: "The homicide increase appears to be primarily driven by rising gun violence, while the overall crime rate has actually dropped."

"The death toll in the US is 280,000 people..."
From: twitter.com/journo_anon 07/23/2021

Subject: California Public Records Act Request: Shirin Sinnar - Immediate disclosure request

To Whom It May Concern:

Pursuant to the California Public Records Act and Sunshine Ordinance, I hereby request the following records:

- exact copies (including all email addresses, date/time stamps, attachments, hyperlinks, audio, images, video, and formatting, To/Cc/Bcc/From) of communications of any form or app between anyone in your office (including but not limited to Boudin) and Shirin Sinnar for the last 6 weeks

Thank you in advance for your anticipated cooperation in this matter. I look forward to receiving your response to this request within 10 calendar days, as the statute requires.

Sincerely,

twitter.com/journo_anon

---

From: Muckrock Staff 08/02/2021

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Shirin Sinnar - Immediate disclosure request

To Whom It May Concern:

I wanted to follow up on the following California Public Records Act request, copied below, and originally submitted on July 23, 2021. Please let me know when I can expect to receive a response.

Thanks for your help, and let me know if further clarification is needed.

---

From: Muckrock Staff 08/17/2021

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Shirin Sinnar - Immediate disclosure request

To Whom It May Concern:

I wanted to follow up on the following California Public Records Act request, copied below, and originally submitted on July 23, 2021. Please let me know when I can expect to receive a response.

Thanks for your help, and let me know if further clarification is needed.

---

From: San Francisco District Attorney's office 08/25/2021

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Shirin Sinnar - Immediate disclosure request

Dear Anonymous,

Attached, please find the response and responsive records to this request.

Thank you,

SFDA Public Records
From: San Francisco District Attorney's office

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Shirin Sinnar - Immediate disclosure request

I apologize, I neglected to add that we have redacted a personal cell phone number from these records based on the right to privacy afforded by Cal. Govt. Code §§ 6250, 6254(c); Cal. Const., Art. I, §§ 1, 3(b); Admin. Code §67.1(g); Admin. Code Chapter 12M. Thank you.
August 25, 2021

Anonymous
116577-11370694@requests.muckrock.com

Re: Your Public Record Act request received on July 23, 2021.

To whom it may concern:

This letter is in response to your Public Record Act request received by our office via email on July 23, 2021, making the following request:

“exact copies (including all email addresses, date/time stamps, attachments, hyperlinks, audio, images, video, and formatting, To/Cc/Bcc/From) of communications of any form or app between anyone in your office (including but not limited to Boudin) and Shirin Sinnar for the last 6 weeks”

Under the Public Records Act and the Sunshine Ordinance, a “public record” is broadly defined to include “any writing containing information relating to the conduct of the public’s business prepared, owned, used or retained by any state or local agency, regardless of the physical form or characteristics.” Cal. Govt. Code §6252(e). If the department has no records responsive to the specific request, the department has no duty to create or recreate one.

Please see the attached responsive records.

Sincerely,
San Francisco District Attorney’s Public Records
Thanks so much, Rachel! I’m out all day but look forward to listening and circulating this when I’m back at work!

Best,
Shirin

Sent from my iPhone

On Jul 20, 2021, at 1:36 PM, Marshall, Rachel (DAT) <rachel.marshall@sfgov.org> wrote:

Hi Professor Sinnar,

I wanted to let you know that our episode with you is up! Thank you so much for interviewing with us. We included in the show notes a link to your report.

We tagged you on Twitter and would love it if you spread the word and shared the episode with those who might be interested.

Link is here.

Thanks so much,

Rachel

--
Rachel Marshall
Director of Communications / Policy Advisor / Assistant District Attorney
She/her/hers
Office of San Francisco District Attorney Chesa Boudin
Rachel.Marshall@sfgov.org
San Francisco District Attorney
350 Rhode Island Street, North Building, Suite 400N
San Francisco, CA 94103
Desk: (628) 652-4193

The information contained in this electronic message may be confidential and may be subject to the attorney-client privilege and/or the attorney work-product doctrine. It is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, or copying of this communication is strictly
My full bio is here: https://law.stanford.edu/directory/shirin-sinnar/
In brief, I'm a law professor at Stanford who studies and teaches on civil rights and national security, including how the law responds to terrorism, hate crimes, and political violence.

On Wed, Jun 23, 2021 at 8:13 PM Marshall, Rachel (DAT) <rachel.marshall@sfgov.org> wrote:
So sorry—I forgot to ask for a preferred bio!

--

Rachel Marshall
Director of Communications / Policy Advisor / Assistant District Attorney
She/her/hers
Office of San Francisco District Attorney Chesa Boudin
Rachel.Marshall@sfgov.org
San Francisco District Attorney
350 Rhode Island Street, North Building, Suite 400N
San Francisco, CA 94103
Desk: (628) 652-4193

Wanted to thank you for the thorough notes for tomorrow's episode! We are looking forward to seeing you at 10am tomorrow (Thursday) morning. Here is the link again: https://squadcast.page.link/tZchU and the instructions:
PLEASE make sure you can **download and use Chrome** for the recording session. Other browsers (especially Firefox) won’t work properly.

- You will need **headphones** for the recording. If you have a microphone, even better.
- Please make sure you are able to find a **quiet location** to record. Please also silence all technology to make sure texts and new email alerts don’t interrupt our recordings.
- The saved recording is audio-only but we will all be on **video** as we record so that we can see each other as we have the conversation.

See you soon!

Rachel

--

**Rachel Marshall**
Director of Communications / Policy Advisor / Assistant District Attorney
She/her/hers
Office of San Francisco District Attorney Chesa Boudin
Rachel.Marshall@sfgov.org
San Francisco District Attorney
350 Rhode Island Street, North Building, Suite 400N
San Francisco, CA 94103
Desk: (628) 652-4193

The information contained in this electronic message may be confidential and may be subject to the attorney-client privilege and/or the attorney work-product doctrine. It is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this electronic message in error, please delete the original message from your e-mail system. Thank you.

From: Shirin Sinnar <sinnar@law.stanford.edu>
Date: Monday, June 21, 2021 at 5:07 PM
To: Kelsey Russom <kelsey.russom@sfgov.org>
Cc: "Marshall, Rachel (DAT)" <rachel.marshall@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: Invitation to Speak on Panel at San Francisco District Attorney's Office's AAPI Hate Crimes Summit

No worries at all! 10 am Thursday works for me!

Best,

Shirin

On Mon, Jun 21, 2021 at 4:45 PM Russom, Kelsey (DAT) <kelsey.russom@sfgov.org> wrote:
I echo Rachel’s apologies and frustrations. So sorry for late responses. The DA’s schedule is tight but let’s do 10am on Thursday for 45 minutes if that works for you!

Kelsey Russom
Confidential Executive Assistant
Office of District Attorney Boudin
I am so sorry, Professor Sinnar. For some reason all your responses went to my junk (and apparently Kelsey’s as well) which is tremendously frustrating (and embarrassing---we’ve been complaining about our office’s servers doing this for some time now but it has intensified recently). We apologize for not seeing any of them and thanks so much for sending over all those suggested topics!

I will let Kelsey respond with scheduling.

Thanks again,

Rachel

--

Rachel Marshall
Director of Communications / Policy Advisor / Assistant District Attorney
She/her/hers
Office of San Francisco District Attorney Chesa Boudin
Rachel.Marshall@sfgov.org
San Francisco District Attorney
350 Rhode Island Street, North Building, Suite 400N
San Francisco, CA 94103
Desk: (628) 652-4193

The information contained in this electronic message may be confidential and may be subject to the attorney-client privilege and/or the attorney work-product doctrine. It is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this electronic message in error, please delete the original message from your e-mail system. Thank you.

From: Shirin Sinnar <sinnar@law.stanford.edu>
Date: Monday, June 21, 2021 at 1:58 PM
To: "Marshall, Rachel (DAT)" <rachel.marshall@sfgov.org>
Cc: Kelsey Russom <kelsey.russom@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: Invitation to Speak on Panel at San Francisco District Attorney's Office's AAPI Hate Crimes Summit

I could do Wed. morning between 9-12, Thursday between 9-12, or Friday between 9-12 or 3-5 pm.
On Mon, Jun 21, 2021 at 1:47 PM Marshall, Rachel (DAT) <rachel.marshall@sfgov.org> wrote:
Hi Prof. Sinnar,

Wanted to follow up so we could reschedule this ASAP. Let us know what works for you.

Thank you,

Rachel

--

Rachel Marshall
Director of Communications / Policy Advisor / Assistant District Attorney
She/her/hers
Office of San Francisco District Attorney Chesa Boudin
Rachel.Marshall@sfgov.org
San Francisco District Attorney
350 Rhode Island Street, North Building, Suite 400N
San Francisco, CA 94103
Desk: (628) 652-4193

The information contained in this electronic message may be confidential and may be subject to the attorney-client privilege and/or the attorney work-product doctrine. It is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this electronic message in error, please delete the original message from your e-mail system. Thank you.

From: "Marshall, Rachel (DAT)" <rachel.marshall@sfgov.org>
Date: Thursday, June 17, 2021 at 7:44 PM
To: Shirin Sinnar <sinnar@law.stanford.edu>, Kelsey Russom <kelsey.russom@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: Invitation to Speak on Panel at San Francisco District Attorney's Office's AAPI Hate Crimes Summit

Hi again, Professor Sinnar,

So sorry but the DA has to attend a funeral tomorrow and we have no other time tomorrow to reschedule the podcast. Could we postpone until next week? Kelsey can help find a time and our sincere apologies!

We are so looking forward to this.

Rachel

--
Hi Prof. Sinnar

Whoops, sent by mistake while still writing the email! Sorry about that.

We will be recording through a program called Squadcast. Here is a link to our session: https://squadcast.page.link/tZchU

Some important things to know:

- PLEASE make sure you can download and use Chrome for the recording session. Other browsers (especially Firefox) won’t work properly.
- You will need headphones for the recording. If you have a microphone, even better.
- Please make sure you are able to find a quiet location to record. Please also silence all technology to make sure texts and new email alerts don’t interrupt our recordings.
- The saved recording is audio-only but we will all be on video as we record so that we can see each other as we have the conversation.
- We will discuss hate crimes, what they mean and what they signify, anti-AAPI violence, your new report, and thoughts on how these cases are best addressed. If there are specific topics or points you want to make sure we cover, please let me know.

Thanks so much for fitting us in during such a busy time. If you have any questions, don’t hesitate to contact me.

Rachel
Rachel Marshall
Director of Communications / Policy Advisor / Assistant District Attorney
She/her/hers
Office of San Francisco District Attorney Chesa Boudin
Rachel.Marshall@sfgov.org
San Francisco District Attorney
350 Rhode Island Street, North Building, Suite 400N
San Francisco, CA 94103
Desk: (628) 652-4193

Hi Prof. Sinnar,

We are really excited to host you tomorrow! I wanted to send along some instructions.

--

Rachel Marshall
Director of Communications / Policy Advisor / Assistant District Attorney
She/her/hers
Office of San Francisco District Attorney Chesa Boudin
Rachel.Marshall@sfgov.org
San Francisco District Attorney
350 Rhode Island Street, North Building, Suite 400N
San Francisco, CA 94103
Desk: (628) 652-4193
Cc: "Marshall, Rachel (DAT)" <rachel.marshall@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: Invitation to Speak on Panel at San Francisco District Attorney's Office's AAPI Hate Crimes Summit

Great, thanks so much!

Best,
Shirin

On Mon, Jun 14, 2021 at 9:21 AM Russom, Kelsey (DAT) <kelsey.russom@sfgov.org> wrote:
So sorry Professor Sinnar! Let's do Friday at 3pm. Sending out a calendar invite now!

From: Shirin Sinnar <sinnar@law.stanford.edu>
Sent: Sunday, June 13, 2021 9:54:00 PM
To: Russom, Kelsey (DAT) <kelsey.russom@sfgov.org>
Cc: Marshall, Rachel (DAT) <rachel.marshall@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: Invitation to Speak on Panel at San Francisco District Attorney's Office's AAPI Hate Crimes Summit

Hi,

Has this been scheduled? I need to finalize plans for this week. At this point, the Fri. times might actually work better for me.

Best,
Shirin

On Mon, Jun 7, 2021 at 11:18 PM Shirin Sinnar <sinnar@law.stanford.edu> wrote:
Hi, Kelsey,

I could do Fri. the 18th at either 2 or 3 pm or Wed. the 16th at 10 am (with a preference for the Wed. time).

Thanks,
Shirin

On Mon, Jun 7, 2021 at 11:25 AM Russom, Kelsey (DAT) <kelsey.russom@sfgov.org> wrote:
Hello Professor Sinnar,

We are so honored to have you as a guest on Chasing Justice! Thank you for your time. Are you available at 2pm, 3pm or 4pm PT next Friday the 18th? Alternatively we could do 10am PT on the 16th? If those don’t work I am happy to offer others. Thank you so much again

Best,
From: twitter.com/journo_anon

Subject: California Public Records Act Request: immediate disclosure request - media comms

06/12/2021

i am requesting:

1) exact copies, including attachments, of all (Feb 1, 2021 to present) communications, of any form (including but not limited to email, text, direct message, group message, or chat, in any or no app), on government or personal property, of Boudin or another DA's office employee, to or from the SF Chronicle, SFGate, SF Examiner, SFist, Mission Local, Marina Times, KQED, KTVU, ABC/KGO, Westside Observer, 48hills, San Francisco Business Times, SF Weekly, The Epoch Times, SF Public Press, International Daily News, San Francisco Bay View, World Journal, Synapse, KRON, KPIX, Wind Newspaper, or any of their employees. also include any calendar entries evidencing meetings of any kind with those parties.

please provide rolling replies.

From: Muckrock Staff

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: immediate disclosure request - media comms

06/23/2021

To Whom It May Concern:

I wanted to follow up on the following California Public Records Act request, copied below, and originally submitted on June 12, 2021. Please let me know when I can expect to receive a response.

Thanks for your help, and let me know if further clarification is needed.

From: Muckrock Staff

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: immediate disclosure request - media comms

07/08/2021

To Whom It May Concern:

I wanted to follow up on the following California Public Records Act request, copied below, and originally submitted on June 12, 2021. Please let me know when I can expect to receive a response.

Thanks for your help, and let me know if further clarification is needed.

From: Muckrock Staff

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: immediate disclosure request - media comms

07/23/2021

To Whom It May Concern:

I wanted to follow up on the following California Public Records Act request, copied below, and originally submitted on June 12, 2021. Please let me know when I can expect to receive a response.

Thanks for your help, and let me know if further clarification is needed.
From: Muckrock Staff 08/09/2021

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: immediate disclosure request - media comms

To Whom It May Concern:

I wanted to follow up on the following California Public Records Act request, copied below, and originally submitted on June 12, 2021. Please let me know when I can expect to receive a response.

Thanks for your help, and let me know if further clarification is needed.

From: Muckrock Staff 08/24/2021

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: immediate disclosure request - media comms

To Whom It May Concern:

I wanted to follow up on the following California Public Records Act request, copied below, and originally submitted on June 12, 2021. Please let me know when I can expect to receive a response.

Thanks for your help, and let me know if further clarification is needed.
Dear Supervisor of Records Herrera:
Determine in writing these records or parts thereof are public and order them disclosed, SFAC 67.21(d).

Dear Herrera and Office of City Attorney:
In 40 days an Ethics complaint will also be filed.

Dear SOTF:
File a new complaint and provide a file number: Anonymous v City Attorney Dennis Herrera and the Office of City Attorney

On February 27/28, I made four IDRs for communications with opposing legal counsel, etc. in 4 pieces of litigation/claims against the City.

Note that communications with the opposing party cannot be privileged since it has already been disclosed to outside-the-City parties, and the common interest doctrine cannot apply to adversarial parties.

On March 11, Respondents declared what must be understood to be a 14-day extension.

As of this complaint, 6 months have passed with not a single record produced or any further responses, and rolling responses were in fact demanded correctly.

It is possible that these records are voluminous (however, I have no idea, since they never responded substantively). However, the proper lawful response is to timely indicate whether records were disclosable and the reasons, and then give rolling responses as required by law, incrementally producing records every week, until all records had been produced. Instead, this wall of silence is part of Dennis Herrera's well-documented-in-writing retaliation (i.e. their own letter signed under Herrera's name) against me for filing Sunshine complaints, which is my right under the Sunshine Ordinance, and his irrelevant opinions about the motivations of my work, which he legally cannot consider at all. Herrera cannot block me out of their controversial records or purposefully slow them down so as to coerce me to not file complaints. His actions instead result in more complaints as he willfully violates the law against me, specifically. Herrera must produce records as fast as physically possible; as long as the agency can perform its other duties, it cannot artificially slow down my requests as it is doing. Finally, any past work in responding to my requests could not possibly affect, at this moment, their ability to currently respond to these requests.

Violations:

1. CPRA Gov Code 6253(c) - failure to provide a notice of determination of disclosable public records and reasons thereof after the extension for 14 days after the initial 10 day deadline
2. SFAC 67.21 - untimely and incomplete response
3. SFAC 67.25(d) - failure to provide rolling responses
4. SFAC 67.29-7(a) - failure of department head to disclose all documents and correspondence according to the Sunshine Ordinance
5. SFAC 67.26 and 67.27 - non-minimum and unjustified withholding (the failure to locate and provide records is equivalent to withholding the records in whole [1])
6. SFAC 67.34 - willful failure by department head to comply with Sunshine Ordinance (as these violations are retaliation for my prior filing of complaints)

[1] - “The effect of the City’s inability or unwillingness to locate the records had the same effect as with-holding requested information from the public.” Community Youth Athletic Center v. City of National City, 220 Cal.App.4th 1385, 1425 (Cal. Ct. App. 2013)

Regards,

Anonymous
Twitter @journo_anon

IMPORTANT:
1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.
2. If you are NOT a public official: This communication is confidential and may contain unpublished information or confidential source information, protected by the California Shield Law, Evidence Code sec. 1070. I am a member of the electronic media and regularly publish information about the conduct of public officials.
3. I am not a lawyer. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.
4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sent with ProtonMail Secure Email.
The below are immediate disclosure requests to your agency:

Please provide EACH record SEPARATELY as an exact PDF copy using PDFMaker, preserving all To/From/Cc/Bcc email, addresses, attachments, images, hyperlink URLs, formatting.
Please DO NOT combine different emails into one PDF file - it is a lot harder to send to SOTF when each file is huge, and by sending records individually there is no problem using email attachments instead of FTP.
For emails sent BY your agency you must provide records with BCCs, if any, which can only be produced using the employee's sent folders.

Because the PDFMaker individual PDF file is available or easily generated, you must provide it (SFAC 67.21(L)).

Please provide in a rolling fashion all records below (you must provide each record within one day of reviewing that record - SFAC 67.25(d)).

Ensure all records are minimally withheld with each redaction KEYED to a written justification. I will not guess which redaction is which. The other agencies have figured out how to do this, you should too. Ensure all records withheld are justified in writing.

1. All communications of every form between your Office and opposing counsel or parties (in either direction) in: PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, v. UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC. et al., A160701, A160706 (City & County of San Francisco Super. Ct. No. CGC-20-584402) and all appeals thereof.

The below are distinct immediate disclosure requests to your agency:

Please provide EACH record SEPARATELY as an exact PDF copy using PDFMaker, preserving all To/From/Cc/Bcc email, addresses, attachments, images, hyperlink URLs, formatting.
Please DO NOT combine different emails into one PDF file - it is a lot harder to send to SOTF when each file is huge, and by sending records individually there is no problem using email attachments instead of FTP.
For emails sent BY your agency you must provide records with BCCs, if any, which can only be produced using the employee's sent folders.

Because the PDFMaker individual PDF file is available or easily generated, you must provide it (SFAC 67.21(L)).

Please provide in a rolling fashion all records below (you must provide each record within one day of reviewing that record - SFAC 67.25(d)).

Ensure all records are minimally withheld with each redaction KEYED to a written justification. I will not guess which redaction is which. The other agencies have figured out how to do this, you should too. Ensure all records withheld are justified in writing.

2. All communications of every form between your Office and opposing counsel or parties (in either direction) in: PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, v. UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC. et al., A160701, A160706 (City & County of San Francisco Super. Ct. No. CGC-20-584402) and all appeals thereof.
From: twitter.com/journo_anon

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: San Francisco Litigation Negotiation Communication...

The below are distinct immediate disclosure requests to your agency:

Please provide EACH record SEPARATELY as an exact PDF copy using PDFMaker, preserving all To/From/Cc/Bcc email, addresses, attachments, images, hyperlink URLs, formatting. Please DO NOT combine different emails into one PDF file - it is a lot harder to send to SOTF when each file is huge, and by sending records individually there is no problem using email attachments instead of FTP.

For emails sent BY your agency you must provide records with BCCs, if any, which can only be produced using the employee's sent folders.

Because the PDFMaker individual PDF file is available or easily generated, you must provide it (SFAC 67.21(L)).

Please provide in a rolling fashion all records below (you must provide each record within one day of reviewing that record - SFAC 67.25(d)).

Ensure all records are minimally withheld with each redaction KEYED to a written justification. I will not guess which redaction is which. The other agencies have figured out how to do this, you should too. Ensure all records withheld are justified in writing.

3. All communications of every form between your Office and opposing counsel or parties (in either direction) in: HASTINGS COLLEGE OF THE LAW, et al. vs CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, 4:20-cv-03033-JST.

From: twitter.com/journo_anon

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: San Francisco Litigation Negotiation Communication...

NOTE: All prior requests from this email address are amended to INCLUDE all communications with the opponent prior to filing of the suit with regards to any pre-litigation settlement or claim discussion, and any post-adjudication/dismissal discussion (such as discussion of whether or not both parties are continuing to comply with terms of settlement/ruling).

The below are distinct immediate disclosure requests to your agency:

Please provide EACH record SEPARATELY as an exact PDF copy using PDFMaker, preserving all To/From/Cc/Bcc email, addresses, attachments, images, hyperlink URLs, formatting. Please DO NOT combine different emails into one PDF file - it is a lot harder to send to SOTF when each file is huge, and by sending records individually there is no problem using email attachments instead of FTP.

For emails sent BY your agency you must provide records with BCCs, if any, which can only be produced using the employee's sent folders.

Because the PDFMaker individual PDF file is available or easily generated, you must provide it (SFAC 67.21(L)).

Please provide in a rolling fashion all records below (you must provide each record within one day of reviewing that record - SFAC 67.25(d)).
Ensure all records are minimally withheld with each redaction KEYED to a written justification. I will not guess which redaction is which. The other agencies have figured out how to do this, you should too. Ensure all records withheld are justified in writing.

4. All communications of every form between your Office and opposing counsel or parties (in either direction) in: CHOI NGOR LI VS. CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ET AL, CG19576285. This includes all communications with opposing counsel or parties (in either direction) prior to filing of the suit with regards to any pre-litigation settlement or claim discussion, and any post-adjudication/dismissal discussion (such as discussion of whether or not both parties are continuing to comply with terms of settlement/ruling).

From: Muckrock Staff

03/10/2021

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: San Francisco Litigation Negotiation Communication...

To Whom It May Concern:

I wanted to follow up on the following California Public Records Act request, copied below, and originally submitted on Feb. 27, 2021. Please let me know when I can expect to receive a response.

Thanks for your help, and let me know if further clarification is needed.

From: San Francisco City Attorney

03/11/2021

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: San Francisco Litigation Negotiation Communication...

Dear requester,

I am responding on behalf of the City Attorney's Office to your below request. We are working on your request, and currently estimate being able to respond within two weeks.

Please send replies to cityattorney@sfcityatty.org

Best,

[Image of email signature]

From: San Francisco City Attorney

03/11/2021

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: San Francisco Litigation Negotiation Communication...
Dear requester,

I am responding on behalf of the City Attorney's Office to your below request. We are working on your request, and currently estimate being able to respond within two weeks. Please send replies to cityattorney@sfcityatty.org

Best,

Elizabeth A. Coolbrith
Paralegal
Office of City Attorney Dennis Herrera
(415) 554-4685 Direct
www.sfcityatty.org

---

From: San Francisco City Attorney 03/11/2021
Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: San Francisco Litigation Negotiation Communication...

Dear requester,

I am responding on behalf of the City Attorney's Office to your below request. We are working on your request, and currently estimate being able to respond within two weeks. Please send replies to cityattorney@sfcityatty.org

Best,

Elizabeth A. Coolbrith
Paralegal
Office of City Attorney Dennis Herrera
(415) 554-4685 Direct
www.sfcityatty.org
From: Muckrock Staff  
03/26/2021

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: San Francisco Litigation Negotiation Communication...  

To Whom It May Concern:

I wanted to follow up on the following California Public Records Act request, copied below, and originally submitted on Feb. 27, 2021. Please let me know when I can expect to receive a response.

Thanks for your help, and let me know if further clarification is needed.

From: Muckrock Staff  
04/12/2021

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: San Francisco Litigation Negotiation Communication...  

To Whom It May Concern:

I wanted to follow up on the following California Public Records Act request, copied below, and originally submitted on Feb. 27, 2021. Please let me know when I can expect to receive a response.

Thanks for your help, and let me know if further clarification is needed.

From: Muckrock Staff  
04/27/2021

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: San Francisco Litigation Negotiation Communication...  

To Whom It May Concern:

I wanted to follow up on the following California Public Records Act request, copied below, and originally submitted on Feb. 27, 2021. Please let me know when I can expect to receive a response.

Thanks for your help, and let me know if further clarification is needed.
To Whom It May Concern:

I wanted to follow up on the following California Public Records Act request, copied below, and originally submitted on Feb. 27, 2021. Please let me know when I can expect to receive a response.

Thanks for your help, and let me know if further clarification is needed.

From: Muckrock Staff

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: San Francisco Litigation Negotiation Communication...

To Whom It May Concern:

I wanted to follow up on the following California Public Records Act request, copied below, and originally submitted on Feb. 27, 2021. Please let me know when I can expect to receive a response.

Thanks for your help, and let me know if further clarification is needed.

From: Muckrock Staff

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: San Francisco Litigation Negotiation Communication...

To Whom It May Concern:

I wanted to follow up on the following California Public Records Act request, copied below, and originally submitted on Feb. 27, 2021. Please let me know when I can expect to receive a response.

Thanks for your help, and let me know if further clarification is needed.

From: Muckrock Staff

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: San Francisco Litigation Negotiation Communication...

To Whom It May Concern:

I wanted to follow up on the following California Public Records Act request, copied below, and originally submitted on Feb. 27, 2021. Please let me know when I can expect to receive a response.

Thanks for your help, and let me know if further clarification is needed.
I wanted to follow up on the following California Public Records Act request, copied below, and originally submitted on Feb. 27, 2021. Please let me know when I can expect to receive a response.

Thanks for your help, and let me know if further clarification is needed.

---

**From: Muckrock Staff**  
**07/28/2021**

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: San Francisco Litigation Negotiation Communication...

To Whom It May Concern:

I wanted to follow up on the following California Public Records Act request, copied below, and originally submitted on Feb. 27, 2021. Please let me know when I can expect to receive a response.

Thanks for your help, and let me know if further clarification is needed.

---

**From: Muckrock Staff**  
**08/12/2021**

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: San Francisco Litigation Negotiation Communication...

To Whom It May Concern:

I wanted to follow up on the following California Public Records Act request, copied below, and originally submitted on Feb. 27, 2021. Please let me know when I can expect to receive a response.

Thanks for your help, and let me know if further clarification is needed.

---

**From: Muckrock Staff**  
**08/27/2021**

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: San Francisco Litigation Negotiation Communication...

To Whom It May Concern:

I wanted to follow up on the following California Public Records Act request, copied below, and originally submitted on Feb. 27, 2021. Please let me know when I can expect to receive a response.

Thanks for your help, and let me know if further clarification is needed.
Buta, Odaya (CAT)

From: Anonymoose 🦌🔍 <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 13, 2021 9:56 AM
To: SOTF, (BOS); Supervisor Records (CAT)
Cc: Heckel, Hank (MYR); MayorSunshineRequests, MYR (MYR); Elsbernd, Sean (MYR); Lee, Ivy (MYR)
Subject: New SOTF complaint/67.21(d) petition against Mayor - Police reform/BLM info - My Ref R108092B1
_MegaBlack_SF_Redacted.pdf; HRC_Reparations_and_Reinvestment_Roundtable_07.24.20
_Redacted.pdf; Appendix.pdf; signature.asc

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Respondents: Ethics Commission complaints will be filed 40 days after this email.

Supervisor of Records: Determine in writing the redacted portions of records attached are public and order them disclosed, SFAC 67.21(d).

SOTF:

Allegations: SFAC 67.26 non-minimum and non-keyed withholding, 67.27 improper written citation, 67.24(a)(1) improper draft citation and withholding, 67.24(h) withholding information under deliberative process exemption

On June 21st, 2021 I requested among other things:
   A. Please provide any meeting prep notes, minutes, agendas, for any 2020 or 2021 Breed meeting about or mentioning any of the following topics:
      ...
      3) Black Lives Matter, George Floyd protests, and police response thereto; police defunding/refunding
      ...

This complaint is solely about production of a specific attached set of records apparently in response to request 3 as Respondents provided on Sept 10, 2021, where they stated, emphasis mine:

Please see the attached records responsive to Items 2 and 3 of your request below. Please note that redactions appear in the staff contact sections of the documents to protect personal privacy. Gov Code § 6254(c), California Constitution, Art. I, Sec. 1. Please also note that certain information has been redacted because it constitutes the draft recommendation of the author and the balance of the public interests weighs against disclosing such non-final recommendations of staff. See Admin Code 67.24(a)(1); Cal. Gov. Code § 6254(a); 6255(a).

Other issues are not tackled here, but may still be subject of other complaints.

Of course, the subset of the draft exemption allowed by the Sunshine Ordinance in 67.24(a)(1) doesn't actually apply to these documents and redactions because that law has multiple clauses that all have to be met to be exempt - moreover Breed must prove to SOTF specific facts that show ALL of those clauses are met by every single redaction in this file. 67.24(a)(1) says: "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
Thus in order to be withheld, the information redacted must meet ALL three conditions:

1. part of a "preliminary draft or department memorandum"
2. a document that is "not normally kept on file and would otherwise be disposed of" - as the Mayor's Office told you in a prior complaint against Elsbernd for deleting his (Petrelis v Elsbernd), if the Mayor's office were to keep records for their convenience, they would have been retained. That applies in the reverse as well: these notes are not discarded - this is proven by the fact that they exist and were produced to me. Moreover, these meeting notes are produced to me consistently - they are not "not normally kept on file" and they are not generally disposed of.
3. "only the recommendation of the author"

Instead, Respondents plead merely that these are "non-final recommendations." That alone does not meet the letter of the law. And the City cannot broaden the exemption beyond the letter of the law, Art 1 Sec 3, CA Const. Moreover, pages and pages of the MegaBlack event document have been redacted. Also, the identity and timestamp of various commenters on the HRC document have been redacted in the right hand side column - that info itself is factual and not the recommendation of the author. Note that the identity of the author is not exempt under SFAC 67.24(a)(1) even if their recommendations are actually exempt.

In fact, I filed complaints about this exact improper draft tactic used by the Mayor earlier this year, so now the Mayor has just slapped on an additional GC 6255 balancing test as essentially CYA. But that makes their violations even worse: the City cannot use Gov Code 6255 simply to cover their failure to meet the full requirements of SFAC 67.24(a)(1) because the first sentence says (emphasis mine): "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." Admin Code 67.24(a) is NOT suspended during COVID. Thus no "other provision" (such as Gov Code 6255) can be used even though SFAC 67.24(g) and (i) are purportedly suspended. Citing an "other provision" to exempt an alleged preliminary draft or department memorandum is illegal.

The Mayor is not permitted to use Gov Code 6255 due to the wording of Admin Code 67.24(a)(1), but even if she was, the balancing test does not fall in favor of non-disclosure. Because of the way the Mayor wrote her COVID orders, she bears the burden to prove to SOTF that the public interest in non-disclosure clearly outweighs the public interest in disclosure in a way that does not use the deliberative process privilege, which is a part of Gov Code 6255, but still prohibited in SF, for each and every redacted portion of the attached document.

If Respondents cannot give sufficient evidence to SOTF to bear their burden, you must rule in favor of disclosure. At this time, the Mayor has given no explanation of why the public interest in non-disclosure would clearly outweigh interest in disclosure. I am not required to prove the public interest in disclosure outweighs public interest in non-disclosure - only the Mayor bears the burden.

In reality, the Mayor is attempting to protect her deliberative process - but the privilege for protecting such deliberative process in San Francisco is prohibited even during COVID. It is also not keyed which of these various exemptions would apply to each redaction. Do all citations apply to every redaction?

What is happening here is that the Mayor's Office's genuine positions on racial issues and police reform are being hidden for political purposes, or to avoid alienating the organizations and Supervisor Walton she apparently speaks to - and this is the deliberative process privilege. It is likely those internal, genuine positions do not reflect her claimed, public, progressive positions on BLM, racial equity, and police reform that she enjoys giving speeches about. There is substantial interest in knowing what the Mayor's Office actual positions on matters of public policy are. Hiding the
discussion of that internal position to promote frank discussion would in fact be protected as a deliberative process under *Times Mirror Co. v Superior Court* but only outside of San Francisco. Within San Francisco, the public has the right to know the full deliberative process their officials engage in. And the 67.24(h) prohibition of deliberative process exemptions protect against their withholding under *any* law. "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."

Regards,

Anonymous

Twitter [@journo_anon](https://twitter.com/journo_anon)

**IMPORTANT:**

1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.
2. If you are NOT a public official: This communication is confidential and may contain unpublished information or confidential source information, protected by the California Shield Law, Evidence Code sec. 1070. I am a member of the electronic media and regularly publish information about the conduct of public officials.
3. I am not a lawyer. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.
4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sent with [ProtonMail](https://protonmail.com) Secure Email.
MEETING OVERVIEW

EVENT: MegaBlack SF meeting
EVENT DATE: Wednesday, August 19, 2020
STAFF ADVANCE/CELL #: Ivy Lee
NOTES PREPARED BY: Ivy Lee
LOCATION: Via Zoom – please see calendar item for details
MEETING START/END: 2:15 PM – 2:45 PM
MLB START/END: 2:15 PM – 2:45 PM
PROJECTED ATTENDANCE:
AUDIENCE DESCRIPTION: African-American community leaders and City employees
ATTACHMENTS: 1) MegaBlack SF policing reform recommendations letter to Mayor Breed; 2) MegaBlack SF “Framework” document; (3) MegaBlack SF Letter to Board of Supervisors; (4) Attendees' Biographies

MAYOR’S ROLE: X LISTEN AND PARTICIPATE IN COMMUNITY DISCUSSION

Madam Mayor: You will be participating in a meeting that is being held at the request of MegaBlack SF, a self-described “collective of Black-led organizations and Black individuals fighting for visibility, sovereignty, dignity and justice for Black San Franciscans.”

The topics of the community discussion are two-fold:
1) Reallocation of law enforcement dollars to the Black community, and
2) Reform recommendations (both are detailed in the Background section)
In addition, MegaBlack SF has noted that they have several more specific questions for you if there is sufficient time to ask them:

- Will these reallocated law enforcement funds be recurring (after the two-year period)? [YES, per your budget office]

- How would you ensure that our Black/African-American LGBT community have services for their physical and mental health?

- How can we help staff the Office of Racial Equity with qualified Members of the Community?

- Will you also be reallocating funds from other city agencies that have also traumatized African Americans? Such as SFDPH, SFUSD, SFHSA, SFPUC, SFRPD, SFMTA, etc.?

- How will you divert funds to a reliable, culturally-sensitive workforce training program for TAY 18 to 30?

**TIMELINE OF MEETING**

**FACILITATOR: HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SHERYL DAVIS**

2:15PM Mayor Breed logs on  
2:16PM Director Davis provides welcoming remarks, introduces Mayor Breed  
2:17PM **Mayor Breed greets attendees**  
2:18PM Introduction of participants  
2:20PM MegaBlack shares background and history of its formation and shares its achievements and actions to date  
2:25PM Director Davis facilitates discussion with Mayor Breed, attendees
2:40PM Mayor Breed makes final remarks
2:42PM Director Davis thanks Mayor Breed and closes meeting
2:45PM Community discussion concludes, Mayor Breed logs-off, event concludes

INvITED NOTABLES/ ELECTEDS

City Staff
Ivy Lee (Lead Staff)
Tyra Fennell
Sheryl Davis, Director, Human Rights Commission (Conversation Facilitator)

Brittni Chiguata, Acting Chief of Staff, Human Rights Commission
Vincent Fuqua, Health Program Coordinator, Office of Health Equity, San Francisco Department of Public Health
Tuquan Harrison, Human Rights Commission
Paul Henderson, Director, Department of Police Accountability
Lyn-Tise Jones, Commissioner, Human Rights Commission
Malik Looper, Community Stabilization Program Officer, Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development
Angelique Mahan, Human Rights Commission Staff
De’Anthony Jones, Mayor’s Office
Theo Miller, Director, HOPE SF
David Miree, Human Rights Commission Staff
Karen Roye, Executive Director, Department of Child Supportive Services
Veronica Shepard, Program Coordination & Support, Office of Food Security & Racial Equity, Department of Public Health
Shakirah Simley, Director, Office of Racial Equity
Nyiisha Underwood, Health Educator, San Francisco Department of Public Health

Commissioners & Elected Officials
Shanell Williams, President, City College of San Francisco Board of Trustees
Dion-Jay Brookter, Executive Director, Young Community Developers, Commissioner, San Francisco Police Commission
Karen Clopton, Commissioner, Human Rights Commission
Damali Taylor, Vice President, San Francisco Police Commission

Community Members
James Bell, Founding President, W. Haywood Burns Institute
Christopher Brown, Chief of Policy & Government Affairs, Positive Resource Center
Brittany Ford, Executive Director, Mo’Magic
Takija Gardner, District Vice President, YMCA of San Francisco
Diane Gray, Executive Director, 100% College Prep
Melonie Green, Co-Executive Director, African American Art & Culture Complex
Melorra Green, Co-Executive Director, African American Art & Culture Complex
Brandi Howard, Chief of Staff, The San Francisco Foundation
Joi Jackson Morgan, Executive Director, 3rd Street Youth Center & Clinic
Lyslynn Lacoste, Executive Director, B’MAGIC
Monique LeSarre, Executive Director, Rafiki Coalition
Geoffrea Morris, San Francisco Black Wall Street
Tacing Parker, Senior Executive Director, Bayview Hunters Point YMCA
Del Seymour, Founder, Code Tenderloin
Veronica Shephard, Program Coordination & Support, Office of Monetta White, Executive Director, Museum of the African Diaspora
Lisa Williams, Co-Chair, Bayard Rustin LGBTQ Coalition
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BACKGROUND

Your Initiatives to Reform Public Safety and Invest in the African-American Community

On June 4, 2020, you announced, with Supervisor Walton, that you would be redirecting resources from the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) and other public safety agencies to support the African-American community in your Fiscal Year 2020-2021 budget.

You have publicly noted the generations of disinvestment in the African-American community and elevated the fact that, using any metric commonly utilized to gauge the health and well-being of a community, the African-American community fares the worst. From educational outcomes to home ownership to infant mortality and...
more, the reality is that long-standing structural and systemic racism has resulted in multi-generational harm.

The death of George Floyd and many other Black and Brown men, women, and children, and the accompanying most recent social unrest that followed George Floyd’s death helped to illuminate this reality for the general public and showcased the daily lived experience of people of color.

As calls from the public to “defund the police” escalated, you exerted your leadership and called for reforms to more than simply the police. You clearly articulated your understanding that there can be no justice without economic justice. Police reform is simply not enough to a healthier and safer community for all of us. As you noted on June 11 Press Release regarding your roadmap for police reforms, “We know that a lack of equity in our society overall leads to a lot of the problems that police are being asked to solve.” Any reform of police must go hand-in-hand with investments to address systemic inequities.

Therefore, you directed the City to reimagine our public safety system, by mandating immediate and long-term changes to the Police Department, but also by transforming public protest into tangible work to repair the legacy of racially disparate policies on health, housing, and economic outcomes for African Americans. Your reinvestment of law enforcement dollars into the African-American community is just one of the concrete ways that you are converting protest into real action.

MegaBlack SF’s Reform Recommendations in Regards to Public Safety and Investments in the African-American Community

In a letter to your office, dated July 10, 2020, MegaBlack SF offered reform recommendations “to reduce the harm inflicted on Black communities and Black residents in San Francisco.” These recommendations are summarized below. Following each summary recommendation is a snapshot of how the recommendation aligns with your initiatives.
1. “Invest in Early Childhood & Elementary Education”
MegaBlack SF urges you to direct “at least 50% of all police budget cuts to improve outcomes for early education and youth development for Black youth in San Francisco.” Furthermore, they also urge removing “all police from school settings and disallow police calls on children.”

Alignment: You have honored the voices of the African-American community which were heard through the HRC’s community engagement process and allocated $120 million to investments in the African American community. You have directed that 95% of those dollars are allocated to mental health, wellness, and homelessness as well as education, youth development, and economic opportunity. You will be continuing to empower African-American residents of San Francisco to lead the specific spending plan decisions through the HRC community process. MegaBlack SF should support this process and support the Mayor’s advocacy to honor the outcomes of this process.

2. “Invest in Behavioral Health Emergency Response”
MegaBlack SF urges you to invest in unarmed responses to behavioral health emergencies within the Black community. They also urge you to invest in services that treat addiction and mental illness rather than supporting further criminalization for these public health issues.

Alignment: You are already leading this effort to divert behavioral health emergencies to a non-police response. You have also included funding for implementation of Mental Health SF, which includes support for crisis response teams that do not include armed personnel, as well as more psychiatric and substance abuse services with the Behavioral Health Access Center, Office of Coordinated Care, and additional beds for individuals in need of treatment. In addition, you have championed safe-injection sites in San Francisco despite very zealous opposition from the federal administration. MegaBlack SF should support all of these efforts.
3. “Prosecute Officers for Excessive Use of Force”
MegaBlack SF urges you to “raise the standard of conduct for police officers in our City by imposing criminal penalties for those that use excessive and deadly force.”

Alignment: As Mayor, prosecution of any individual is not within your purview. However, you have publicly announced your support for prosecuting officers to the full extent of the law if they have engaged in excessive and unnecessary force or other forms of misconduct. You have shared publicly your outrage and lived experience with police brutality, including suffering the death of your cousin at the hands of the SFPD.

4. “Cut the Police Budget by an Amount Commensurate with the Work they Will No Longer Perform” MegaBlack urges you to “redirect at least $105M from the SFPD budget.” However, in a letter dated August 10, 2020, MegaBlack supports your budget and expressly supports your redirection of $120M over two years to invest in the African-American community.

Alignment: Your proposed budget reallocation of $120M over the course of two years for investment in the African-American community is aligned and supported by MegaBlack SF. Per MegaBlack SF’s August 10th letter addressed to the entire Board of Supervisors and copied to your office, “We are writing to advocate that this body support the proposal by Mayor London Breed to appropriate $120 million from San Francisco law enforcement agency budgets exclusively towards investments for the Black community.” Later in the same letter: “Supervisors should unequivocally support passage of the entire $120 million budget appropriation for Black community investment in San Francisco. We will refuse any budget that does not appropriate, at minimum, the money the Mayor has identified exclusively for Black people.”

5. “Develop and conduct a landscape analysis”
MegaBlack asks you to assess the 911 calls for the last 5 years and establish a process over the next year to analyze the police’s budget and functions. They urge you to include community partners in this process and for this process to develop alternative responses and structures.
Alignment: You have already provided direction to undertake all of these efforts.

6. “Set Aside Budget for Reimagining Community Safety and Restorative Justice” MegaBlack asks you to invest “…in communities themselves to determine what they need to offer them support in executing those programs...Employ properly equipped, non-violent community care workers trained in restorative justice as neighborhood resources...and mandate allocation and participation from your city departments, such as Human Services, Department of Public Health, Recreation and Parks Department, Department of Children, Youth, and Families, Office of Economic and Workforce Development, and the Public Defender.

Alignment: You have made clear your commitment to investing in the community itself. You have already taken strong action to actualize these efforts: reinvestment of $120M over two years; establishing new crisis response teams that do not involve the police but involve community members; creation of the Opportunities for All cohort of OFA interns that will be participating in a 40-week experience to learn about the criminal legal system and public defense through the Young Defenders Program with the Public Defender; the African American Revolving Loan Fund and more. Your work goes above and beyond the recommendation made by MegaBlack SF.

**Bios**

Due to the number of attendees of this meeting, staff has included their biographies as an attachment to this briefing. This attachment is entitled “Attachment 4: Attendees’ Biographies.”

---

Event contact: Sheryl Davis, [Contact Information]
From: twitter.com/journo_anon
06/21/2021

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Mayor's Meeting Notes - Immediate Disclosure Req...

Email

A. Please provide any meeting prep notes, minutes, agendas, for any 2020 or 2021 Breed meeting about or mentioning any of the following topics:

1) COVID, emergency decisions, vaccines, emergency orders
2) School board, school reopening, school renaming, board recall, reopening lawsuit, Lowell admissions
3) Black Lives Matter, George Floyd protests, and police response thereto; police defunding/refunding
4) Sunshine Ordinance, CPRA, Brown Act, changes to those laws, or any records request or response thereto
5) Any meeting whose notes mention that one of the participants or organizers is a donor to Breed or anyone else
6) Choice of City Attorney or expression of interest in being City Attorney

Also for your Feb 17, 2021 dept head meeting, if those notes accurately reflect what actually happened at the meeting, an acceptable Prop G general statement of issues discussed could have been "COVID-19 public health indicators; COVID-19 Vaccines; budget".

From: Muckrock Staff
07/07/2021

From: Office of the Mayor
07/08/2021

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Mayor's Meeting Notes - Immediate Disclosure Req...

Anonymous,

Email

Further to our previous invocation of the rule of reason regarding your requests and the volume, scope and complexity of this request, it will take us several weeks to process this request. Responsive documents will be provided on a rolling basis.

Regards,

Hank Heckel
Legal Compliance Officer
Office of the Mayor
City and County of San Francisco

From: Muckrock Staff
07/26/2021

From: Muckrock Staff
08/10/2021

From: Muckrock Staff
08/25/2021

From: Muckrock Staff
09/09/2021

From: Office of the Mayor
09/10/2021

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Mayor's Meeting Notes - Immediate Disclosure Req...

Email
Anonymous,

Please see the attached records responsive to Items 2 and 3 of your request below. Please note that redactions appear in the staff contact sections of the documents to protect personal privacy. Gov Code § 6254(c), California Constitution, Art. I, Sec. 1. Please also note that certain information has been redacted because it constitutes the draft recommendation of the author and the balance of the public interests weighs against disclosing such non-final recommendations of staff. See Admin Code 67.24(a)(1); Cal. Gov. Code § 6254(a); 6255(a).

The Office of the Mayor has not located any responsive records for Items 4-6 of your request.

Regarding Item 1, can you please provide a further date restriction and/or keyword or topic limitation so that we may further focus and expedite our response? The request is quite broad in that it seeks notes and minutes relating to COVID for the entirety of the nearly two years of the pandemic.

Regards,

Hank Heckel
Legal Compliance Officer
Office of the Mayor
City and County of San Francisco

01. Decreasing the Distance (Schools) Press Conference
   - View
   - Embed
   - Download

01. Notes for DPH Town Hall on Schools, OST and Youth Sports_Redacted
   - View
   - Embed
   - Download

04.29.21 Meeting with School Board President Gabriela Lopez
   - View
   - Embed
   - Download

02. Talking Points (2)
   - View
   - Embed
   - Download

01.12.2021 Schools Press Conference
   - View
   - Embed
   - Download

TPs and stats for MBO.Draft.08.11.2020
   - View
   - Embed
   - Download

08.19.2020 MegaBlack SF_Redacted
   - View
   - Embed
   - Download
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title</th>
<th>View</th>
<th>Embed</th>
<th>Download</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07.07.2020 School Guidance Media Availability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRC Reparations and Reinvestment Roundtable 07.24.20_Redacted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## EVENT OVERVIEW

**Event:** Community Roundtable: Reparations to the African American Community and Recommendations for Reinvesting SFPD funding into the African American Community  
**Event Date:** Monday, July 27, 2020  
**Staff Advance/Cell #:** Ivy Lee  
**Notes Prepared By:** Lisa Nguyen (Human Rights Commission), Ivy Lee  
**Location:** Via Zoom – See calendar for details.  
**Event Start/End:** 3:00 PM - 4:30 PM  
**MLB Start/End:** 4:00 PM – 4:30 PM  
**Projected Attendance:** 200  
**Audience Description:** The audience is a mix of city workers, nonprofit staff/management, residents and community members.  
**Press Attendance:** No  
**Attachments:** (1) Talking Points; (2) Draft Report re: Recommendations  

### Set Up  
**Stage:** no  
**Podium/Standing Mic:** laptop microphone  
**Program Indoors/Outdoors:** Indoors – Virtual Meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mayor's Role</th>
<th>Provide Brief Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Madam Mayor:**

This conversation will be a continuation of the Human Rights Commission’s (HRC) first meeting framing reparations, which took place on June 29, 2020. At your direction, in partnership with Supervisor Walton, the HRC was asked to facilitate a community conversation concerning the reinvestments that you announced that you would be making into the African American community in San Francisco.

Monday’s conversation will take a deeper dive into San Francisco-centric policies that have yielded today’s negative outcomes for Black San Franciscans and greater Bay Area residents. There will also be a discussion of next steps and what members of the public can
do to support the overall movement for long overdue reparations to the African American community.

PROGRAM/TIMELINE
EMCEE: BRITTNI CHICUATA, ACTING CHIEF OF STAFF, SF HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

3:00 PM Virtual room opens, guests arrive
3:05 PM Brittni Chicuata provides Welcome Remarks
3:05 PM Brittni Chicuata Frames Meeting
3:10 PM Brittni Chicuata facilitates conversation – on what?
3:50 PM Supervisor Walton provides Introduction of Draft Reparations Framework
3:55 PM Discussion on informing of framework – community input sessions on redirecting funds
4:00 PM Mayor Breed logs-in to event; listens to Director Davis share on Draft Report
4:00 PM Director Davis shares Draft Report
4:05 PM Director Davis introduces Mayor Breed, asks Mayor Breed to speak towards her move to redirect police department funding
4:06 PM Mayor Breed Provides Remarks (5 min)
4:11 PM Mayor Breed concludes remarks

4:12 PM Brittni Chuicuta asks Mayor Breed & Supervisor Walton to speak towards next steps
4:25 PM Brittni Chuicuta asks Anand Subramanian about best practices
4:25 PM Meeting wrap up & brief discussion of how community members can continue to participate in this conversation
4:30 PM Mayor Breed logs-off event, event concludes

INVITED NOTABLES/ELECTEDS

Please note the below list is tentative and not yet confirmed. Staff will include an updated list of attendees in Monday’s updated version of the notes.

- Supervisor Shamann Walton, Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors, District 10
- HRC Director, Sheryl Davis
- HRC Acting Chief of Staff, Brittni Chuicuta
- Anand Subramanian, PolicyLink

Anand Subramanian, Managing Director, leads PolicyLink efforts to advance community safety and justice through campaigns and programs that shift the paradigm away from surveillance and punishment toward healing and community investment. Anand also co-directs PolicyLink Legal and oversees work to dismantle fines and fees and on arts, culture, and equitable development. He served as the executive director of the San Francisco Blue Ribbon Panel on Transparency, Accountability, and Fairness in Law Enforcement and led strategic communications for PolicyLink work in California, including for the Alliance for Boys and Men of Color. Prior to joining PolicyLink, Anand worked at the Insight
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Center for Community Economic Development, the Law School Consortium Project, and as an associate attorney at Sheppard, Mullin, Richter, and Hampton after earning his JD from Northwestern University School of Law. He serves on the boards of South Asian Americans Leading Together (SAALT) and the Community Resource Hub for Safety and Accountability, and sings and plays guitar in the band Fair and Kind.

Mayor’s staff who will be in attendance:

- Ivy Lee, Mayor’s Office

BACKGROUND

**Supervisor Walton’s Legislative Efforts -- Investing in the Black Community**
On June 30, 2020, Supervisor Shamann Walton introduced legislation to the San Francisco Board of Supervisors declaring Anti-Black Racism a Human Right and Public Health crisis. Previously, on February 11, 2020, Supervisor Walton also introduced a resolution supporting a reparations plan that will comprehensively address the inequities that exist in the African American community as a result of slavery’s legacy of systemic oppression and calling for the creation of an advisory committee to develop this reparations plan.

**Your Equity Initiatives**

**Police Reform Policy Working Groups**
On June 11, 2020 you provided the City with your vision for public safety reform following the killing of George Floyd and many other Black and Brown victims of police violence. Your directive was to address both the immediate police reforms needed as well as the structural inequities that have resulted in disproportionate and longstanding injuries to the Black community.

Departments were directed to undertake the following four objectives:
1) End the use of police to respond to calls that can be addressed by unarmed civilians;

2) Address bias and strengthen accountability;

3) Demilitarize and divest from military-grade weapons;

4) Invest in better outcomes for the Black community and other communities of color.

These policies build on the City’s ongoing work to meet the standards contained in President Obama’s 2015 Task Force on 21st Century Policing.

These four priorities also build on San Francisco’s ongoing police reforms, including efforts to limit use of force and require independent investigations. San Francisco has already implemented several best practices that have been shown to reduce police violence, including banning chokeholds and strangleholds, requiring de-escalation, requiring a warning before shooting, and exhausting all other means before shooting. Additionally, San Francisco requires officers to intervene in cases of excessive use of force, bans shooting at moving vehicles, requires officers to use the minimum amount of force necessary when force is used, and requires comprehensive reporting.

This meeting that you are attending is linked with Objective 4: Invest in better outcomes for the Black community and other communities of color. This is the first public reporting of the results from the community conversations regarding reinvestments.

**Objective 4: Invest in better outcomes for the Black community**

This objective speaks to the crux of your vision for justice and public safety reform. When you announced your roadmap for public safety reform on June 11, you stated that any reform to police must go hand-in-hand with investments to address systemic inequities. There can be no durable and meaningful public safety reform without both: changing policing AND reparations.

This objective is being led by the Human Rights Commission (HRC) and is currently in progress. HRC is engaging in a community process
to prioritize reinvestment of law enforcement dollars to achieve stronger community structures and services that help to prevent violence and crime in the first place. The community process consists of a community survey and 13 community conversations, facilitated by Director Davis. The first meeting was on Thursday, July 2. You attended the second meeting on July 7. The last meeting was held on July 11.

On July 15, Director Davis met with you and shared an overview of her community process as well as the final outcomes in terms of what types of reinvestment the community would like to see. During this meeting, you made clear that your priority is to support organizations with a proven ability to improve the quality of life for African Americans in San Francisco. In addition, you directed that there must be accountability for results if an organization is a recipient of reinvestment dollars, with concrete benchmarks that can be evaluated at the conclusion of the fiscal year.

During your July 15 meeting with Director Davis, you both discussed the next steps in regards to actual allocation of these SFPD dollars. You have given two directives in regards to next steps:

1) You directed that your budget reflect the recommendations made by the African American community by earmarking funds for the three priority areas to be held by the Department of Public Health, Office of Economic and Workforce Development, and the Human Rights Commission. Pursuant to the community recommendations, the three priority areas are: mental health/homelessness, education/youth development, and economic justice. This serves as a downpayment on the reparations efforts.

2) You directed that the HRC continue the community engagement process held to develop recommendations for priorities to be funded by any redirecting police budget resources. However, you directed that the topic shift to now actualizing the type of allocations that should be made within those three priority areas.
TO: Mayor Breed  
CC: Andres, Jeff  
RE: Reinvestment of Police Dollars

FROM: Ivy  
DATE: July 24, 2020  
LAST UPDATED: July 1, 2020

X IMMEDIATE RESPONSE NEEDED: 
Calls to Key Contacts July 24-26

PLEASE REVIEW

Madam Mayor:

On June 4, you, along with Supervisor Walton, announced that you would redirect funding from the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) to the African American community by the close of the 2019/2020 budget cycle on August 1, 2020. Your intent was to decrease overpolicing of the Black community and to repair the legacy of racially disparate policies on health, housing, and economic outcomes for African American/Black people in San Francisco. You invited community members to share their ideas and input on the redistribution of budget dollars to ensure a collaborative process that was both data-driven and informed by lived experiences. In addition to circulating a survey citywide and accepting comments emailed to the Human Rights Commission (HRC) Roundtable, the HRC hosted and facilitated thirteen meetings between June 23 and July 16, 2020.

On June 11, you provided the City with your vision for public safety reform following the killing of George Floyd and many other Black and Brown victims of police violence. Your directive was to address both the immediate police reforms needed as well as the structural inequities that have resulted in disproportionate and longstanding injuries to the Black community.

On July 1, as a next step, you approved the formation of two workgroups to develop recommendations on how best to reduce the use of police to respond to calls that could otherwise be handled by unarmed partners. These recommendations will be developed in advance of next year's budget deliberations, with some recommendations able to be made and implemented on a rolling basis.
On July 15, you were presented with the results of the HRC community conversations by HRC Director Sheryl Davis. In short:

- Over 300 people emailed the HRC-Roundtable with feedback on the proposal to redirect SFPD budget dollars to the Black/African American community
- 387 people participated in the online survey
- 70% of online survey respondents identified as Black or African American
- 77% of online survey respondents reported currently living in San Francisco
- 95% of respondents believe a portion of the SFPD budget should be reallocated to support the African American/Black community, while 4% were unsure and 1% disagreed with reallocation
- Top recommendations for reinvestment areas are: mental health and homelessness, followed by education and youth development, and finally, economic justice.

On July 27, you will be participating in a live conversation convened by the HRC that will report publicly on the recommendations made by the African American and Black community for reinvestment of police budget dollars. This conversation will also tie this reinvestment effort to the reparations framework described by you and Supervisor Walton when you first announced this reinvestment.

Please note: Supervisor Walton introduced a resolution at the Board on February 11, 2020 supporting a reparations plan that will comprehensively address the inequities that exist in the African American community as a result of slavery’s legacy of systemic oppression and calling for the creation of an advisory committee to develop this reparations plan.

Per your budget office, $60 million will be reinvested each year for fiscal years 2020-2021 and 2021-2022, for a total of $120 million. The Department of Public Health, Office of Economic and Workforce Development, and the Human Rights Commission will be the departments that will hold these funds in reserve while the specific allocations are discussed in greater detail. The Human Rights Commission will continue to hold community conversations to lead this allocation discussion over the next few months.
Supervisor of Records Herrera:
This is a 67.21(d) petition to determine the below records are in whole or in part public, and an order for their disclosure.

------- Original Message -------
On Saturday, September 25th, 2021 at 5:35 PM, Anonymoose 🦌🔍 <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:

Dear SOTF:

Please file this complaint and provide a file number, Anonymous v Mayor London Breed, Hank Heckel, and the Office of the Mayor.
The allegations are below as headings. Please preserve them all as written.

Background:
I asked via an emailed IDR with requested rolling response on July 24, 2021 (see thread in Exhibit A) 1.5 years of written evidence of the Mayor's own work, specifically:
- "an electronic scanned copy of any physical public record written at least in part personally by the Mayor since January 2020 EXCEPT where the sole contribution of the Mayor is her signature or initials"
- "an electronic exact copy of any electronic public record of any form entered at least in part personally by the Mayor since January 2020 (including but not limited to texts, chats, DMs, PMs, group messages, Word, Excel, all forms of messaging, email, etc.)"

(Note that I did not ask for merely the parts of the record entered in by Breed, but every public record which was authored at least in part by the Mayor.)

I warned: "Even if the Mayor has deleted her own copy of these records, ALL such records in the constructive possession of the Office of Mayor must be searched and provided (say Elsbernd has a copy of a Breed written memo, even if Breed deleted her original, Elsbernd must provide his copy). You must also search all personal property. PRESERVE ALL ORIGINALS OF RECORDS." (Note that this warning isn't specifically required, and everything I stated is always an obligation of the Respondents).

There were apparently only 8 responsive records, as produced on Sept. 22. They sole written justification for withholding is redactions for Gov Code § 6254(c), California Constitution, Art. I, Sec. 1 (personal privacy). All 8 are available at: https://www.muckrock.com/foi/san-francisco-141/mayors-own-work-immediate-disclosure-request-116629/#comm-1167186

In the responsive email records, respondents without justification unlawfully withheld all hyperlink URLs (such as the Google Document at issue) and attachments, violating not only the law but also their own signed representations to the SOTF.

Detailed allegations:
1. SF Admin Code 67.34, willful failure by Breed to comply with the Sunshine Ordinance:
In exchange for withdrawing/closing certain prior SOTF complaints, the Mayor's Office voluntarily entered into multiple signed agreements representing to both the SOTF and to myself that they would, going forward, disclose various specific parts of public records, including explicitly requiring the disclosure of email attachments and hyperlinks in the agreement in Exhibit C. The Mayor's Office violated this agreement, which they apparently entered into as a ruse to avoid responsibility before SOTF in prior complaint 20006. The Mayor's Office signed letter to the Task Force dated May 5, 2021 states:

**Dear Task Force** and Anonymous:
Regarding Anonymous’ offer to withdraw SOTF Complaint File No. 20006, the Office of the Mayor agrees generally (a) to produce exact PDF copies of public record emails for requesters (preserving any available non-exempt attachments, available non-exempt email addresses in the To/From/Cc/Bcc, and available non-exempt hyperlinks, images, formatting, and the body of the email), and (b) when specifically requested, to disclose full email headers of public record emails, subject to information security redactions of particular header values, and other lawfully applicable exemptions. We understand that following receipt of this letter and our production of non-exempt email header data for a July 2, 2019 email from Sophia Kittler to Andres Power, Anonymous will consider the issues in SOTF File No. 20006 resolved and withdraw the complaint.

Note this was not merely a written representation and promise to me, but also to the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force. Since the Mayor's Office entered voluntarily into these agreements, Breed was clearly aware of her and her office's Sunshine obligations (for which she is legally responsible), and Breed willfully violated the law. It is Breed's legal responsibility (under SFAC 67.29-7(a)) to ensure all of her office's documents and correspondence are disclosed in accordance with the Sunshine Ordinance.

(The agreement is signed on behalf of the Office of the Mayor by Breed's Legal Compliance Officer, Hank Heckel. Thus, Hank Heckel also appears to have lied (again, see below) to the Task Force in a signed writing. As the Task Force was the administrative tribunal processing prior SOTF complaint 20006, and had the authority to issue binding orders, Heckel's lies to the Task Force in that letter about complaint 20006 appear to be a violation of his duty of candor to a tribunal under California Rules of Professional Conduct 3.3, which is now repeated, and I intend to pursue separately.)

2. SF Admin Code 67.27, failure to provide written justification of withholding, and 67.26 non-minimum withholding of email attachments and hyperlink URLs:
The attachments and hyperlink URLs were withheld without any written justification.

3. SF Admin Code 67.26 and CPRA Gov Code 6254.3(b)(1) non-minimum withholding of email addresses used by public employees to conduct public business:
It appears from the disclosure that the Mayor solely communicates using email with her staffers about public business using her and their personal email addresses. Under 6254.3(b)(1), these email addresses cannot be redacted: "(b) (1) **Unless used by the employee to conduct public business**, or necessary to identify a person in an otherwise disclosable communication, the personal email addresses of all employees of a public agency shall not be deemed to be public records and shall not be open to public inspection, except that disclosure of that information may be made as specified in paragraphs (1) to (4), inclusive, of subdivision (a)."
The Mayor and her employees use personal email to conduct public business away from the automatic search and retention capabilities of City sfgov.org accounts, and, if Respondents are to be believed, this is moreover the exclusive email mechanism the Mayor uses to conduct public business, as no sfgov.org emails were produced for over 1.5 years of requests.
4. SF Admin Code 67.25(d), failure to provide rolling/incremental response:
Exhibit B, one of the responsive records, was clearly converted to PDF on July 30, almost immediately after my request. Note the top right heading which preserves the date of conversion. Respondents waited until Sept. 22 to provide it to me, even though the law requires "when so requested, the City and County shall produce any and all responsive public records as soon as reasonably possible on an incremental or "rolling" basis such that responsive records are produced as soon as possible by the end of the same business day that they are reviewed and collected." 

5. CPRA Gov Code 6253(c), failure to notify requester of disclosable public records within 10 days:
Respondents clearly knew within 10 days that responsive disclosable public records did exist no later than July 30 (per the header in Exhibit B). They refused to tell me. There was no acknowledgement or response whatsoever until Sept 22.

6. SF Admin Code 67.21(b), failure to provide a copy of a record; SFAC 67.26/67.27 non-minimum and unjustified withholding of Word document metadata:
As SOTF has held previously, failure to provide an exact copy of an electronic record means a copy simply has not been provided. I had in fact asked for exact copies. Respondents appear to have failed to provide the original Word documents of the executive directives signed by the Mayor - and the fact that they are Word documents is disclosed by the PDF's metadata. Mayor's Office was previously informed by the city IT experts that Word documents do not carry any security-sensitive metadata.

7. SF Admin Code 67.29-7(a), failure of Breed to maintain all documents and correspondence in a professional and businesslike manner and to disclose them lawfully
It is Breed's personal obligation as department head to maintain all documents and correspondence in a professional and businesslike manner and to disclose them according to law.

(1) Breed did not disclose all the responsive documents and correspondence lawfully, per the above allegations.

(2) Breed apparently solely conducts public business using her personal email address, which is neither professional nor businesslike. And/or her office has destroyed all written evidence of her work using her sfgov.org account.

(3) Breed claims that 8 public records are apparently the entirety of the written evidence of Breed's own work as Mayor in over 1.5 years. Which means either she does essentially no work, she is lying about what records exists, or she has deleted all of the rest. Note even the records produced are printed out from the recipients' (staffers') personal email accounts. Which means Breed has at least refused to disclose or already deleted her own "Sent" versions of the provided emails - which if they exist are responsive records that must be provided. The law requires all documents and correspondence to be maintained professionally and in a businesslike manner - this stricter requirement overrides any lesser requirement in any other local or state law. Even records existing less than a year have apparently been deleted.

Breed (via Heckel) has made such false claims before, stating falsely in writing to the SOTF (as their complaint response) and refusing to correct themselves at the initial committee hearing of the SOTF that available non-metadata calendar information had been provided to me in SOTF 19047 - she was of course lying, having neither produced the additional internal non-Prop G calendar at all, nor identified it as withheld and justifying it - merely keeping the existence of such records a secret. I alleged correctly that such claims of having no other calendar records were simply unbelievable, SOTF in fact questioned Heckel about this, he refused to come clean, but Breed eventually later produced the record and SOTF found Breed in violation.
The claim is of course ridiculous; my requests have produced various texts throughout the City of Breed directing City employees to do various work, showing that either Breed lies or deletes essentially all of her writings immediately.

Neither the Mayor nor Hank Heckel have any credibility, and SOTF should simply not believe them.

Regards,

Anonymous
Twitter @journo_anon

**IMPORTANT:**
1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.
2. If you are NOT a public official: This communication is confidential and may contain unpublished information or confidential source information, protected by the California Shield Law, Evidence Code sec. 1070. I am a member of the electronic media and regularly publish information about the conduct of public officials.
3. I am not a lawyer. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.
4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sent with ProtonMail Secure Email.
From: twitter.com/journo_anon

Subject: California Public Records Act Request: Mayor's Own Work - Immediate Disclosure Request

Mayor Breed,

This is a new Immediate Disclosure Request under the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance and the CPRA.

All records must be provided in rolling fashion.

Please provide the following. NOTE: Even if the Mayor has deleted her own copy of these records, ALL such records in the constructive possession of the Office of Mayor must be searched and provided (say Elsbernd has a copy of a Breed written memo, even if Breed deleted her original, Elsbernd must provide his copy). You must also search all personal property. PRESERVE ALL ORIGINALS OF RECORDS

1. IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE: an electronic scanned copy of any physical public record written at least in part personally by the Mayor since January 2020 EXCEPT where the sole contribution of the Mayor is her signature or initials

2. IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE: an electronic exact copy of any electronic public record of any form entered at least in part personally by the Mayor since January 2020 (including but not limited to texts, chats, DMs, PMs, group messages, Word, Excel, all forms of messaging, email, etc.)

Sincerely,

Twitter.com/journo_anon

---

From: Muckrock Staff

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Mayor's Own Work - Immediate Disclosure Request

To Whom It May Concern:

I wanted to follow up on the following California Public Records Act request, copied below, and originally submitted on July 24, 2021. Please let me know when I can expect to receive a response.

Thanks for your help, and let me know if further clarification is needed.

---

From: Muckrock Staff

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Mayor's Own Work - Immediate Disclosure Request

To Whom It May Concern:

I wanted to follow up on the following California Public Records Act request, copied below, and originally submitted on July 24, 2021. Please let me know when I can expect to receive a response.

Thanks for your help, and let me know if further clarification is needed.
From: Muckrock Staff

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Mayor’s Own Work - Immediate Disclosure Request

To Whom It May Concern:

I wanted to follow up on the following California Public Records Act request, copied below, and originally submitted on July 24, 2021. Please let me know when I can expect to receive a response.

Thanks for your help, and let me know if further clarification is needed.

---

From: Muckrock Staff

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Mayor’s Own Work - Immediate Disclosure Request

To Whom It May Concern:

I wanted to follow up on the following California Public Records Act request, copied below, and originally submitted on July 24, 2021. Please let me know when I can expect to receive a response.

Thanks for your help, and let me know if further clarification is needed.

---

From: Office of the Mayor

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Mayor’s Own Work - Immediate Disclosure Request

Anonymous,

Please see the attached records responsive to your request below. Please note that certain information has been redacted to protect personal privacy. See Gov Code § 6254(c), California Constitution, Art. I, Sec. 1.

Regards,

Hank Heckel
Compliance Officer
Office of the Mayor
City and County of San Francisco

Executive Directive 20_02_Gifts to Departments Through Non-City Organizations
- View  - Embed  - Download

Executive Directive 20_03 _Prop H Implementation
- View  - Embed  - Download

Executive Directive 20_1_Cooperation with City Attorney and Controller Investigation
- View  - Embed  - Download
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gmail - Re_04.27.2021 Scripts for Video Recordings - Invitation to edit_Redacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gmail - Fwd Leading Social and Economic Recovery Login Instructions for Thursday August 20 (006)_Redacted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gmail - Re_Scripts for Video Event Recordings -- Monday January 25 2021 (003)_Redacted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gmail - Fwd Special Session for Bloomberg Harvard Mayors Addressing Racial Injustice Public Narrative and Mayoral Leadership (006)_Redacted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gmail - Fwd Materials for Bloomberg Harvard October 23 Wrap-up Session (006)_Redacted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fwd: Leading Social and Economic Recovery – Login Instructions for Thursday, August 20

1 message

London Breed [redacted]
To: Selina Sun [redacted]

Fri, Aug 14, 2020 at 11:53 AM

Don't think I registered for this

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Bloomberg Harvard City Leadership Initiative <no-reply@zoom.us>
Date: August 14, 2020 at 10:34:50 AM PDT
To: Mayor Breed - San Francisco [redacted]
Subject: Leading Social and Economic Recovery – Login Instructions for Thursday, August 20
Reply-To: cityleadership_mayors@harvard.edu

Hi Mayor Breed - San Francisco,

Thank you for registering for "Leading Social and Economic Recovery Session 3". We look forward to having you join the third session of the Leading Social and Economic Recovery Series on Thursday, August 20. The session will begin at 1:00 p.m. and conclude at 2:30 p.m. US Eastern Time, followed by an optional Q&A from 2:30 – 3:00 p.m. This week's session will be led by Jorrit de Jong and Dutch Leonard from Harvard University and Monica Schoch-Spana and Josh Sharfstein from Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health.

This month’s public health section will focus on vaccines and the role Mayors can play to ready and guide their populations for COVID-19 vaccines. During the crisis leadership segment, we will revisit the basic principles of crisis leadership and discuss strategies for sustaining an effective local response to an evolving multi-stage, multi-dimensional crisis.

To join the session, click on the URL link below on Thursday, August 20 at 12:30 p.m. US Eastern Time (we recommend logging in 30 minutes before the session begins to familiarize yourself with session norms and to account for any technical difficulties that may arise). You may also wish to add this session to your calendar by clicking the “Add to Calendar” link below.

Please submit any questions to: cityleadership_mayors@harvard.edu

Date Time: Aug 20, 2020 01:00 PM Eastern Time (US and Canada)

Join from a PC, Mac, iPad, iPhone or Android device: 

Click Here to Join 

Note: This link should not be shared with others; it is unique to you. 

Add to Calendar  Add to Google Calendar  Add to Yahoo Calendar
Or iPhone one-tap:
US: Personal Info.

Or Telephone:
Dial (for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location):
US: Personal Info.
or +
Webinar ID: Personal Info.
International numbers available:...

Or an H.323/SIP room system:
H.323: Personal Info.

Meeting ID: Personal Info.
SIP: Personal Info.

Please submit any questions to: cityleadership_mayors@harvard.edu

Bloomberg Harvard City Leadership Initiative
Cambridge, MA 02138 USA | cityleadership.harvard.edu

You can cancel your registration at any time.
VIA EMAIL

Sunshine Ordinance Task Force
City and County of San Francisco

Anonymous
arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com

May 5, 2021

Re: SOTF File No. 20006

Dear Task Force and Anonymous:

Regarding Anonymous’ offer to withdraw SOTF Complaint File No. 20006, the Office of the Mayor agrees generally (a) to produce exact PDF copies of public record emails for requesters (preserving any available non-exempt attachments, available non-exempt email addresses in the To/From/Cc/Bcc, and available non-exempt hyperlinks, images, formatting, and the body of the email), and (b) when specifically requested, to disclose full email headers of public record emails, subject to information security redactions of particular header values, and other lawfully-applicable exemptions. We understand that following receipt of this letter and our production of non-exempt email header data for a July 2, 2019 email from Sophia Kittler to Andres Power, Anonymous will consider the issues in SOTF File No. 20006 resolved and withdraw the complaint.

Sincerely,

/s/ Hank Heckel

Hank Heckel
Legal Compliance Officer
Office of the Mayor
City and County of San Francisco
Supervisor of Records Chiu:

Under Admin Code 67.21(d), determine in writing that the records or parts thereof are public and order them disclosed, for both of the attached requests from August 2021.

No substantive response complying with either the CPRA or the Sunshine Ordinance has ever been received. While incremental response was requested, not a single part of any of the requests have ever been responded to.

SFPD Chief Scott: this is a 40-day notice. On the 40th day an Ethics Commission complaint for willful violation will be filed against you.

Regards,

Anonymous
Twitter @journo_anon

**IMPORTANT:**
1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.
2. If you are NOT a public official: This communication is confidential and may contain unpublished information or confidential source information, protected by the California Shield Law, Evidence Code sec. 1070. I am a member of the electronic media and regularly publish information about the conduct of public officials.
3. I am not a lawyer. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.
4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sent with ProtonMail Secure Email.

------ Original Message ------
On Wednesday, December 1st, 2021 at 12:32 PM, San Francisco Police Records Portal <sanfranciscopd@mycusthelp.net> wrote:

**Attachments:**
- P44805_-_SFPD_response_letter_12-1.pdf

--- Please respond above this line ---
December 01, 2021

Via email arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com

Anonymous

, 

RE: Public Records Request, dated August 16, 2021, Reference # P044805-081621

Dear Anonymous:

In response to your request, please see attached document(s).

Sincerely,

Lieutenant Arran Pera #531

Risk Management - Legal Division

To monitor the progress or update this request please log into the [SFPD Public Records Center](#).

This is an auto-generated email and has originated from an unmonitored email account. Please DO NOT REPLY.
December 1, 2021

Via email arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com

Anonymous

RE: Public Records Request, dated August 16, 2021
Reference # P044805-081621

Dear Anonymous:

The San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) received your Public Records Act request, dated August 11, 2021, received August 16, 2021.

You requested, “****Immediate Disclosure Request*** This request is amended as follows. I had some typos.

Dear Mayor Breed, City Attorney Herrera, DEM Head Carroll, DPW Head Degrafinried, and SFPD Head Scott:

Disclose FOR EACH OF YOU each meeting on your calendars or on your aides' calendars in the following 3 months (from today) where Breed, Herrera, Carroll, Degrafinried, or Scott is about homeless/HSOC/street conditions or COVID. All of those fall under 67.3(d) & 67.4. Please read SFAC 67.3(d) and 67.4 very carefully. This is an amazing rule that I don't see it being used often! Please ALSO follow the rules in SOTF 19112 and SOTF 19103 creating baseline requirements for Scott and Breed to disclose their own future calendars generally. I will file complaints for every violation. Remember, if you argue these topics are not public health, safety, or welfare or relating to services for the homeless, I will prove that from your own prior public statements, that they are.

If someone who is NOT a City employee is meeting with the mayor to "discuss with or advise the Mayor or any Department Head on fiscal, economic, or policy issues" OR even employees alone are "reviewing, developing, modifying, or creating City policies or procedures relating to the public health, safety, or welfare or relating to services for the homeless" you MUST disclose the time, place, and nature of the meeting and you must allow the public to attend passively so don't censor the Zoom/conference call/etc!

Regards,
Anonymous
Twitter @iourno anon.

On August 17, SFPD acknowledged your request, and informed you that the 10-day maximum deadline to respond applies. Please refer to California Government Code Section 6253(c).
On August 26, SFPD invoked the extension of time to respond to your request pursuant to Government Code section 6253(c) because of the need to consult with another division of the agency.

On September 9, September 23, October 6, October 20, November 3, and November 17, SFPD informed you that we were in the process of consulting with other divisions of the agency for responsive records.

SFPD is still in the process of searching for responsive records. We will continue to be in contact with you and provide you with an update by December 15, 2021.

Sincerely,

Lieutenant Arran Pera #531
Risk Management - Legal Division
December 1, 2021

Via email arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com

Anonymous

RE: Public Records Request, dated August 4, 2021
Reference # P043647-080421

Dear Anonymous:

The San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) received your Public Records Act request, dated August 4, 2021.

You requested, “IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE REQUEST Good Afternoon All Department Heads and Departments: PRESERVE ALL RESPONSIVE RECORDS THAT EXIST WHEN YOU RECEIVE THIS REQUEST. Do not allow any retention or auto-deletion policy to delete them after the time you receive this message. Even the Good Govt Guide tells you that you must do this. Sadly Mayor Breed, Chief of Staff Elsbernd, and certain other public officials delete their public records, so I have to go to the entire rest of the City to find them. Complaints will be filed pursuant to Admin Code 67.29-7(a) against each department head that has failed to preserve and maintain ALL documents and correspondence in a professional and businesslike manner. I'm aware of Herrera's interpretation that this law is essentially meaningless - luckily for the public Herrera is not the final word, and as you may have seen through the last 2 years, he is often wrong, interpreting the Sunshine Ordinance in an unlawfully narrow manner. You all are very clever in deleting and obfuscating records, so this is a very carefully worded request, and your search will indeed be complicated as a direct result of the work that you and/or your peers put into thwarting public disclosure. Read the entirety of the requests very carefully. All responses will be cross-checked against other agencies and other information I already have. Many of you have ignored these requests previously. Complaints for every violation will be filed. Provide all records in the constructive possession of your department or agency. You have the responsibility to conduct a sufficient search (an IT search, a personal and govt property, instruct employees/contractors to search, and look in any not-yet-finally destroyed records in any Trash, Recycle Bin, Deleted Items, or similar folder, etc.) to find all of those records in your agency's and employees' constructive possession. It is possible that even if a Responsible Person (defined below) deleted their own copy of a record that your IT search or other employees in your agency who are not Responsible Persons still possess the record and thus all employees and IT servers must be searched as well. For example if London Breed, your department head, and some other agency employee Bob were in a group text, and even if Breed and your dept head may have deleted their copy of the record, the other person Bob (or your IT servers) may not have deleted the record, and they must be searched and turn over the record. Boudin specifically appears to have tried to fool a prior requester this way - it won't work here. Provide EXACT copies of every record. For records that are emails, be sure to preserve at least all text, hyperlinks, images, audio, video, formatting, attachments, email addresses, To, From, Cc, and Bcc, and date/time stamps. For other forms of digital messaging, be sure to preserve at least all text, hyperlinks, images, audio, video,
formatting, attachments, date/time stamps, and the name of the sender of each message, and the names of all recipients of each message. You must provide the list of participants in any group message, which is also a responsive record. If you refuse to provide the name of any participant in any communication, then I am also requesting any contact cards/records in the constructive possession of your office that would identify the unnamed participant. Every attachment, image, audio, video, or hyperlink to a responsive record is also a responsive record - and each of those must also be provided as an exact copy in its original electronic format (for example: Word documents must be provided as such, not converted to PDFs). Do not combine distinct public records into a single PDF if doing so removes any of the metadata. Preserve all original file names of all records - those names are themselves a non-exempt record. Provide incremental response pursuant to SFAC 67.25(d). You may prioritize responses in the order requests are listed but you CANNOT let any responsive record be destroyed after you receive this request. You may also prioritize more recent messages over older ones in your rolling response. Answer EACH of the following distinct numbered requests, referencing the definitions below for capitalized terms. EACH request must have a separate response under Gov Code 6253(c) indicating the responsive records, whether they are disclosable, and a reason. Do not mix them up or jumble together the results or records; provide each record associated with its request. There is no rule that I have to send a separate email for each request.

1. Every text, chat, private, direct, group, iMessage, SMS, MMS or other message Between any Responsible Person and (London Breed or Sean Elsbernd) (of EVERY FORM OR APP, EXCEPT email, Signal, or government Microsoft Teams which are covered separately below). If you refuse to conduct a search based on this info alone or claim you cannot do so without Breed's phone number, I would encourage you to contact the Mayor's Office for the information and then conduct the complete informed search. Otherwise, DPW has disclosed Breed's number to me at least twice. Breed uses this number for the conduct of public business.

2. A full and exact copy of the Signal inbox page of every Responsible Person (if Signal is ever used to communicate about public business). Each Signal installation on each device can store DIFFERENT records - I want copies of all of them. You may of course redact purely personal messages or names etc. under appropriate justifications. See my own completely redacted Signal inbox in Exhibit C for an example. It's just the front page of the Signal app summarizing all of your conversations; all I need is a screenshot. You cannot hide who you are talking to about public business.

3. A full and exact copy of the SMS, MMS, Messages, Google Hangouts, Google Chat, iMessage, WhatsApp, Facebook Messenger (including Secret messages), Twitter Direct Message, Telegram, and WeChat inbox page of every Responsible Person (if any of those is used to communicate about public business). You must search EACH phone, tablet, and computer device of each Responsible Person. Each app installation on each device can store DIFFERENT records - I want copies of all of them. You may of course redact purely personal messages or names etc. under appropriate justifications. The inbox page is just the front page of the app showing a summary of all the conversations; all I need is a screenshot. You cannot hide who you are talking to about public business.

4. Dec 5, 2017 to present: Every email Between any Responsible Person and either londonbreed@gmail.com or london.breed@gmail.com (case insensitive), which is publicly stated by Breed herself to be her personal email here:
   https://mobile.twitter.com/londonbreed/status/953517854061608960?lang=en,
   https://archive.is/xoIlB, https://tweetstamp.org/953517854061608960,
   http://web.archive.org/web/20210803145709/https://mobile.twitter.com/londonbreed/status/953517854061608960?lang=en. DPW has shown that Breed uses this account for the conduct of public business in a prior request. You must search EACH phone, tablet, and computer device of each Responsible Person (of every screen of every Signal thread Between every Responsible Person and every Target Person. You must search EACH phone, tablet, and computer device of each Responsible Person. Each Signal installation on each device can store DIFFERENT records - I want copies of all of them. I want complete screenshots (with all parts of the screen) of every screen of every Signal thread Between every Responsible Person and every Target Person,
even if most of the messages are deleted and all that remains is the timer messages. Any attachments within Signal must also be provided separately in their original electronic format. You may of course redact purely personal messages under appropriate justifications. When either party in Signal changes the auto-deletion timer a visible, textual, human-readable message is sent to the other party and stored in the thread, and is visible in the top-left corner of the screen, and I want those too. There’s no issue of invisible metadata here: it’s right on the face of the conversation. Please see Exhibit A (which is an example of my own conversation in Signal when the messages have not yet been auto-deleted) and Exhibit B (which is what the conversation looks like when the messages are old and auto-deleted - note that the messages back and forth changing the auto-delete timer are preserved and still visible). All dates are relevant. 6.A full and exact copy of the SMS, MMS, Messages, Google Hangouts, Google Chat, iMessage, WhatsApp, Facebook Messenger (including Secret messages), Twitter Direct Message, Telegram, and WeChat thread Between every Responsible Person and every Target Person. You must search EACH phone, tablet, and computer device of each Responsible Person. Each installation on each device can store DIFFERENT records - I want copies of all of them. I want complete screenshots (with all parts of the screen) of every screen of every thread Between every Responsible Person and every Target Person, even if most of the messages are deleted. Any attachments within messages must also be provided separately in their original electronic format. You may of course redact purely personal messages under appropriate justifications. Dates: For messages with Breed or Elsbernd, all dates are relevant; For all other Target Persons, Jan 1, 2020 to present. 7.Dec 5, 2017 to present: Every screenshot taken by Sean Elsbernd of a text message to or from London Breed in the constructive possession of any Responsible Person (search at least their texts, chat, their iPhotos, their Google Photos, their device’s camera, screenshots, and photos folder). Elsbernd appears to screenshot Breed’s messages and then send those screenshots as images/texts to other people. He then boasts about deleting these screenshots (see https://twitter.com/journo_anon/status/1421220560919437312, https://tweetstamp.org/1421220560919437312 ). 8.Jan 1, 2020 to present: Every government Microsoft Teams message Between any Responsible Person and each Target Person. If you claim these are in DT’s, and not your, constructive possession, I will use that argument to have DT turn over all of your department's communications themselves. 9.Jan 1, 2020 to present: Every recording (audio, video, and/or phone) of a meeting (EXCEPT open sessions open to the public under the Brown Act, press conferences, or recordings already posted by your agency online open to any member of the public) having a Designated Person and (London Breed or Sean Elsbernd) in attendance. If you claim these are in DT’s, and not your, constructive possession, I will use that argument to have DT turn over all of your department’s meetings themselves. Every closed session is a responsive record and will have to be justified as exempt under a PRA exemption if you withhold it. This ALSO includes voicemails received from London Breed or Sean Elsbernd by Designated Persons. Definitions: **"Between": When communications "between" 2 parties are requested, this includes communications sent by either party To/Cc/Bcc the other party (and potentially additional recipients as well), or sent by some third party To/Cc/Bcc both mentioned parties. Group communications are responsive. **"Target Person(s)"**: London Breed, Sean Elsbernd, Andrea Bruss, Jeff Cretan, Andres Power, Jeff Kositsky, William Scott, David Lazar, Chesa Boudin, David Campos, Rachel Marshall, Kasei Lee, Alaric Degrafinefrid, David Steinberg, John Cote, Noreen Ambrose, Hank Heckel, Sophia Kittler, Jeff Pierce, Grant Colfax, Tomas Aragon **"Responsible Person(s)"**: (a) The Designated Person, (b) each administrative/executive assistant of the Designated Person, (c) each chief of staff or deputy chief of staff of the Designated Person, (d) each director of communications, press director, media director, PR director, or spokesperson of the Designated Person, and (e) any of the Target Persons who are in your department. For many agencies, Target Persons are also Responsible Persons -- Conversations between them must still be produced. "Designated Person(s)” means: 1. If your agency is a commission, board, task force, committee, or
other "policy body" or "passive meeting body" as defined by the Sunshine Ordinance: your clerk or secretary, or if you have neither a clerk nor a secretary, your chair or president. 2. If your agency has a department head: your department head. 3. If both (1) and (2) apply, then your agency should respond once for each applicable definition (for example, the Public Utilities Commission has both a general manager and also a commission secretary and should respond for each) 4. If somehow you believe none of 1 through 3 apply to your agency, you may contact me for clarification. If another staff member is responsible for sending or receiving electronic communications on their account on behalf of the Designated Person, that other staff member's government accounts must be searched. For example, Dennis Herrera is the Designated Person for the Office of the City Attorney; but Brittany Feitelberg apparently sends and receives his communications on her account, and thus her accounts, in addition to his, must be searched. All definitions apply as of the time you receive the requests. Please note that the earlier requests are amended so as to add "Michael Carlin" and "Dennis Herrera" as "Target Person(s)." Regards, Anonymous Twitter @journo_anon"

On August 4, SFPD acknowledged your request, and informed you that the 10-day maximum deadline to respond applies. Please refer to California Government Code Section 6253(c).

On August 13, SFPD invoked the extension of time to respond to your request pursuant to Government Code section 6253(c). On August 27, September 10, September 24, October 6, October 20, November 3, and November 17, SFPD informed you that we were in the process of searching for responsive records.

SFPD is still in the process of searching for responsive records. We will continue to be in contact with you and provide you with an update by December 15, 2021.

Sincerely,

Lieutenant Arran Pera #531
Risk Management - Legal Division
Buta, Odaya (CAT)

From: Anonymoose (@journo_anon) 🦌🔍 <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, December 4, 2021 8:13 AM
To: Supervisor Records (CAT); Cretan, Jeff (MYR)
Subject: Re: 67.21(d) - Jeff Cretan - Fwd: RE: Union Square - Immediate disclosure request
Attachments: signature.asc

Supervisor of Records:
To avoid any doubt re: the below petition, please determine them to be public in writing and order them disclosed.

On Fri, Dec 3, 2021 at 10:31 PM, Anonymoose (@journo_anon) 🦌🔍 <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:

Supervisor of Records,

On Nov 20 3:51pm I made the request below, including specifically by emailing Jeff Cretan. At Nov 20 7:18am, 9:01am, and 1:07pm - less than 3 hours beforehand, Jeff Cretan and SFPD spokesperson Matt Dorsey texted each other about the Nov 19, 2021 Union Square/Louis Vuitton alleged crimes and the PR response to it. Those records are responsive to my request. They have not been produced by Cretan and the Mayor’s Office.

Please determine the records to be public and order them disclosed, pursuant to 67.21(d).

Regards,

Anonymous
Twitter @journo_anon

IMPORTANT:
1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.
2. If you are NOT a public official: This communication is confidential and may contain unpublished information or confidential source information, protected by the California Shield Law, Evidence Code sec. 1070. I am a member of the electronic media and regularly publish information about the conduct of public officials.
3. I am not a lawyer. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.
4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sent from ProtonMail for iOS

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: Heckel, Hank (MYR)<hank.heckel@sfgov.org>
Anonymous,

The Office of the Mayor has conducted an inquiry regarding your request. We have no responsive records.

Regards,

Hank Heckel
Legal Compliance Officer
Office of the Mayor
City and County of San Francisco

---

From: Heckel, Hank (MYR)
Sent: Tuesday, November 23, 2021 3:51 PM
To: Anonymoose (@journo_anon) <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Cc: MayorSunshineRequests, MYR (MYR) <mayorsunshinerequests@sfgov.org>
Subject: RE: Union Square - Immediate disclosure request

Anonymous,

This request is neither simple nor routine nor readily answerable. Accordingly the request warrants the full statutory time period of 10 days in which to respond. See Cal. Gov. Code 6253(c); Admin. Code 67.25(b).

Regards,
From: Anonymoose (@journo_anon) 🦌🔍 <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 20, 2021 3:51 PM
To: Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; Boudin, Chesa (DAT) <chesa@sfgov.org>
Cc: District Attorney, (DAT) <districtattorney@sfgov.org>; MayorSunshineRequests, MYR (MYR) <mayorsunshinerequests@sfgov.org>; Heckel, Hank (MYR) <hank.heckel@sfgov.org>; Pera, Arran (POL) <arran.pera@sfgov.org>; Elsbernd, Sean (MYR) <sean.elsbernd@sfgov.org>; Bruss, Andrea (MYR) <andrea.bruss@sfgov.org>; Cretan, Jeff (MYR) <jeff.cretan@sfgov.org>
Subject: Union Square - Immediate disclosure request

SFPD, Mayor's Office, and DA's Office:

Please preserve and produce any communication, discussion, or record within each of your offices or between 2 or more of your 3 offices, of all forms or kinds, on any type of property, regarding the Nov 19, 2021 Union Square/Louis Vuitton alleged crimes, including any responses, strategies, policy options, coordination, talking points, press releases, memos, meeting entries, or meeting invites. Let's see how the sausage is made from alleged crime -> instant policy making / PR response.

If you ignore the below instructions, you know I will file a complaint. If I already have a ruling against you on any of the below, I will file a complaint directly with the Ethics Commission for now willful violation:

For email and calendar, exact PDF copies of each and every distinct record (including separate emails in one thread) are sufficient with the body, invitees, attendees, attachments, email addresses, To/From/cc/Bcc, urls, formatting, and hyperlinks.
For Microsoft Office or office productivity (word processing, spreadsheets, and presentations) documents, produce an exact copy of the record in its original electronic format; do not convert to PDF.

For records of any kind with: attachments (must be produced in their original electronic format), images, audio, video, formatting, hyperlinks/URLs, date/time stamps, participant/author names, comments, or history -- be sure to preserve and produce all of those parts.

Regards,

Anonymous

Twitter @journo_anon

**IMPORTANT:**

1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.

2. If you are NOT a public official: This communication is confidential and may contain unpublished information or confidential source information, protected by the California Shield Law, Evidence Code sec. 1070. I am a member of the electronic media and regularly publish information about the conduct of public officials.

3. I am not a lawyer. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.

4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sent with ProtonMail Secure Email.
Supervisor of Records Chiu:

This is a petition under 67.21(d) to determine in writing various parts of records public and order them disclosed. I have a request for all SB 1421 records against the Police Commission from 88550-29784388@requests.muckrock.com; such requests for all SB 1421 records in existence have been upheld by various courts and I cannot be required to narrow it.

(This is also a 40-day notice to cure to the Police Commission; otherwise an Ethics complaint will be filed).

Issues:

1. In the following record: https://cdn.muckrock.com/foia_files/2021/12/08/Police_Commission_copy_of_Commission_notification_letter_to_Erb_Redacted.pdf, what Police Commission refers to as redaction type 1 Penal Code 832.7(b)(5)(A) is being used to withhold oddly enough Sgt. Erb's name, even though (b)(5)(A) specifically cannot exempt the names of peace officers.

I challenge all uses of redaction type 1 to withhold the names of peace officers in all of the records provided to me on this request.

2. The Police Commission has stated the following written justification and redaction key for various withholdings for SB 1421 records: Redaction type 7 - "California Penal Code § 11105 et. seq. - CORI data (personal identifiable criminal history) and CLETS data (California Law Enforcement Telecommunications Systems)."

Admin C0de 67.26 requires that each redaction be keyed to a justification under 67.27. But this is not a lawful 67.27 justification because it is neither citing a "specific permissive exemption" nor a "specific statutory authority."

"California Penal Code § 11105 et. seq" refers to dozens of different clauses. The Police Commission must take a specific position on which of these various distinct statutory authorities apply. Which clause specifically purportedly exempts this information?

Moreover, this redaction justification seems to be abused: For example, photographs of cars in the Erb incident cannot possibly be derived from CLETS or CORI. They are from the incident at hand. https://cdn.muckrock.com/foia_files/2021/12/08/Police_Commission_copy_of_PowerPoint_for_Erb_hearing_R edacted.pdf

The Hotsheet is also withheld - under what specific statutory authority is it withheld?

I challenge all redactions of type 7 in all of the records provided to me on this request.
Regards,

Anonymous
Twitter @journo_anon

**IMPORTANT:**
1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.
2. If you are NOT a public official: This communication is confidential and may contain unpublished information or confidential source information, protected by the California Shield Law, Evidence Code sec. 1070. I am a member of the electronic media and regularly publish information about the conduct of public officials.
3. I am not a lawyer. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.
4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sent from ProtonMail for iOS
Buta, Odaya (CAT)

From: Anonymoose (@journo_anon) 🦌🔍 <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 15, 2021 9:07 PM
To: Supervisor Records (CAT)
Subject: 4 redactions re hidden budget items - 67.21(d) petition
Attachments: carla-short-messages-darlene-frohm-pdf-redacted.pdf; Screen Shot 2021-12-15 at 8.00.54 PM.png; signature.asc

Supervisor of Records Chiu:

This is a petition under 67.21(d) to order Carla Short, Darlene Frohm and the DPW to disclose four pieces of info (or the maximum non-exempt portions) withheld as personnel records (and determine in writing they are at least in part public) on page 74 of the attached record.

In the text Carla Short appears to tell Darlene Frohm she "hid" funding for something called "Coach" in the budget. (DPW claims "hid" is supposedly a typo for "had" in the context of some other records request.)

Frohm states: "Speaking of Coach, Julia has pushed back on funding, can you bring this up with Alaric. We were told it was a go then no go"
Short replies: "I hid it in the budget- I think we have it. I'll check"

Immediately around those items are fully redacted messages. Presumably they refer to Coach, because the text says "speaking of" Coach.

Regards,

Anonymous
Twitter @journo_anon

IMPORTANT:
1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.
2. If you are NOT a public official: This communication is confidential and may contain unpublished information or confidential source information, protected by the California Shield Law, Evidence Code sec. 1070. I am a member of the electronic media and regularly publish information about the conduct of public officials.
3. I am not a lawyer. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.
4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sent with ProtonMail Secure Email.
Darlene Frohm: Hi
It’s Darlene would you give a call

5/30/19 4:17:20 PM PDT

Darlene Frohm: Hello,
Regarding 1312 we both have an in house person on panel. I would like to keep Donna on panel as we do not have a 2917 if you don’t mind. Just need to confirm you are okay with this so Raquel can schedule
Thank you
Darlene

6/26/19 12:40:01 PM PDT

Darlene Frohm: Hi
STATS??

7/9/19 10:23:18 AM PDT

Can you do me a favor? Can you grab a box of N95 masks from the tool room when you come to City Hall? One of the sheriff deputies was asking about them, she is at the loading dock all day with the big door open. I thought we could bring her some.

10/28/19 7:40:42 AM PDT

Darlene Frohm: Yes Ma’am

10/28/19 7:50:25 AM PDT

Darlene Frohm: Should I bring to you or give them to loading dock staff?
Darlene Frohm: If you are coming in that door, you could give them directly.

Darlene Frohm: Okay

1/22/19 9:29:16 AM PST

Darlene Frohm: Good morning,
Happy Friday!!
Would you get confirmation on whether Marisol’s last day will be
12/04/19, we have no paperwork and she will be off tomorrow through
December 3rd?
Thank you
Darlene

1/22/19 10:54:29 AM PST

Darlene Frohm: Wow. Sure!

1/22/19 11:15:19 AM PST

Darlene Frohm: Not confirmed. She may be back on 12/4

12/11/19 8:51:52 AM PST

Darlene Frohm: Good morning Ma’am,
Any news on Marisol’s new job? She’s here today?

12/11/19 9:35:34 AM PST

Darlene Frohm: Oh really? No, no news. That is too bad.

12/12/19 1:52:24 PM PST

Darlene Frohm: Hi,
I know Personnel Records - just checking your approximate eta? First
person is 2
Second is 2:30

12/12/19 1:58:30 PM PST

Darlene Frohm: I am on my way back. I think 2:10-2:15 to be back in yard

12/13/19 2:32:15 PM PST

Darlene Frohm: Need to talk more about guy we interviewed yesterday

12/13/19 2:33:11 PM PST

Darlene Frohm: We should ask for references

12/13/19 2:46:09 PM PST

Darlene Frohm: Is it because of Warren?
Of course. I asked if he could get me names??

I asked him too in the meeting today and he didn't have a great impression. But let's check references on both guys.

I agree. Thank you

Good morning Ma'am,
I can pick you up at 5th & Stevenson one block from Market

Forgot to ask- any news or announcement from Kimberly?

She didn't say anything and nothing has been finalized for January. I informed her I need it all by this Friday!!!

Should we have Rachel ask her?

I see she has started to reach out to people (today!) because Supervisor Peskin's side looped me in!

Plus she's off for holidays and no Wednesday meeting for next two weeks.
If Rachel could that would be great

She offered to. I will ask if she can

Hello Ma'am,
Just checking on you. Are we meeting at 1 today?

Hi
Shih-Wei and Kenny Bruce confirmed that John Reily will attend tonight
Okay update, Alison is going tonight since she's Special Projects and Shih-Wei is very happy.

Excellent! Thank you

You are welcomed

Also, big boss approved moving forward with Traci

Ralph Payton accepted the meeting invite but also asked me for context, can I share with him?

Thank you!! And yes for Ralph

Hello Ma'am,
L261 meeting is today, I thought tomorrow. We will head over there for 1pm

Ah, ok. I declined it, so it doesn't show up on my calendar. Sorry!

Who would be the best person to work with MTA on the Idea to do Ed's neighborhood just a couple times a year?

Donna, if not then possibly Jonathan Goldberg?

Now that Jerad is at MTA he is going to help facilitate a meeting.

That's great are you okay with Donna? She's really good

Sure.
Good morning Ma'am, Are coming to yard for your meeting with Matt this am?

No, sorry, we have budget and I was running late. I forgot about that meeting.

I'll let him know.

Hi Ma'am, Do you have the SES tonnage picked up for sites visited for the Castro & Dolores Park Homeless meeting?

I will ask Kenny.

Is that all Larry was asking for?

Yes I couldn't find Kenny but I can check on that if you like?

You can start without me, just wrapping up with Jon.

Good morning Ma'am, Did you mean to send to me?(Darlene)

Yes! Community programs meeting?

I am in San Ramon with Apprentice I actually thought that meeting was canceled. But maybe Jonathan will express his concerns with you.

Ok. Forgot sorry! Have a good meeting.

Of course they are late 😊
Forgot to ask you, can you ask about Thornton at the Caltrans meeting?

I have on my list when I met with Jonathan yesterday.

He did just say you were going to do it. Thanks.

I jumped the gun with my text. Also, Larry said he is going to Caltrans meeting- so you don’t have to, but you still can if you want to.

Ma’am, I can if you like.

How are you?

Doing ok, thanks for asking. It is going to get ugly for a while and I’m worried about everyone’s morale. But we will get through it. Caltrans totally up to you. You should go home from there if you want.

Hello Ma’am, Do you need me to attend the IT meeting today?

Linda was asking if you could attend. I am still hoping I`ll be back by the

Then

Okay, I`ll go. Hope all is well with you

Good morning Ma’am. Just confirming you will not be here for meeting Matt? He’s looking for you

Sorry! I texted Matt, I thought Anna had canceled. I should have checked. I`m on my way to 1155 now
2/6/20 1:11:18 PM PST

Darlene Frohm Privacy

Personnel Records - CA Govt Code Secs 6254(c), 6254(k); CA Const., Art I, Sec 1
I will confirm with Kimberly that he’s okay to come back to work tomorrow?

2/6/20 1:20:16 PM PST

Yes, I think tomorrow, it is the 10th that it expires. So maybe if we do the 9922 thing he might even get to come back Monday!

2/6/20 1:40:43 PM PST

Darlene Frohm Privacy

Yes it’s all settled per Kimberly. My apologies but I’m just leaving the yard to head to the 2pm meeting just finished call with City Attorney

2/11/20 8:00:11 AM PST

Darlene Frohm Privacy

Good morning Ma’am, Where is the 8:30 meeting? Thank you

2/11/20 8:03:00 AM PST

2/11/20 8:03:11 AM PST

2/11/20 12:53:39 PM PST

Darlene Frohm Privacy

Thank you

2/12/20 7:21:57 PM PST

Darlene Frohm Privacy

For Arborist Day we pulled permit from Everett Middle School, we are going with this die to time we need to move on it. Hope you are okay with this?

2/12/20 7:22:54 PM PST

Sorry to text you late, can you go to the Mendell plaza and Bayview community plan meeting tomorrow at 3? I’ll be at City Hall for strategic plan meeting 2-3

2/12/20 7:24:09 PM PST

Darlene Frohm Privacy

Hi Ma’am, Yes I can

2/12/20 7:24:21 PM PST

Thank you! I think we need someone there to be sure OEWD doesn’t do something crazy!

Darlene Frohm Privacy

I agree
Good morning Ma’am, 
My apologies I just saw Rachel’s email. Due to Mayors Press conference today, do you want to cancel Personnel meeting? Or do later today? Lots and lots going on

Jonathan wanted to discuss his schedule with us, but since you’re out tomorrow, what do you think about deferring one more week to discuss? Or do you want him to change and then we discuss? (He pointed out it is the middle of the pay period)... 

And he wanted to go to Cynthia Chono’s memorial

That’s fine Ma’am, 
It was done based on pay period.

I do feel he should have the same schedule as everyone

Agreed, and I told him that made sense to me, too.

I would like to let him go to Cynthia’s memorial, though, he did work closely with her on water stuff.

I agree Ma’am

Ok. I gave him one more week, but said primarily to allow him to attend Cynthia’s.

Thank you Ma’am for your support

Enjoy the long weekend. Do NOT think about our crazy work!

Happy Valentines Day Ma’am, 
Now I tried to heed your Do NOT think but I’ve received so many calls only because I don’t watch the news!!!
Just checking on you
2/14/20 5:15:24 PM PST
Thanks. Crazy day. All good.

2/20/20 8:02:45 PM PST

2/21/20 7:21:18 AM PST
Hello Ma'am,
Just double checking do you still canceling meeting?

2/21/20 7:21:34 AM PST
I think so. I talked to Alaric yesterday, he's in the same page as we are but hasn't spoken to Naomi or Sean. I think makes sense to postpone. What do you think?

2/21/20 7:29:39 AM PST
Or were you talking about the 1pm? That is cancelled for sure

2/21/20 8:33:15 AM PST
Good morning Ma'am,
Yes I am talking about 1pm meeting, but I agree with the other as well.

2/21/20 9:22:24 AM PST
The apprentice program from yesterday is electricians

2/21/20 9:30:21 AM PST
Ok, pushed the Ian meeting. I already told Anna to cancel the 1pm.

2/21/20 9:32:58 AM PST
So we are still meeting with Ian at City Hall today 2:30 right?

2/21/20 9:33:14 AM PST
No, sorry. I wasn't clear! By pushed I meant postponed to next week

2/25/20 8:40:49 AM PST
Okay got it

2/27/20 8:36:32 AM PST
Hi,
Sent you an email regarding arborists meeting today. Checking if you have concerns or questions

2/27/20 8:37:06 AM PST
Ok. On the call this morning Julia said we should be able to get the vendors a check in a day or two and we could commit that to them. She also said we can discuss this afternoon.

2/27/20 8:37:06 AM PST
Thank you Ma'am
2/27/20 10:41:20 AM PST
Sorry to trouble you in the middle of your event. Could I borrow your car at 11:45 for an hour and a half?

2/27/20 10:42:27 AM PST
Yes of course I'll bring you keys

2/28/20 10:31:06 AM PST
Would you like Coach Q to meet you downtown?

3/2/20 8:36:56 AM PST
Good morning Ma'am.
My apologies for the disturbance. Could you confirm Recology or are we working it out for Arbor Day food?

3/2/20 8:53:05 AM PST
Also, if you could check your email

3/2/20 9:51:22 AM PST
Wasn't able to get confirmation but they promised today. Also, on my way back now but may be about 5 min late, can you let folks know?

3/2/20 9:52:55 AM PST
Yes

3/2/20 5:18:37 PM PST
Got go-ahead for Recology! Yay.

3/3/20 7:23:31 AM PST
Good morning Ma'am,
Thank you so much!!!

3/3/20 7:31:16 AM PST
Ma'am,
I will confirm with the vendors this morning for Arbor Day. It's only six and we really need to move on this.
Thank you
Darlene

3/3/20 7:42:58 AM PST
I agree. Julia promised we could confirm this morning. I can't imagine she is going to say we can't move forward with them.

3/3/20 7:43:26 AM PST
Thank you
3/7/20 8:33 AM PST
When you get a chance can you swing by 17th and Guerrero? I told Suzanne she could only get a shirt if she worked for it, and she is here.

3/7/20 8:34 AM PST
Darlene Frohm Privacy
Yes what size? Also Community Programs staff is coming to plant, any location you would them to go to?

3/7/20 8:36 AM PST
3/7/20 8:37 AM PST
Guerrero medians!

3/7/20 8:45 AM PST
3/7/20 8:48 AM PST
I asked Suzanne what size but she hasn't responded.
Large for Suzanne

3/7/20 8:53 AM PST
3/7/20 9:17 AM PST
Darlene Frohm Privacy
Thank you
Alaric is headed to Guerrero, just FYI

3/7/20 11:32 AM PST
Can you bring 3 shirts to 24th and Guerrero when you get a chance? Not urgent

3/7/20 11:34 AM PST
Darlene Frohm Privacy
Looks like trees were planted at all locations!!!

3/7/20 11:34 AM PST
3/7/20 11:35 AM PST
Yep! We are in the yard getting more trees to plant in other sites!
Happy Arbor Day!

3/7/20 11:36 AM PST
Darlene Frohm Privacy
Happy Arbor Day!!!
3/7/20 11:36 AM PST
Do you need help unloading shirts or anything?
Darlene Frohm: Thank you I already did it.

Darlene Frohm: Leaving Waller streets. Think I'll head out? Do you need anything?

No, get on outta here!

Darlene Frohm: Didn't find Suzanne.

Darlene Frohm: Drove all the locations and I must say the trees look very nice. I was a bit worried when that downpour came.

We love rain at BUF!

Darlene Frohm: You are funny. I'm still drying off got a bit soaked.

Darlene Frohm: Good morning Ma'am, Matt's truck drivers are to report to a Turk Street?

Yes, just texted him, but told him to double check with Peter first, because he talked to DEM this morning.

Okay.

Hello Ma'am, Community Programs 9 Quarterly meeting 9:30 Short time.

Coming now, sorry.

Any more news on toolroom staff?
Darlene Frohm: Will you make 5 meeting with Alaric?

Carla Short: Yes, I'm headed there now for a meeting Myisha just asked me to attend, so I'll be there for 5pm.

Darlene Frohm: But I was literally driving away.

Darlene Frohm: Ma'am, Are we still open for business tomorrow?? Have a great night. No stress. Take a nice leisure walk.

Carla Short: We are still open for business. Have a good evening!

Darlene Frohm: I knew that, I just wanted to relax you. You have a good evening as well!!

Carla Short: Call you in a few.

Darlene Frohm: Purchase orders were held up by OFFMA way before new email went out. He's doing inventory now.

Carla Short: Really?! That is interesting. This place is so crazy!
Hi Ma'am,
They will need the driver and truck again in the morning to go back to Sacramento. I'm not able to send emails, this phone. No answer from Matt but Maura will get a driver and send email.

Ok, thanks for heads up

Hope you had a great massage!!

I did! Feel great! Thanks

You are off the hook for EOC tomorrow. Although we will probably be standing up our DoC, and may need you to rotate through there. We can talk in the morning

Thank you Ma'am,
As long as you know I am here ALWAYS!!!

Good morning Ma'am,
FYI, I am going to have the Storeroom go back to window service. It's to close inside and it gets very crowded. If it rains we will open doors. Thank you
Darlene

Sounds good. I'm not going to make it by six, obviously, and I am still in Oakland. But leaving soon. Thank you and see you soon

Are you still in Toolroom?

I'm going to SES meeting

In my office with Alaric I'll bring him to meeting

I'm in a meeting, I will call you later. You can try texting me.
Darlene Frohm 3/17/20 7:36:43 AM PDT
Where is SES meeting?

3/17/20 7:37:49 AM PDT
Darlene Frohm  Privacy
Heading to Toolroom

3/17/20 9:34:19 AM PDT
Darlene Frohm  Privacy
Hi,
Just checking, did you decide if you were going to have a conversation with Lena (UA) additional staff or rehires?

3/17/20 6:25:18 PM PDT
Darlene Frohm  Privacy
Hello Ma’am,
Just checking on you?

3/17/20 6:40:29 PM PDT
Darlene Frohm  Privacy
All good- no traffic coming home! Amazing!

3/17/20 6:40:43 PM PDT
Darlene Frohm  Privacy
How was your drive?

3/17/20 6:58:41 PM PDT
Darlene Frohm  Privacy
Yes indeed you, all of 37 minutes😊

3/18/20 8:48:41 AM PDT
Darlene Frohm  Privacy
Hi
Vendor can deliver gloves and wipes, can we give the BUF purchase order number?

3/19/20 7:19:30 PM PDT
Darlene Frohm  Privacy
Hi Ma’am,
I hope I’m not waking you. Okay so the calls are coming in, your governors message stay at home?? I know that’s not us but what’s your take on this?

3/19/20 7:34:27 PM PDT
Darlene Frohm  Privacy
Did the governor say something new today?

3/19/20 7:34:47 PM PDT
Darlene Frohm  Privacy
Or is that from Tuesday?

3/19/20 7:37:36 PM PDT
Darlene Frohm  Privacy
Ok, just saw it. That definitely puts a wrinkle in things. I think we will likely have to backtrack. Things are still NBC singing minute by minute!
3/19/20 7:38:03 PM PDT
NBC singing? What? That should say still changing!

3/19/20 7:38:04 PM PDT
Darlene Frohn Privacy
One hour ago. Call for ALL California to stay home. We know that’s not for all. Just checking if you had any current news I could share? I'm watching channel 5

3/19/20 7:38:24 PM PDT
No news but I'm sending a text now

3/19/20 7:40:14 PM PDT
Darlene Frohn Privacy
Until I hear different I'm telling folks work as usual.

3/19/20 7:45:08 PM PDT
Ok. As of now no change to plan. Of course everything may go topsy turvy tomorrow

3/19/20 7:46:23 PM PDT
Darlene Frohn Privacy
Okay I'm turning news off. Have a great night sleep.

3/19/20 7:46:47 PM PDT
Ok. You too!

3/22/20 4:02:58 PM PDT
Darlene Frohn Privacy
Sorry to text you on a Sunday, do we need three more porta-potties at SF General? Bayron is planning to deliver them tomorrow. I thought they only wanted the 3 we already got them?

3/22/20 4:05:14 PM PDT
Darlene Frohn Privacy
No problem. That's what my understanding was and I thought that's what Alaric wanted to talk about tomorrow? And why is Bayron placing orders?

3/22/20 4:06:21 PM PDT
Darlene Frohn Privacy
He left his number on email, do you mind if I call him?

3/22/20 4:06:26 PM PDT
I know. It sounds like Bruce was talking to Lena 😳 and they thought they needed those 3. I called Bayron and left a mess her telling him not to deliver until we speak. Too much craziness!

3/22/20 4:06:36 PM PDT
You can try too, but I just called

3/22/20 4:06:04 PM PDT
Darlene Frohn Privacy
I just read the email. Those conversations need to stop!!!
3/22/20 4:08:36 PM PDT

Darlene Frohm

I know! Too many cooks in the kitchen!

3/22/20 4:17:32 PM PDT

Darlene Frohm

I have not heard from anyone that more Porto potties were needed???

3/22/20 4:19:14 PM PDT

Privacy

Ok, I think this was duplicative. I hope Byron will listen to his voicemail before delivering those units!

3/22/20 4:19:50 PM PDT

Darlene Frohm

This is way out of hand.

3/22/20 5:42:11 PM PDT

Privacy

Ok. Just talked to Byron he is going to cancel the delivery to General, but keep the units on hold. We can have EOC determine where they want them.

3/22/20 7:08:08 PM PDT

Darlene Frohm

Privacy

Okay. FYI part of the challenge, these people are not speaking with the contract people? I believe that's why so many people are involved.

3/22/20 7:12:14 PM PDT

Privacy

Hopefully we can get everyone to stay in their lane tomorrow! (A big ask!)

3/22/20 7:15:03 PM PDT

Darlene Frohm

Privacy

Have you heard from your family members in Italy?

3/22/20 7:15:52 PM PDT

Privacy

I heard from 2 today. Both ok. Going a little stir crazy but they understand the need to be at home.

3/22/20 7:15:57 PM PDT

Privacy

Thanks for asking!

3/22/20 7:18:59 PM PDT

Darlene Frohm

Privacy

I'm so glad to hear that.

3/22/20 7:19:15 PM PDT

Privacy

Me too. Thanks!

3/22/20 7:19:33 PM PDT

Darlene Frohm

Privacy

You are so welcomed!!
Hi
Are we still looking to send the OnE Team to the EOC?

10,000 rolls toilet tissue 90 days for pit stop

Do you want me to do call with HR?

Hello Ma'am,
I am heading out. I am available if you need anything.
Have a good evening

Are you out the door?

Was Donna on furlough before going to EOC? Or was she working from home?

She was working from home, like everyone for those couple days?

That's what I thoughtZ. Thanks. Payroll was asking

Strange, I sent the confirmation list to Margaret last Friday, and she replied thank you?

I think she got confused because most of the others were on furlough

Beautiful rainbow!

Yes it is.
Have a beautiful night Ma'am!!

You too!
Thank you

Ma'am,
Just checking, what about shutting down the area they were in and cleaning?

Yes, I was going to talk to BBR abo it that.

I just volunteered Benjamin, Sevilla, Enid and Traci to go to EOC

THANK YOU
YOU ARE MY SHERO!!!!!

Hi,
Hand washing stations should not be included in the Pit Stop RFP. I saw
them while I was out today and we should not spend our resources on
that. I spoke with Jonathan and he's in agreement it would be a waste of
resources

Jonathan's comment
They need to stop listening to Lena - monitoring hand washing stations is
her idea...

Hmmm. I think we will be blamed for them if we don't monitor, but
maybe we spell out they don't need to be staffed-just inspected daily for
condition and needs?

Ok - But maybe Peter can provide temporary people to monitor since it
his group special projects that has been involved with them - might be
worth asking

I realize it's a bit late but let's go for it. Because if we don't spell it out
then they will try to charge us.
If we are going to monitor them daily then we may probably need a
vehicle (to be included in the RFP) to drive from location to location

Ok. Good points
Forgot to tell you. Alaric will be there around 7. I'll try to be there by then too.

Thank you

Enjoy!

https://twitter.com/JLCauvin/status

Good morning Ma’am, Happy Friday!!! Thank you for sharing it was very funny.

Ma’am, It’s 8:27

My apologies. I thought call was 8:30, was dealing with an issue here

No problem. Jonathan is on and I am too

Now

I am on

delivery list_1.pdf
Darlene Frohm: Hi Ma'am, I hope you are enjoying your day and getting some much needed rest. These are the supplies that were picked up yesterday.

Carla short: Thank you! I hope you’re also relaxing this weekend!

Darlene Frohm: Hi
Need 150 buckets for signs original order was 40

Carla short: We should place tape on ground for social distance key watch included

Darlene Frohm: Supervisors pick up supplies from storeroom, still individuals picking up supplies

Carla short: Are you available to chat about the OnE Team?

Darlene Frohm: Okay

Carla short: Ma'am, How about working from home today?? You deserve it

Darlene Frohm: Thanks, I am coming in now.

Carla short: Gonna be a minute I ordered coffee, but didn’t realize there would be a line to pick up

Darlene Frohm: Hello Ma'am, Just checking if you had any word regarding supply pick up?
3/31/20 4:23:24 PM PDT
On call with Alaric and deputies

3/31/20 4:24:52 PM PDT
Darlene Frohm  Privacy
I'll check with you tomorrow. I am heading out. Have a good night!!! REALLY!!

3/31/20 4:26:03 PM PDT
Not yet, Matt asked Taraneh, we are supposed to wait until Friday but I'm going to have Alaric ask for another pick up

3/31/20 4:27:01 PM PDT
Darlene Frohm  Privacy
Okay, we are completely out of sanitizers

4/1/20 2:57:55 PM PDT
Yep

4/1/20 2:58:14 PM PDT
Darlene Frohm  Privacy
Hi are you here?

4/3/20 10:15:09 AM PDT
Yep, on a call

4/3/20 10:15:41 AM PDT
Darlene Frohm  Privacy
Need someone from BUF for vehicle meeting, in training trailer

4/3/20 10:16:39 AM PDT
Jada was going to call in.

4/3/20 11:53:03 AM PDT
Darlene Frohm  Privacy
Okay she's on now

4/3/20 11:53:22 AM PDT
On call with Mario

4/3/20 11:53:42 AM PDT
Darlene Frohm  Privacy
Okay, later
Darlene Frohm  Privacy

Hi
Are we meeting? Warren is in my office

4/3/20 12:59:41 PM PDT

Darlene Frohm  Privacy

If you don’t mind I will assign Sequoia to BBR M-F 7:30-4

4/3/20 3:41:54 PM PDT

Darlene Frohm  Privacy

Hi,
I am getting off call and can head to storeroom to assist since I am still here

4/3/20 3:42:37 PM PDT

I'm heading over now, too

4/6/20 11:10:27 AM PDT

I'm on a call with Marlo

4/6/20 2:33:56 PM PDT

Darlene Frohm  Privacy

Hi just an FYI signs may not stay on cars

4/6/20 2:34:19 PM PDT

Yep. I think we can only do what we can do

4/6/20 2:34:58 PM PDT

Darlene Frohm  Privacy

One last thing, do you have the answers you need per Alaric's email

4/6/20 2:35:30 PM PDT

I think so.

4/6/20 8:17:48 PM PDT

Darlene Frohm  Privacy

Hi Ma'am,
My apologies for this late text but I just couldn’t relax. As you know the RFP is HORRIBLY WRITTEN!!! I realize we are in a rush but I hope you were able to take a look at it before it went to city attorney for review this evening? As I stated it has nothing regarding troubleshooting/keep of the units or overtime language (we discussed this prior to the RFP going out).
Okay just my thoughts.
Also, I will go to the training tomorrow with Jonathan
Thank you
Darlene
4/6/20 8:20:21 PM PDT
No need to apologize. I’m sorry that you are stressed about it! I did not read it thoroughly but will do that. (They only sent it to me after already went to City Attorney). But we can still question those good points! Try to relax!!!

4/6/20 8:27:21 PM PDT
Darlene Frohm  Privacy
I appreciate you hearing me out. Have a good night.

4/5/20 8:27:35 PM PDT
You too!

4/7/20 11:44:28 AM PDT
Darlene Frohm  Privacy
Hi
The 3 TL locations are good to go. I’m head to 2111 Jennings and 245 Bayshore locations

4/7/20 11:44:51 AM PDT
Great!

4/7/20 11:46:39 AM PDT
Darlene Frohm  Privacy
Had to walk away from person in charge at project open hand he was blowing smoke in my face. So they can actually place the unit on his head

4/7/20 11:47:14 AM PDT
Sorry, ma’am.

4/7/20 11:48:26 AM PDT
Darlene Frohm  Privacy
Had my mask on but still. Okay I’m taking off

4/7/20 11:53:31 AM PDT
Thanks for checking those!

4/7/20 12:21:01 PM PDT
Darlene Frohm  Privacy
No signs posted at 2111 Jennings or 245 Bayshore

4/7/20 12:21:40 PM PDT
Uh oh. Can we fit them in?

4/7/20 12:22:20 PM PDT
Can you check street sweeping? We could possible go early and block the spot
4/7/20 12:36:25 PM PDT
Darlene Frohm Privacy
Yes
2111 Jennings is residential but it would work

4/7/20 12:38:53 PM PDT
Darlene Frohm Privacy
It wasn’t 245 Bayshore, it’s Barneveld & Loomis this one will be okay. I’m back at the yard but I’ll go back and check 2111 Jennings for street sweeping

4/7/20 1:02:51 PM PDT
Darlene Frohm Privacy
Heading to Jonathan’s training and will stop by 2111 Jennings to confirm street cleaning

4/7/20 1:29:22 PM PDT
Darlene Frohm Privacy
Hi
Jennings is cool, they removed the buckets but I just spoke to the folks and they will be gone by morning

4/7/20 1:37:27 PM PDT
Darlene Frohm Privacy
And the 245 Bayshore is in the back of the Burger King parking lot.

4/7/20 1:43:04 PM PDT
Great. Thanks so much! I think 245 Bayshore was instead of Barneveld because that site was so nuts. Let me know how training goes!

4/7/20 3:30:21 PM PDT
Darlene Frohm Privacy
Oh my goodness!!! Just spent the last 1.45 with UA. Interesting group of folks. But great information and trainings. Okay I’m going to sites and I’ll head home. Hope the rest of your day was okay

4/7/20 3:39:41 PM PDT
Thanks! I have to call Lena to remind her staff to wear PPE. We got two complaints today - one official through OSHA! Want to hear more about how it went today.

4/8/20 12:40:53 PM PDT
Can you ask John to call me when the signs from repro arrive?

4/8/20 2:14:14 PM PDT
On a call. I can call you after

4/10/20 7:56:54 AM PDT
Good morning. Let me know if you’d like me to help with restroom sites. After my morning meeting, I am flexible!
4/10/20 8:02 AM PDT

Darlene Frohm  Privacy

Good morning Ma'am,
Thank you but we are good, waiting on drop offs for mission.
Making another trip to yard for PPE locations

4/10/20 8:05 AM PDT

Ok. As mentioned I'm pretty flexible after the morning meeting so just let me know what I can do to help!

4/10/20 8:05:49 AM PDT

Darlene Frohm  Privacy

Cannot unmute

4/13/20 10:00 AM PDT

4/13/20 10:05:13 AM PDT

Darlene Frohm  Privacy

I'm on now

4/13/20 10:39:17 AM PDT

Darlene Frohm  Privacy

Could this be Nancy's group?

4/13/20 10:39:54 AM PDT

Darlene Frohm  Privacy

Okay maybe not but public health

4/13/20 2:11:37 PM PDT

On a call
Darlene Frohm: Privacy

Okay, FYI UA may acquire some OT for delivery of last 5 tomorrow. Their folks are on 5 days now from the beginning of this contract?

Darlene Frohm: Privacy

Is that because they haven’t on boarded enough?

Darlene Frohm: Privacy

Asking Darlene to look into other vendor for toilets and I will review agreement. I will also review reimbursement for incorrect pricing.

Darlene Frohm: Privacy

Yes. I have scheduled next training for Wednesday 9am.

Darlene Frohm: Privacy

Ok. If they need OT because of onboarding, I think we can approve.

Darlene Frohm: Privacy

Ma’am, I hope your day wasn’t stressful??

Darlene Frohm: Privacy

No just busy. How about you?

Darlene Frohm: Privacy

It was okay. Just wanted to check on you.

Darlene Frohm: Privacy

Thank you! I am fine.

Darlene Frohm: Privacy

You are doing a great job!!

Darlene Frohm: Privacy

You are very nice! I couldn’t do it without you!

Darlene Frohm: Privacy

Ma’am, That’s kind of you to say but always know we are here for you!

Darlene Frohm: Privacy

Thanks! I do appreciate it!
4/14/20 10:42:52 AM PDT
Darlene Frohm  Privacy
Hi, Are you available?

4/14/20 10:43:43 AM PDT
In training trailer with Alaric Peter and Rachel to talk about sidewalk cleaning

4/14/20 1:43:53 PM PDT
Darlene Frohm  Privacy
Jonathan and I are taking one last look and heading out. We are a bit beat. Ma'am I must say this program would be CRAZY for one person. Next phase will be AWESOME! If you need anything just HOLLER!!!

4/14/20 1:44:40 PM PDT
Thank you! Yes totally crazy. We should get more help. We can brainstorm. Thank you!!!

4/14/20 1:45:11 PM PDT
Darlene Frohm  Privacy
Yes Ma'am

4/14/20 5:07:47 PM PDT
Sorry to text you but urgent request for united. There is a United porta potty at site on 7th st. That we would like removed before 11am. I don’t know who was renting it but it has been stuck on site behind a locked gate and has a broken door. Confidentially, the Mayor will be there for a press conference tomorrow at 11. Can you call your United contact and try to get it out early? We will have a crew on site at about 8am to open the gate (and I can go earlier if needed).

4/14/20 7:33:05 PM PDT
Darlene Frohm  Privacy
Okay let me call

4/14/20 7:35:47 PM PDT

4/14/20 8:50:02 PM PDT

4/14/20 8:50:46 PM PDT
Darlene Frohm  Privacy
Hi do you have the cross street?

4/14/20 8:50:59 PM PDT
7th and Brannon. 600 7th st

4/14/20 8:51:30 PM PDT
Darlene Frohm  Privacy
Thank you

4/14/20 8:51:30 PM PDT
You’re welcome. Thank you!
4/14/20 9:03:43 PM PDT

Darlene Frohm **Privacy**

It was sent to their dispatch and she will confirm in the morning

4/14/20 9:04:22 PM PDT

Thank you! If they get this done for us, I will give than another chance

4/14/20 9:04:55 PM PDT

Darlene Frohm **Privacy**

Great minds think alike 😊

4/14/20 9:18:11 PM PDT

Darlene Frohm **Privacy**

I'll go over early in the morning to keep an eye open

4/15/20 7:33:59 AM PDT

Darlene Frohm **Privacy**

Good morning
Should Peter make sure this area is clean for mayor

4/15/20 8:30:57 AM PDT

Darlene Frohm **Privacy**

United will get unit at 7th

4/15/20 8:39:26 AM PDT

Hooray!

4/15/20 8:43:11 AM PDT

Can you send some icky photos of porta potty issues? We are trying to push back on Sup Haney and want to send him some examples of what happens if we don't have good staffing and good service

4/15/20 10:16:47 AM PDT

United picked up the toilet at 7th!

4/15/20 2:50:56 PM PDT

Who is the contact at SFGH?

4/15/20 2:55:09 PM PDT

Darlene Frohm **Privacy**

Hi,
I sent you an email with the contact info

4/15/20 2:55:32 PM PDT

Thanks! Just saw it!

4/15/20 2:56:17 PM PDT

Darlene Frohm **Privacy**

Everything okay? I am going to look at a site just for my own

4/15/20 2:57:16 PM PDT

Yes, trying to push to get the HPF grant approved
Okay you are not alone so let me know what I can do to help you.

Thank you, I'm not reaching out, just providing her name. I think they want to include a contact for the hospital. But thanks. I did want to ask—did we ever ask them for a 213RR after the fact?

Hi
Did you see Bruce email about locations

Yes, he sent that before I forwarded the list we are checking on. If all the ones on the list (minus Balboa which I took off already) are good it is 17 total (including SFGH)

Hello Ma'am, What can I take off your plate? I do not want you to feel overwhelmed

Thank you! I think the big thing is just finalizing that toilet list!

Just waiting on Jonathan to confirm his locations. Not sure 16th Market nor Haight-Ashbury (residential) will be good locations. I had Jonathan double check after me 😈

Ok sounds good!

Do you want to cancel 1:00 unless you have topics?

Are you on phone?

Sorry, I thought we could regroup on the toilets at 1, but not essential

Okay we can
Darlene Frohm: Did you get your two addresses? Need to requests permits?

Darlene Frohm: Never mind my apologies missed your email

Darlene Frohm: Are you available?

Darlene Frohm: Ma'am,
You are never a bother to me. One day you will get it. But yes they have two shifts and they are not 24/7. I was told two separate shifts so I'm waiting to hear from the folks at General. Should be one person per shift

Darlene Frohm: Ok, so 4 total for the two sites. Perfect! Thank you. Let me know as soon as you get schedule information

Darlene Frohm: Hi,
This is what general sent as their shifts:

Building 25 entrance (2 non-ADA and 1 ADA) 3 portable toilets 6am - 8pm every day

New location: B80/B90 (1 non-ADA and 1 ADA) 2 portable toilets and a sink
1 FTE M-F 6am - 12pm, Saturday 8am-5pm
1 FTE 12pm-8pm

Darlene Frohm: On a BUF meeting

Darlene Frohm: Okay
Okay Ma'am, 
You pay these folks an awful lot of money to not think!!!! 
I am heading to 939 Ellis again, no signs and a possible fire. So maybe 
they burned the signs. It it is one of the deliveries for tomorrow😊

4/24/20 11:02:08 AM PDT

Yes Ma'am

4/24/20 11:05:20 AM PDT

Alaric is asking about servicing of that handwashing station in the TL, did 
we confirm it got water? (If not can we?)

4/24/20 2:27:05 PM PDT

Do you have the location?

4/24/20 2:29:50 PM PDT

United will fill handwashing station at Ellis & Taylor Street.

Thank you!

4/24/20 2:32:32 PM PDT

Anytime

4/25/20 8:17:20 AM PDT

Good morning Ma'am, 
I am working on getting a unit to the school. Or have you made the call

4/25/20 8:20:40 AM PDT

I have not, thank you.

4/25/20 8:43:04 AM PDT

Can you call United and ask them to service that existing porta potty at 
Garfield? I don't think we should service their unit. (Right?)
4/25/20 8:47:16 AM PDT
Darlene Frohm Privacy
I thought that was that a national unit not United

4/25/20 8:47:49 AM PDT
Darlene Frohm Privacy
Just so I'm clear we do not need to send a unit period?

4/25/20 8:49:13 AM PDT
The one we delivered today is National. There was an existing porta potty not ours, but it needs service. I believe that is United. But correct we don't need to send one of our units

4/25/20 8:49:35 AM PDT

4/25/20 8:49:47 AM PDT
Darlene Frohm Privacy
Got it calling now

4/25/20 8:50:03 AM PDT
Thank you, ma'am!

4/25/20 10:32:30 AM PDT
Darlene Frohm Privacy
You are most welcomed!!

4/25/20 11:10:17 AM PDT
Sorry, were you able to reach United?

4/25/20 11:11:27 AM PDT
Darlene Frohm Privacy
Yes they are going out there. I was waiting to the text it was done

4/25/20 11:14:47 AM PDT
Darlene Frohm Privacy
Double checking now

4/25/20 11:15:44 AM PDT
Perfect

4/25/20 11:16:15 AM PDT
Darlene Frohm Privacy
Service person just text it was done

4/25/20 11:18:43 AM PDT
Thank you. Just wanted to confirm

4/25/20 11:21:12 AM PDT
Darlene Frohm Privacy
Thanks!

4/25/20 11:22:53 AM PDT
Darlene Frohm Privacy
Welcome!
Still on my 8:25 call.

Okay sorry I missed your call.

No worries. I was trying to get in the building--of all days, I forgot my key card!

Oh no.

What about your key?

It doesn't work on gates. I called radio room, they let me in. I just have to have a backup plan if I leave the building!

At your door May I get your key?

So bill and I can check.

Lighting for some 24/7 pit stop?

Right, I was supposed to ask JLM.

Larsh & Van Ness is pitch black at night

I'm emailing her now.

Who is supposed to be monitoring the new unit at Hyde and Fulton? It is here and getting a ton of use but no monitor.

I'd that Asian art museum?
4/28/20 8:21:31 AM PDT
Darlene Frohm Privacy
Is that Asian art

4/28/20 8:23:30 AM PDT
Darlene Frohm Privacy
I’m calling now

4/28/20 8:23:41 AM PDT

4/28/20 8:23:57 AM PDT
He’s here

4/28/20 8:24:16 AM PDT
Blended in too well with the population

4/28/20 8:27:58 AM PDT
Darlene Frohm Privacy
Thank you for making me laugh. See I told you!!!

4/28/20 8:40:58 AM PDT
The supervisor was here too and gave him some supplies

4/28/20 8:41:33 AM PDT
First hour and we are still just on Fulton!

4/28/20 8:42:48 AM PDT
Darlene Frohm Privacy
Oh boy may be a long day

4/28/20 8:44:33 AM PDT
Yes, I will come back after my training and relieve you. I’m sure it will still be going on!

4/28/20 9:03:46 AM PDT
Darlene Frohm Privacy
You will text me when you want me to head there right?

4/28/20 9:04:04 AM PDT
Sure. If you can plan to be nearby at 10:30, I’ll text you where we are.

4/28/20 10:16:16 AM PDT
Darlene Frohm Privacy
Okay

4/28/20 10:17:05 AM PDT
Can you come to Larkin heading n from golden gate

4/28/20 10:17:08 AM PDT
Darlene Frohm Privacy
On my way
4/26/20 10:25:45 AM PDT

Now on Turk at Hyde

4/26/20 10:29:52 AM PDT

Darlene Frohm Privacy

On Turk just parked

4/26/20 10:30:27 AM PDT

Ok I'm on Hyde and Turk walking down Hyde to golden gate

4/26/20 10:30:50 AM PDT

4/26/20 10:31:16 AM PDT

Darlene Frohm Privacy

Walking up Turk from GG

4/26/20 11:40:42 AM PDT

McAllister

4/26/20 11:41:10 AM PDT

Darlene Frohm Privacy

Ma'am,
Done walking back to my car

4/26/20 2:22:35 PM PDT

Thank you so much for covering for me!

4/26/20 3:37:33 PM PDT

Darlene Frohm Privacy

Ma'am,
Anything and anytime I am there for you. REALLY!!! Whatever you need.

4/26/20 3:37:39 PM PDT

What is the exact number of normal pit stops? I thought 27.

4/26/20 3:40:08 PM PDT

Report says 24

4/26/20 3:41:02 PM PDT

Darlene Frohm Privacy

Unfortunately I have not seen that report? This number cannot include the COVID-19?

4/26/20 3:44:01 PM PDT

No, just asking about original. They just sent report I'll forward. But they are saying 24 original and I was thinking 27 original

4/26/20 3:44:41 PM PDT

Darlene Frohm Privacy

It's 24 per Jonathan
4/28/20 3:44:25 PM PDT

Ok. Thanks. I don't know why I had 27 in my head.

4/29/20 10:58:14 AM PDT

Darlene Frohm Privacy

Hi,
Should DOC complete 213RR or Darlene FA? It should be the same as with restrooms right?

4/29/20 11:10:34 AM PDT

If an internal request? I think just copy restroom process which would be Darlene FA.

4/30/20 8:26:43 AM PDT

On my 8:15 call

4/30/20 8:44:33 AM PDT

Darlene Frohm Privacy

Do you know anything about units being removed
25th Harrison
3100 26th
3125 Cesar Chavez

4/30/20 8:46:43 AM PDT

Harrison is the Garfield Park those were only supposed to be through Tues, possibly 26th as well. The Chavez may be for Flynn. Are any of those sites on our list?

4/30/20 8:49:39 AM PDT

Darlene Frohm Privacy

I just left Willow side of 939 Ellis
Major construction across street tents on both sides, do you still want it moved there?

4/30/20 8:51:16 AM PDT

Construction on Willow? That is new. The tents were there, that's why I thought it would be good. If we don't move it we should somehow notify those tents that there is a toilet around the corner

4/30/20 8:59:37 AM PDT

Darlene Frohm Privacy

Major construction.
I thought the same. If we move we will need to do permits but it won't happen for removal tomorrow

5/1/20 8:10:52 AM PDT

So I woke up in the middle of the night with a little congestion and a headache. (Also having a scary dream). I feel better now but I'm a little spooked! I think I should stay home and be sure this is nothing. 😶

5/1/20 6:50:40 AM PDT

Darlene Frohm Privacy

Good morning Ma'am,
I'm rubbing off on you😊. But I understand. Relax
Thank you. Since I'm always yelling at people for coming to work sick, I thought I should stay home. But I can't stop thinking that the TL gave me COVID!

Darlene Frohm

I would agree if you got but we know you don't but it would come from the TL 😞

Darlene Frohm

Hi Ma'am,
Not sure but who is representing Operations at the Pit Stop meeting today?

Darlene Frohm

The hearing? I am. The meeting at the yard, you are. (Is that ok?)

Darlene Frohm

No that's great would it be possible to get the agenda I would like to listen?

For sure. I'll send

Darlene Frohm

They (the board) didn't want us to forward the teams invite, so I also sent you the link to watch and listen in.

Darlene Frohm

I saw that and thank you

Darlene Frohm

Did you know that South Van Ness and Cesar Chavez was closed?

Darlene Frohm

Those are monitored by JC Decaux and not by Public Works.
5/1/20 11:23:55 AM PDT

In the hearing Haney said it was broken. We should get on Decaux to fix that one!

5/1/20 11:25:40 AM PDT

Darlene Frohm Privacy

I will see how that works I heard that and was shocked. I need to check who the party's are with those units. And rec n park should we be responsible

5/1/20 11:28:09 AM PDT

No, definitely not for those!

5/1/20 11:26:37 AM PDT

But Decaux is our contract. I don't know if it is still technically managed by BSM? It used to be

5/1/20 1:21:31 PM PDT

Darlene Frohm Privacy

Just sent you and Jonathan an email. Can we have a quick call at 1:30? To talk about pit stop follow up from hearing?

5/1/20 1:26:09 PM PDT

Okay

5/4/20 7:17:16 AM PDT

Darlene Frohm Privacy

Good morning Ma'am, I hope you are feeling better.
Double checking if you approved OT for Rachel Penwell-Williams 4 hours at the EOC

5/5/20 4:24:59 PM PDT

Darlene Frohm Privacy

Just copied you on an email. Apparently Warren promised DPH he would give them a hand washing station for Caledonia (which has 2 positive COVID individuals staying there.). I don't know where he is planning to get one, they are hard to find right now and even the ones we thought we had on hold are gone. I hope he didn't over promise. Anyway, can you follow up with him in the morning to see if we can pull this off?

5/5/20 6:20:08 PM PDT

Darlene Frohm Privacy

Yes Ma'am, I think once again folks don't understand their roles. I'm looking into it now. I will text you once resolved😊

5/5/20 6:57:54 PM PDT

Darlene Frohm Privacy

Ok. He did reply to the email, you saw, I'm sure

5/5/20 6:58:07 PM PDT

Thank you for your help with this!
5/5/20 6:58:52 PM PDT
Darlene Frohm Privacy
You are welcomed now go enjoy your night off

5/7/20 2:48:49 PM PDT
Darlene Frohm Privacy
Ma'am are you on a call?

5/7/20 2:49:12 PM PDT

5/7/20 2:49:30 PM PDT

5/8/20 9:04:54 AM PDT
Darlene Frohm Privacy
Okie dokiee

5/8/20 9:28:09 AM PDT

5/8/20 9:28:31 AM PDT

5/11/20 11:25:15 AM PDT
Darlene Frohm Privacy
I’ll come see you as soon as we are done e

5/11/20 11:30:55 AM PDT

5/11/20 6:18:41 PM PDT

5/11/20 8:15:53 PM PDT
Hi Ma'am,
Would you kindly send me the final list of new locations after Lena's and Alaric's conversation

5/11/20 8:23:23 PM PDT
I didn’t confirm with Larry if he wanted to just add the two sites or switch two. She was asking for the UN Plaza and the Grove and Larkin since they are also doing Fulton St safe sleeping site. I'd say just add those to her list, but I meant to ask Larry if that was also his thinking, or take two others away?

5/11/20 8:23:23 PM PDT
Darlene Frohm Privacy
Hi Ma'am,
Per Alaric's conversation with Lena Saturday, Larry said to just switch two out. I'll confirm in the am.
Thank you
Ok. But I thought we were trying to stick with UA doing all the mobile so if we switch then HPF or MNC will have 2 mobile...

Sorry I’m not much help! (I came by your office today but you weren’t there! Strange not seeing you at all today 😞)

You are a bunch of help. Oh my goodness!!! Since no Larry, I had to do another TL assessment walk that was 2 hours long and don’t ask me what the result was. Again no Public Health person. The place by the library, all those folks NO MASKS!!!! I don’t know what Wednesday is going to look like but they were up to 93 tents for this location. Okay I’ll let you go to bed. But I miss our chats!!

Me too! Oh wow, you had quite a day. This afternoon in the safe sleeping site call they finally acknowledged that they need security! And apparently both PD and the sheriff are now refusing to do it! Oh boy. You know I’m happy to help out if you need me, right?

Yes Jeff was talking up UA and PD was not having it. Between PD and Sheriff’s there must have been 8 staff

Wow. Jeff is so oblivious!

Totally clueless I heard him say multiples that he didn’t care where the homeless land and I mentioned to him you know that’s not something you should keep saying out loud.

Seriously?! I can’t believe he said that!

Plus he was expecting Alaric to manage the walk but he was there.

He is the worst!

I agree

Ok, bedtime. Have a good night. I’ll try to catch you tomorrow
5/11/20 8:40:46 PM PDT
Darlene Frohm: Privacy
Good night

5/12/20 2:34:22 PM PDT
Darlene Frohm: Privacy
Larry is going to include Alaric we shall see how that goes

5/12/20 2:35:22 PM PDT
Also, Bruce may not have heard of the additional sites, but Julia definitely did. We talked about it on one of our deputy calls

5/12/20 2:36:04 PM PDT
Darlene Frohm: Privacy
Funny, all the sites are on his list

5/13/20 4:30:20 PM PDT
Darlene Frohm: Privacy
What am I missing??

5/13/20 4:36:16 PM PDT
Oh you are here! Good. Didn't we say at the beginning exactly what Bruce then said, you know what we can do...

5/13/20 4:36:41 PM PDT
Darlene Frohm: Privacy
Yes Ma'am

5/13/20 4:37:45 PM PDT
Fascinating- did you hear the part that we need to review the new RFP by early next week?

5/13/20 4:38:05 PM PDT
And that Jonathan supposedly told Aaron the current scope of work was good?!

5/13/20 4:38:51 PM PDT
Darlene Frohm: Privacy
Yes and I almost fell on my face
That's not correct they are talking about the first one. I know for a fact I haven't seen the new one

5/13/20 4:39:28 PM PDT
Ok, well he just sent it, so let's get all our needs in there this time around so we get better service!!!

5/13/20 5:09:05 PM PDT
Darlene Frohm: Privacy
HPF already signed and sent back to finance. Go figure

5/13/20 5:28:42 PM PDT
I think that was just the first mod.
5/13/20 5:28:50 PM PDT

But who knows?!

5/13/20 5:32:49 PM PDT

Darlene Frohm Privacy

No Ma'am,
Bruce just sent me an email asking for them to reroute to HPF to sign for tomorrow. As long as it gets sign I hope

5/13/20 5:33:26 PM PDT

Oh good!

5/15/20 9:32:59 AM PDT

Darlene Frohm Privacy

Hello Ma'am,
21st & Folsom we said no was that due to potential safe sleeping site? Extending to 24 hours?

5/15/20 9:34:05 AM PDT

No, not safe sleeping was it because Park is there?

5/15/20 9:34:15 AM PDT

I'll try to look at my notes

5/15/20 9:37:22 AM PDT

I think because near Jose Coronado Park

5/15/20 9:37:52 AM PDT

The idea was we should get rec/park to open their bathrooms

5/15/20 9:38:26 AM PDT

Darlene Frohm Privacy

Yes Ma'am,
That was it!! Thank you
Are you feeling okay?

5/15/20 9:39:26 AM PDT

Feel fine, thanks. I am just all in the head about this test!

5/15/20 9:45:48 AM PDT

Darlene Frohm Privacy

You are okay, just a formality😊

5/15/20 9:46:16 AM PDT

Yes. Deep breaths

5/15/20 4:26:59 PM PDT

Darlene Frohm Privacy

Oh my goodness!!! Just finished another 2.5 hour assessment walk of the alleys!!!!
I hope you are feeling better..
Have a great weekend
5/15/20 4:28:40 PM PDT
Argh. Who is organizing those assessments? I feel fine. I don't have my results and my mind is still playing tricks. But all in all fine. You have a good weekend!

5/15/20 4:31:07 PM PDT
Darlene Frohm
Privacy
Same folks but Sam People's was the lead.
Thank you I will try getting to change clothes and head to parking lot.
So now you know it's your mind playing tricks, you can handle that. But I do understand 😊

5/15/20 4:31:52 PM PDT
Privacy
Yes, and you need to be taking extra precaution since you were in the TL!

5/16/20 1:30:00 PM PDT
Darlene Frohm
Privacy
Hello Ma'am,
I hope you are feeling okay. Just wanted to check on you.

5/16/20 1:31:07 PM PDT
Privacy
Thank you for checking. Not results yet but I got an email last night saying should have them by 8pm today. But I am feeling fine! Thanks!

5/16/20 1:32:59 PM PDT
Darlene Frohm
Privacy
Great!!!

5/16/20 1:32:59 PM PDT
Privacy
Personnel Records - CA Govt Code
Secs 6254(c), 6254(k); CA Const., Art I, Sec 1
My brain playing tricks, as you said from the beginning. Thanks for your support!

5/16/20 4:13:03 PM PDT
Darlene Frohm
Privacy
CELEBRATION!!!!

5/16/20 4:13:45 PM PDT
Privacy

5/20/20 10:55:37 AM PDT
Darlene Frohm
Privacy
Hi,
Are you okay with extending Patty until June 30th? DOC

5/20/20 10:56:02 AM PDT
Privacy
Yep

5/21/20 12:00:08 PM PDT
Privacy
Just finishing up a call
5/21/20 12:00:13 PM PDT

I will call you in a few.

5/21/20 12:00:33 PM PDT

Okie dokee
Thank you

6/2/20 3:22:56 PM PDT

Made it home no issues- you?

6/2/20 3:37:30 PM PDT

That's good. I just made it home and no issues here!! Well it's 100 but I'll survive.

6/2/20 3:38:11 PM PDT

Sheesh! Have some iced tea and put your feet up!

6/2/20 3:50:10 PM PDT

Good idea thank you

6/2/20 3:51:00 PM PDT

6/17/20 11:41:45 AM PDT

Are you around? Bag and tag guy was told to meet with Allison and he's uncomfortable

6/17/20 11:42:04 AM PDT

I'm on a call with City Attorney so can't be available now.

6/17/20 2:21:46 PM PDT

My apologies for delay, Jason (HR) was there

6/17/20 2:28:36 PM PDT

No worries. Mario was texting me while I was on call with City Attorney.

Personnel Records - CA Govt Code Secs 6254(c), 6254(k); CA Const., Art I, Sec 1

7/2/20 6:15:53 AM PDT

I'm not coming in today after all even worse. I don't think there's any way I can drive. Argh! So frustrating. I think the pit stop stuff can wait till next week. Hope you have a great long weekend. Hopefully I will be more mobile next week!
7/2/20 6:45:43 AM PDT

Darlene Frohm  Privacy

Good morning. Oh no!!! Take it very slow. I hope you have a great weekend as well.

7/2/20 6:46:16 AM PDT

Thanks. Getting old is the worst!

7/2/20 8:26:51 AM PDT

Darlene Frohm  Privacy

Oh stop it. You are a young whipersnapper!!!

7/17/20 4:38:04 PM PDT

I grabbed another thermometer from your box for Jada to use Monday morning. She’s going to do BUF’s first shift.

8/3/20 2:56:54 PM PDT

Darlene Frohm  Privacy

https://www.marinatimes.com/2020/07/the-city-family-is-a-machiavellian-tragedy/

8/3/20 3:00:10 PM PDT

https://missionlocal.org/2020/07/nuru-jcdecaux-toilet-san-francisco/

8/3/20 3:05:53 PM PDT

Darlene Frohm  Privacy

Thank you for sharing!!

8/3/20 3:06:06 PM PDT

8/6/20 11:11:30 AM PDT

This is nuts!

Nothing urgent, I just got on another call. I was going to see if you could help Joseph with moving Colm’s computer, but I talked to Joseph and he said he is clear on it and can do it. So we are ok.

8/6/20 11:12:34 AM PDT

Darlene Frohm  Privacy

Thank you, Real crazy morning

8/6/20 11:12:51 AM PDT

8/28/20 2:34:59 PM PDT

Darlene Frohm  Privacy

Did Solomon get his new position? He was thanking me profusely today for looking out for him...😊😢

8/28/20 2:35:49 PM PDT

Darlene Frohm  Privacy

No Ma’am, It’s stuck in the mayors budget.
8/28/20 2:38:04 PM PDT
Darlene Frohm Privacy
Knows Larry is leaving and you will be in charge.

8/28/20 2:38:11 PM PDT
Oh. It seemed like he knew something was in the works.

8/28/20 2:39:13 PM PDT
Did Jonathan tell her his job was at risk or what was that?! One big Jonathan promotion session 😅

8/28/20 2:30:44 PM PDT
Darlene Frohm Privacy
Probably!!! This was definitely his show

9/28/20 2:31:07 PM PDT
No kidding! It was not very smooth!

9/28/20 2:31:12 PM PDT

9/28/20 2:31:44 PM PDT

Personnel Records - CA Govt Code Secs 6254(c), 6254(k); CA Const., Art I, Sec 1

9/29/20 2:33:05 PM PDT

9/29/20 6:30:05 AM PDT
Anna got in my head last night and I’m going to go for a test today. I had sore muscles and now I’m scared!

9/29/20 7:06:39 AM PDT
Darlene Frohm Privacy
Oh no!!! You are okay but better safe than sorry especially for the mind...

9/29/20 7:50:54 AM PDT
Yes, thanks! I was able to get a test at 1:30 today- but that was the only option! 😊

9/29/20 7:51:31 AM PDT
Darlene Frohm Privacy
Do what you need to. Put your mind at ease.
9/29/20 8:01:35 AM PDT
Personnel Records - CA Govt Code Secs 6254(c), 6254(k); CA Const., Art I, Sec 1

9/29/20 12:22:19 PM PDT
Personnel Records - CA Govt Code Secs 6254(c), 6254(k); CA Const., Art I, Sec 1

9/29/20 12:25:35 PM PDT
Personnel Records - CA Govt Code Secs 6254(c), 6254(k); CA Const., Art I, Sec 1

9/29/20 12:26:08 PM PDT
Ugh! What was the outcome? Personnel Records - CA Govt Code Secs 6254(c), 6254(k); CA Const., Art I, Sec 1

9/29/20 3:06:11 PM PDT
Personnel Records - CA Govt Code Secs 6254(c), 6254(k); CA Const., Art I, Sec 1

9/29/20 3:06:30 PM PDT
Personnel Records - CA Govt Code Secs 6254(c), 6254(k); CA Const., Art I, Sec 1

9/29/20 3:07:08 PM PDT
Personnel Records - CA Govt Code Secs 6254(c), 6254(k); CA Const., Art I, Sec 1

9/29/20 3:07:15 PM PDT
Personnel Records - CA Govt Code Secs 6254(c), 6254(k); CA Const., Art I, Sec 1

9/29/20 3:52:05 PM PDT
Personnel Records - CA Govt Code Secs 6254(c), 6254(k); CA Const., Art I, Sec 1

10/2/20 12:15:51 PM PDT
I'm glad you are in this call, but you're supposed to be off today!

10/2/20 12:44:21 PM PDT
THANK YOU MA'AM!!!

10/2/20 12:49:10 PM PDT
The documentation is there.

10/2/20 12:50:49 PM PDT
I know. Crazy making.
I'm on with deputies call, I will call you when we hang up.

I am driving back from a field meeting so will join by phone at first, and then when I get back I can log into computer.

Please chime in, it's not Rachel!!!! And definitely not Sam

Liked "Please chime in, it's not Rachel!!!! And definitely not Sam"

It's not their call
Totally distracting operations also these are for no toilet areas

Disrespecting not distracting
This is not their call

We need to know where managing for Pit Stop will be. Reporting is fine and I get that but these other folks are a slap in the face. If they let us run the program I'm I missing something?

It stays with Ops!

What about some of these were put in place at the request of the supervisor?

Right. Good point.

Outreach was agreed that Communications would do outreach. Always been her group, but she's right they did not go out

Are you ok with Sam doing it?
10/7/20 12:11 PM PDT

Darlene Frohm  Privacy

YES!!!!

10/7/20 12:11:51 PM PDT

Ok. I was about to chime in but when she said Sam, I shut myself up!

10/7/20 12:14:34 PM PDT

Darlene Frohm  Privacy

Your turn Ma’am

10/7/20 12:16:32 PM PDT

Darlene Frohm  Privacy

Public restrooms access

10/7/20 12:16:49 PM PDT

Yep. Just waiting for a moment to jump in!

10/7/20 12:18:25 PM PDT

10/7/20 12:20:00 PM PDT

Darlene Frohm  Privacy

Not just encampments

10/7/20 12:28:34 PM PDT

Darlene Frohm  Privacy

You can represent operations pit stop with controllers office not finance/ accounting

10/7/20 12:44:07 PM PDT

Darlene Frohm  Privacy

Her face shows her displeasure

10/7/20 12:54:51 PM PDT

Darlene Frohm  Privacy

That is nothing new. They were suppose to work with us to make sure we are all on the same page.

10/7/20 12:59:38 PM PDT

Darlene Frohm  Privacy

Here we go with the Sam Dodge!! Should not happen

10/7/20 1:00:11 PM PDT

Darlene Frohm  Privacy

Julia has been pushing this for months. Way before he even came back. He does not have operations, this is the Kimberly issue all over again

10/7/20 1:01:16 PM PDT

Yeah.

10/7/20 1:01:16 PM PDT

I’d we can flesh out the org chart and get clear job duties, it will be clear that we don’t need that job over this group. (But she may still push to get move that position to Sam!)
She should not be allowed to put people in your spots. Once again interference.

I know! I was trying not to even have her on this call. But...

I also asked him why is she a part of the call? We don't interfere with accounting/finance, still not fair.

I think I need you to let me into my office- can't find my keys, I'm just leaving home. I'll come find you when I get there!

Good morning
Okay

Is personnel still on this am

Yes

Mario is here checking

Oh, ok. Yes it is on at 9. I'm on an IT call till 9

Hi,
Did you speak with Jonathan Goldberg?

Good job!!
10/8/20 9:50:35 AM PDT
Darlene Frohm Privacy
Yes, I only bring it up because Alaric said you were going to talk with him.

10/8/20 9:51:39 AM PDT
Oh he did? Last I talked to Alaric I wasn’t clear. (I thought he was still deciding if he would). I can if needed.

10/8/20 9:58:19 AM PDT
Darlene Frohm Privacy
Just sent an email that I will bring up due to they have not responded from Monday

10/8/20 9:59:41 AM PDT
Darlene Frohm Privacy
Also, Larry was fine with releasing Personnel Records - Ca. I guess tomorrow?

10/8/20 10:01:10 AM PDT
Ah, ok! Good.

10/8/20 10:01:12 AM PDT
Sure!

10/8/20 10:03:40 AM PDT
Just got the email. Yes, definitely bring that up!

10/8/20 10:06:26 AM PDT
Darlene Frohm Privacy
You are DDO not Superintendent! Stop it!!

10/8/20 10:08:42 AM PDT
Laughed at "You are DDO not Superintendent! Stop it!!"

10/8/20 10:25:44 AM PDT
Darlene Frohm Privacy
I brought up timeclocks two years ago, I was told it was to costly

10/8/20 10:26:01 AM PDT
Darlene Frohm Privacy
OnE team needs it as well

10/8/20 10:26:13 AM PDT
I think that is because they are trying to make it too complicated!

10/8/20 10:26:18 AM PDT
Just a simple clock

10/8/20 10:26:28 AM PDT
Darlene Frohm Privacy
Yes!!!
Hi,
Will you be staying on this call?

Till 4:30ish

Okay I'll hang in

Sorry!

It's okay

Very well done!

Why thank you

News cans should be graffiti repellent right?

There will be prototypes made of each type and they will be tested in several neighborhoods

And yes all will be graffiti repellent

I think oval

I'm going to have to jump off now. Exactly right.

They are all designed for a minimum capacity.
10/8/20 4:48:31 PM PDT
Yes, there is a whole committee to evaluate these, not just the GAB.

10/8/20 4:49:04 PM PDT
You got it! I just hopped off. Thanks for covering!

10/8/20 4:50:23 PM PDT

10/8/20 4:50:41 PM PDT

10/9/20 12:24:23 PM PDT

10/9/20 12:34:14 PM PDT
They will only be able to know if this is happening if and when an employee complains to OLSE, this should not be holding up payment.

10/9/20 12:43:59 PM PDT

10/9/20 12:50:28 PM PDT
Please!

10/9/20 12:50:28 PM PDT
This is crazy!!! What are they doing at home!!!! Do they actually wait until these calls to do some work????

10/9/20 12:56:28 PM PDT
It seems like it. I am tearing out my hair with these payments. Every time I ask they bring up some new issue- but never until we ask!!!

10/9/20 12:57:03 PM PDT
I assume I should approve the UA amendment for the TL litter reduction grant?

10/9/20 12:58:35 PM PDT

10/9/20 1:24:40 PM PDT
This is our frustration for quite some time

10/9/20 1:24:40 PM PDT

10/9/20 1:25:03 PM PDT
I know. And then they act so self righteous about their “verifying” things- they haven’t done that for 10 months, but now suddenly they are using a fine tooth comb?!

10/9/20 1:28:37 PM PDT
Should I sign the TL Clean amendment?

10/9/20 1:28:37 PM PDT

10/9/20 1:28:37 PM PDT
Yes Ma’am on TL
Good morning
My apologies. Would you kindly join this call.

Thank you. How is it 9am already?!

She's not correct. Roles are clear, her group

NO!!! She's wrong!! The vendors call them only because they are contacting them first

Step in they get their feel is hurt when I talk??

Ok.

I think they also will be upset with what I say

He's listening to them all over again. She's on the defense again. She keep saying that. What she is saying is wrong???

She's not listening to Bruce We have been asked for changes and we have added, now they want us to rewrite the scope to include the changes

No need to rewrite scope when it's an amendment

They have 6 folks and working g from home. That stuff is a part of contracts not PM

Not true
Bruce and Julia do not know what their accountants are asking. If they have to go to them first I think they will see some of the ridiculous questions we are getting.

They allowed him to do all that stuff. Again they gave 6 folks

Hello Ma'am, 
Just a reminder Superintendents call?

Ma'am, 
Would you like me to jump in the IT call?

Did Larry sign off on the Pit Stop contract? The latest description fro. Joy sounds like we are getting the weekend support and IT is paying.

Ok. Good. Did he actually sign it? Do you know? (I can ask Anna).

I can ask her but I don’t think so

We are looking now

Would it be DocuSign or the physical contract?
Darlene Frohm: We do not have the physical document from 09/22/2020

Darlene Frohm: Anna will scan and send to them tomorrow

Thank you!

Darlene Frohm: Hi
Be there in 10 minutes

Liked “Hi
Be there in 10 minutes”

Darlene Frohm: Hello Ma’am,
Personnel Records - CA Govt Code Secs 6254(c), 6254(k); CA Const., Art I, Sec 1

Thank you. Yes, I do.

I'll meet with him tomorrow afternoon. He should still be here at 3, right?

Darlene Frohm: Yes he should.

Ok. I'll be ready!

Darlene Frohm: You are funny 😊

I know this may be hard so I can do it if you like. You are the DDO and have a lot in your plate right now.
10/15/20 6:52:34 AM PDT

Darlene Frohm 📄

Good morning Ma'am. Call me when you have a moment. Thank you

10/15/20 9:09:03 AM PDT

Darlene Frohm 📄

Hi
Personnel Records - CA Govt Code Secs 6254(c), 6254(k); CA Const., Art I, Sec 1

10/15/20 9:09:41 AM PDT

Uh oh... on?
Personnel Records - CA Govt Code Secs 6254(c), 6254(k); CA Const., Art I, Sec 1

10/15/20 9:11:08 AM PDT

Darlene Frohm 📄

Personnel Records - CA Govt Code Secs 6254(c), 6254(k); CA Const., Art I, Sec 1

10/15/20 9:11:49 AM PDT

Darlene Frohm 📄

Personnel Records - CA Govt Code Secs 6254(c), 6254(k); CA Const., Art I, Sec 1 He would not elaborate

10/15/20 9:13:12 AM PDT

Darlene Frohm 📄

Oh right. Argh. Ok I want to try to talk to Peter - now I'm curious!

10/15/20 9:13:36 AM PDT

Yes Ma'am

10/15/20 9:14:22 AM PDT

Darlene Frohm 📄

That testing should have never been there. This should be moved forward ASAP

10/15/20 9:19:29 AM PDT

Darlene Frohm 📄

Two other 9922's Bag n tag & Pitstop other spot Should be

10/15/20 10:12:46 AM PDT

Darlene Frohm 📄

I think we should do now

10/15/20 10:14:11 AM PDT

Darlene Frohm 📄

Would you like me to be present?
I would love the moral support, if you don't mind. But if you're swamped, I can do it. Part of the job.

No I can be there.

Thank you. He said walking up in 3 minutes.

Yes, did Margaret tell you what he has available?

Would love for you to join if you can. But you are off, so up to you.

I'm never off. I didn't want to intrude.

Good morning Ma'am. My apologies. I should not have taken off. I will see if I can get down there. Somehow.

You don't need to come in, I will go down there!

This is fine.

Are you sure? I don't mind. I know you have a lot going on.
Darlene Frohm: Thank you.

Darlene Frohm: This is why you need to be in that meeting?

Darlene Frohm: They need to tell you who will be making the decision as to where these units need to be placed.

Darlene Frohm: Why wasn't Operations YOU in that meeting??

Darlene Frohm: The ultimate decision should be YOU. You are not getting all the information until a problem arises, like now.

Darlene Frohm: NO NO not HSOC.

Darlene Frohm: That's not our problem.

Darlene Frohm: YES.

Darlene Frohm: I am done. They don't listen.

I am done too. This is insanity.

Darlene Frohm: TOTAL INSANITY!!

Darlene Frohm: You are good.

I am muting myself so that I can SCREAM!!!
I know I am screaming as well. So at least we are on the same page.

Laughed at "I know I am screaming as well. So at least we are on the same page."

This is the problem they don’t ask all the questions.

This is crazy.

Deal with her please.

I had to hang up. This is the biggest waste of time.

I am so DONE! I know, they ask one question and then you answer it and they ask another and so on!!!

Sorry on this Zoom call.

No, we didn’t solve the banner thing. I like the idea of putting them up between buildings, but other option is putting them on Building B entrances.

What do you think? We should probably also do the SSR yard and the Arborists yard.

Okay, Just checking, was there any info regarding new PitStop requirements? Thought I’d ask before I send email to Julia & Bruce. If we are on hold with the bids??

I agree with you on buildings and yes to SSR & Arborist yard.

New info on PitStop: don’t think so, on hold with the bids?
I may have missed something

So are we moving forward with evaluating based on Friday's call that things were changing?

Oh right. I think we said we would move forward and get it in place in case things don't change. But before moving forward I think we would need to make clear to awardees that money might get yanked

I was just thinking, how about placing banners at pedestrian gates? Everyone should be coming through them right?

That is a good point. Yes! Like that solution. So probably the 6' makes sense, right?

Yes Ma'am, is it worth bringing up HSOC and who decides the moves and relocating pit stops?

Yep, good point.

WOW!! I didn't know we had a new safety person???

Yes, she transferred from DPH

Would be nice meet her. I'll walk over there. I know Mark didn't show up for our walk one Friday and I saw him with a lady but I thought there was something going on???

Ah! Yes, she seems nice and knowledgeable.

Still in the dark. Thank you for the additional information. Oh well. I'm going to work on these PitStop Bid evaluations
10/20/20 12:50:11 PM PDT
Can I vent for a moment? I don't want to be doing Larry's job, but it is not fair for him to come back and criticize the decisions I make when he is out. He needs to either retire or work- if he wants to work, great, I won't make any decisions and I will happily leave it all for him to deal with. And Bill saying he didn't know what was happening is also ridiculous!

Darlene Frohn  Privacy
10/20/20 1:27:29 PM PDT
I feel you it's a challenge and I feel for you. This is a major issue. I plan on having a conversation with Mr. Stringer. I am just venging also

10/20/20 1:33:22 PM PDT
I actually had a good chat with him. I told him o feel caught in the middle and I wouldn't have made that decision if I knew he would be back and wanting to make it. He acknowledged it wasn't really fair to challenge it like that. He also said he is meeting with retirement tomorrow and he promised to tell me what the decision will be, but he said maybe as soon as this Friday, or next week, but "not long"!

Darlene Frohn  Privacy
10/20/20 2:21:41 PM PDT
I guess it's just hard to let go.

10/20/20 4:30:03 PM PDT
I know it is. I was frustrated today but then he get bad, and then that made me feel bad!

10/21/20 10:20:58 AM PDT
Ma'am,
How are you today?? Just my two cents, change is always difficult. I deal with it everyday.
Siesta know you are doing a great job!!!

10/21/20 10:24:04 AM PDT
Thank you! I'm good. I'm glad I talked to Larry yesterday because I would have just been stewing! But that got it off my chest. Did you talk to him yesterday? Thanks for checking in!

Darlene Frohn  Privacy
10/21/20 10:25:38 AM PDT
Yes I did but nothing resolved. So everything will be left up to you until the new person. And then it will still be you as the new person will be on the dark.

10/21/20 10:28:48 AM PDT
Boo. Ok, well fee free to brief me on anything you need me to try to help resolve!

Darlene Frohn  Privacy
10/21/20 10:30:34 AM PDT
Thank you much appreciated!!
Darlene Frohm: Hi Ma'am, Before this call I was not going to share a note that I received but after listening to this call I would like to share with you some of the thoughts on this yard, "SF claim they are so anti racist, liberals, open to diversity, if you look at Department of Public Works, that's clearly not true, more lies".

10/23/20 10:09:22 AM PDT

I think you should share it! That is important perspective to hear from staff.

10/23/20 10:10:41 AM PDT

Darlene Frohm: You are welcomed to. I've been told that my comments will never be received well so stop talking. This is a very hurtful thing but you know it's so true and unfortunate.

10/23/20 10:16:51 AM PDT

I'll send it in the chat. I unmuted to chime in but right as I was about to talk Alaric said we had to move on.

10/23/20 10:20:21 AM PDT

Oh he mentioned Colm!

10/23/20 10:20:27 AM PDT

10/23/20 10:27:41 AM PDT

Darlene Frohm: I guess I missed the Colm. But as usual, he praises the wrong people. And that has been really bad for morale so I'm being told.

10/23/20 10:28:16 AM PDT

Hmmm. That is an important note.

10/23/20 10:28:43 AM PDT

He said Colm had been coming to work every day! (He also mentioned you and I).

10/23/20 10:30:03 AM PDT

That's not true.

10/23/20 10:30:13 AM PDT

I know!

10/23/20 10:34:04 AM PDT

Darlene Frohm: So we will be working with no vacation benefits.
Darlene Frohm Privacy
This is crazy!!! I am at 476

You need to take next week off!

Darlene Frohm Privacy
Ma'am,
You may have no staff and you talk about morale, I am getting calls and
texts 🙃. Also, Operations has been here since day one and for people
to work without accruing vacation is a total slap in the face. Just relaying
conversations I am hearing, also the Union

Absolutely! I hope they at least extend the timeline to use. This is
ridiculous!

Darlene Frohm Privacy
Well now you may have others jumping on board with the split!!!!

But this is DHR affects everyone not just us

Darlene Frohm Privacy
This is a major problem. Thank you for your input

They make me SO crazy.

Darlene Frohm Privacy
She is pushing for Sam and he is not helping

Darlene Frohm Privacy
He cannot be about reimbursement

Right. Not his job. But boy does Julia love him!

Darlene Frohm Privacy
Yes she is pushing for him 0933 Community Engagement spot
Larry told me yesterday. That is unacceptable. I like Sam but that is not the role.

I had a conversation with Alaric and asked him to get on the call for this reason.

Why is Sam Dodge on the Optional?

Optional for the meeting?

No Ma'am, I believe this may be a Julia insert?

Sorry, I'm confused. For the 0933? That is definitely a Julia insert. Larry said he did talk to Alaric yesterday but also wanted me to be on high alert.

Yes first Alaric told me there was no 0933 spot and then yesterday, the conversation came up to put Sam Dodge in Sandra's 0933 spot, so that drew a lot of silence and questions from Larry.

Jeez. The big point Larry made to me (and said he made to Alaric) was that no decisions about positions in Ops can be made without talking to the DDO.

Hi there, just thinking, you should probably take a vacation day tomorrow in case they don't extend the time to use it. Hopefully we get an extension tomorrow, but in case not...

Hello, I heard it may go to March 2021 or June 2021. I appreciate the thought but unfortunately there is so much uncertainty I'd like to be able to plan a little better. Thank you.

Ok. They did say they might extend and we should know tomorrow, but I don't want you to lose out on even more time if they don't!
Bill is having computer issues and will call by phone.

Thanks!

I am able to approve those as well but I didn’t want to overstep?

Ah, good to know.

Sorry on a meeting.

Okay, Did you say you have files from Jonathan Goldberg in your office? We are trying to get these Letters of support done. Thank you.

All I have are some “sensitive GBD” files. But I know of Peru Steps and DeHaro project. I do have some concerns about Peru project- they are proposing to remove 12 trees and we don’t support that/ so we need the letter to say that we support the project but they still need to work with them on tree removals.

I can help review/write letters if needed.

Hello Ma’am, If you need me to assist with your meetings, let me know. I am here to help you.

Thank you.

Am I calling you or you calling me?

Calling you now.

Do you have Mario’s sheet?
10/29/20 9:13:59 AM PDT
Yes, just got it from Anna

10/29/20 9:14:24 AM PDT
So did I. Thank you

10/29/20 9:27:13 AM PDT
We met with Local 38 2 years ago on this. And they were onboard and BBR

10/29/20 9:49:11 AM PDT
What is that 1842 for community engagement?

10/29/20 9:49:50 AM PDT
That's a Julia she claims she wanted to keep it there?

10/29/20 9:50:02 AM PDT
?

10/29/20 9:50:07 AM PDT
Ok I'll ask.

10/29/20 9:50:33 AM PDT
Every week I've asked

10/29/20 9:51:09 AM PDT
It's not operations for sure

10/29/20 9:52:34 AM PDT
Your turn Ma'am😊

10/29/20 9:53:02 AM PDT
Yes, I'm trying to jump in!

10/29/20 10:06:20 AM PDT
He needs to stop!!! They were at the meeting and understood. It may not be the response they expected

10/29/20 10:07:10 AM PDT
This is from peter

Yes. DT had replaced the equipment, but staff were still concerned for their safety. I asked Eric to have DT come back out and take readings to show that the EMF levels were actually lowered.
Darlene Frohm: So penalize the staff

Darlene Frohm: Hi,
Peter brought this to me and below was my recommendation:

Personnel Records - CA Govt Code Secs 6254(c), 6254(k); CA Const., Art I, Sec 1

Darlene Frohm: Are we really going to go over everything before Larry left?? This was a done deal?? Ma’am am I missing something

Darlene Frohm: Not sure if you didn’t see this. This is from peter

Personnel Records - CA Govt Code Secs 6254(c), 6254(k); CA Const., Art I, Sec 1

Darlene Frohm: They are asking for monitors to report if there are tents that show up. Can that happen?

Darlene Frohm: No this is not the monitors job
They will not report on tents. We cannot have them doing this
Darlene Frohm: This is the problem

Darlene Frohm: They agreed their outreach team would do this.

Darlene Frohm: The app will be how they report from future, right?

Darlene Frohm: Yes Ma'am,

Darlene Frohm: Are you in a meeting?

Darlene Frohm: Just got out

Darlene Frohm: Ma'am, PitStop is not just COVID, but staff and other people using the units. You should be at that meeting

Darlene Frohm: If units are removed or relocated the vendor still needs to be paid whether reimbursed or not

Darlene Frohm: That's not what was agreed

Darlene Frohm: Which part, the advisory group?

Darlene Frohm: If there are shared spots, they are supposed to provide units in that contract

Darlene Frohm: Ah, good to know.
Darlene Frohm: No that's not correct. Methdone parking lot is new one.

Darlene Frohm: Should be 26 now.

Darlene Frohm: That's okay I am still trying to be helpful.

Darlene Frohm: Would you ask status for CYC's.

Darlene Frohm: That's on contract admins side not operations or pm.

Darlene Frohm: This is part of the issue with the payment.

Darlene Frohm: Ma'am, Leaving downtown. Just my two cents, but we need to have PitStops throughout the City whether reimbursed or not. Have a great weekend.

Darlene Frohm: Thank you, sorry was doing a presentation when you texted so couldn’t reply. That is good information, and would like your perspective on where! I agree we can’t be driven just by reimbursement concerns!

Darlene Frohm: And Nancy Wong.

Darlene Frohm: Oh yeah. Forgot about Nancy!
We talked about either PitStop, equipment, and final was Fix it. This was done already, but it seems they are changing.

For the cuts?

Yes Ma'am,
I went over this budget with Larry months ago

Ok, thanks- you can brief me.

Yes, let me go through my notes. I believe there was another program we talked about, so let me check. 😊 This is the challenge, the last minute stuff

Thank you! Your knowledge and history is so essential!

I'm trying.

Good morning Ma'am,
I have a meeting with Alaric at 9

Ok. Any idea what it is about? Need any support?

Well I was going to ask you to join but I thought I'd give it a shot alone. Thank you for asking I'll be good

I'm happy to join if you want. But I'm sure you are good- but let me know if you need anything.

How was the 9am ok?

Ok thank you for asking
Darlene Frohm: Privacy

Real issues with locating stand-alone hand-washing units, splitting up with HPF to confirm their sites verses what’s on our spreadsheet. Will let you know outcome in am. Also, did you get any update on the reviewing of the invoice?

Darlene Frohm: Privacy

Ma’am,
Leaving 2nd site no unit. I think we may need HSH/United to provide a list of what they may be billing us

Darlene Frohm: Privacy

3rd site no unit

Darlene Frohm: Privacy

We only located 8 sites

Darlene Frohm: Privacy

Today

So looking back at that email, there were three sites that United also mentioned were missing: 15th & Julian, Florida & 17th and 224 S Van Ness. They also said 125 Bayshore was not accessible for service. Were the 8 in reasonable shape?

Darlene Frohm: Privacy

BTW, Sam Dodge said he has time tomorrow to help with anything needed for Pit Stop relocations- I take that to mean we could also ask him to help find these hand washing stations! Let me know if you want to put him to work.

Darlene Frohm: Privacy

No worries just checking g if you were off

Darlene Frohm: Privacy

Just checking are you on your 1:00 call?
Ma'am,
This is going on WAY too long and they need to honor your request and Larry's

TWO YEARS!!

The conversations that staff feels there is no confidentiality in SSR and HR?

Yes and the folks on previous call

Ah right.

Speaking of Coach Q, Julia has pushed back on funding, can you bring this up with Alaric. We were told it was a go then no go??

I hid it in the budget- I think we have it. I'll check
11/5/20 10:51:14 AM PST
Exactly. He is like the Ramses of BBR!

11/5/20 10:51:22 AM PST
Darlene Frohm
Yes Ma'am

11/5/20 2:34:15 PM PST
Darlene Frohm
I have never seen you with glasses. So cool!!

11/5/20 2:34:40 PM PST
Reading glasses. I'm getting old.

11/5/20 2:34:43 PM PST
But thanks!

11/5/20 2:49:32 PM PST
Darlene Frohm
We would not know that??

11/5/20 2:50:57 PM PST
Darlene Frohm
I don't know if this is correct??

11/5/20 2:52:31 PM PST
Darlene Frohm
We stopped it in SOMA to help with budget

11/5/20 4:00:25 PM PST
Sorry! Finished with Jada and I missed you. Call or text if you want, otherwise we can touch base in the morning!

11/5/20 4:15:20 PM PST
Darlene Frohm
No worries. I thing urgent

11/5/20 4:16:21 PM PST
Ok. I'll take that to be nothing rather than I thing 😞

11/5/20 4:16:27 PM PST
Have a good evening.

11/5/20 4:17:02 PM PST
Darlene Frohm
Thank you and you do the same really!!!

11/5/20 4:17:32 PM PST
Will try!
Ma'am,
That's not an option. I need your strength

What???

I was sending an email regarding invoic

Hi Ma'am,
Hope you are good. Marlo asked about a 2917 for SES I believe this was for the Apprenticeship program. I would keep that position. Just my 2 cents

I think it may have been the OnE team manager.

That's possible also, there should be two 2917's for that group.

Ok. We should definitely keep them both.

I agree.

Just sent you Marlo's email. I am still here for you.
11/12/20 12:12:53 PM PST

It was actually the GBD position, that was originally put in for Goldberg back in 2015 as a temporary position. So I told her she could just cancel that one.

11/12/20 12:13:45 PM PST

Okay thank you for letting me know.

11/12/20 12:13:59 PM PST

Course!

11/16/20 11:37:48 AM PST

My apologies my buttons were acting up.

11/16/20 11:38:02 AM PST

No problem

11/16/20 11:42:01 AM PST

Are you able to un mute now?

11/16/20 11:43:46 AM PST

11/16/20 11:44:04 AM PST

Ok, you're up after Bill!

11/16/20 12:41:06 PM PST

11/16/20 1:00:37 PM PST

Ma’am, call me when you get a minute.

11/16/20 1:01:46 PM PST

Ok, just starting BBR meeting, can I call in 20-30 min? Or is it more urgent?

11/16/20 1:04:05 PM PST

No no it can wait

11/16/20 1:35:54 PM PST

Ok. As soon as I'm done

11/16/20 3:36:15 PM PST

Are you still here?

11/16/20 3:36:15 PM PST

Yep, in Nick's office
11/16/20 3:38:16 PM PST

Darlene Frohm  Privacy

Question, on Bayview call, do you know about testing site tomorrow at Alemany? Sam Dodge states he will talk with Public Works to deal with the flooding??

11/16/20 3:48:32 PM PST

PUC? No, I don't know but that site does flow regularly. PUC has it on their radar for sure

11/16/20 3:53:08 PM PST

Darlene Frohm  Privacy

Okay

11/16/20 4:08:03 PM PST

Darlene Frohm  Privacy

I will try to tape the sheets together before our meeting in the morning. Have a good evening Ma'am

11/16/20 4:14:16 PM PST

Darlene Frohm  Privacy

FYI, Lots of personal cars parked on the yard?? Did I miss something last week

11/16/20 4:16:37 PM PST

No ma'am bunch of rule breakers!

11/17/20 9:41:54 AM PST

In a call with Rachel

11/17/20 9:42:47 AM PST

Darlene Frohm  Privacy

Hi, Great call thank you. Just checking, did you confirm setup for tomorrow with Peter? If not I can take care of it.

11/17/20 9:42:58 AM PST

Darlene Frohm  Privacy

It not kit

11/17/20 9:43:25 AM PST

Yes, Peter is on it

11/17/20 6:12:43 PM PST

Did you not make a Larry retirement video? I just watched the draft

11/17/20 6:25:23 PM PST

Darlene Frohm  Privacy

Oh you are so sweet. My story, I couldn't do it without crying, so I passed. But thank you for thinking of me.
Hi,
Not sure if you are still here but I have the letters. I can out in your box and we will send out tomorrow.

I can come sign now, I’m here.
Darlene Frohn  Privacy
I believe SSR is using Jonathan's office for storage. This stuff wasn't here a few days ago

SSR or Ramses? This looks like community programs stuff.

Ramses confirmed it's not there's. Also Mike was asked months ago to remove the lock and their stuff on the end office but that has not been done either. Larry told Matt the same thing

Ma'am, You make the decision not her.

Would you ask Alaric to make a call 9922

They messed this up!! Julia is wrong
Darlene Frohm: They are wasting our time both of them

Carla Short: Were you wanting to do Coach Q for him too?

Darlene Frohm: Yes Ma'am

Carla Short: Liked “Yes Ma'am”

Darlene Frohm: 4 minutes

Carla Short: Liked “4 minutes”

Darlene Frohm: Personnel Records - CA Govt Code Secs 6254(c), 6254(k); CA Const., Art I, Sec 1

Carla Short: Are we meeting in person or on call?

Darlene Frohm: Either way. What do you prefer?

Carla Short: Liked “Either way. What do you prefer?”

Darlene Frohm: How about in person in conference room

Carla Short: Liked “How about in person in conference room”

Darlene Frohm: Hi Ma'am,
Just checking in with the status of the letters. Do you think we'll send them today if not no worries. They are due tomorrow. This is a text from Ramses

Carla Short: Wait, which letters? Didn't I sign them all yesterday?

Darlene Frohm: I sent to you earlier due to some changes. Oh my I hope I sent them. If not we will send tomorrow. Let me double check
Shoot! And I just left so I can get home by this Heart of the City thing. I'll read/edit them when I get home and can paste in a signature.

No worries we can do tomorrow.

Liked “No worries we can do tomorrow”

Ok Dr. Buettner is the chiropractor she is in Union Square. 450 Sutter St.

Thank you

Hi Ma'am, Just checking, did you respond to Bruce's email? I may have misunderstood you.

Thank you

I did not. I think we just need to confirm with Jonathan if there were any other cost changes and what date we need to go back to with the 8 hours.

Do you have 15 seconds?

Oh no I see you are on your call. We can chat after. Regarding time for amendments?

Sure

Just an FYI for TL, the budget schedule does not reflect the actual personnel and rates. I've asked for the original document with UA's proposed budget, well you saw the email.

Not sure if you are in the call?
I'm here.

Okay.

I am sorry you are going to meet next week! Can o cover that for you?

Thank you, it's okay.

That's not correct? Are you aware of this?

The library?

Yes we have never had a monitor in the library??

Right. We never have, but they had a contract with UA directly apparently.

Also that grant for Parks Alliance that Sam People's was somehow managing was actually with UA.

That pool was not a part of the PitStop?

I think previously no but now their contract expired they are asking to use our pool. As long as it is just for UA I think it is ok, but we don't want them to use up our capacity.

Any news on the curfew letter for nonprofits?

No, but apparently SF is exempted from the curfew- according to Captain Catigaranone.
Darlene Frohm: I'll send that to the nonprofits

I just sent a text to follow up

Ok, so curfew is for purple and we are red, but Alaric asked me to draft something up for him so that we have it ready if we hit purple

Darlene Frohm: Okay thank you

Liked “Okay thank you”

Hi,
My apologies but this is really weighing heavy on my soul. Didn’t know you were going to send the estimate, but I kept digging and I figured it should be 1/2 a day for the supervisor. Also, this is why we don’t have finance people, it’s her shop that should submit the information. I know I’m beating a dead horse but it’s just not right. It appears we don’t know what we are doing and it’s not a good feeling for the rest of your department.

I think it is actually fine. I only sent the estimate because Julia sent me an email that we had to do it today, so I did my best, which was TOTALLY wrong! But that points out that this is a finance responsibility! So I think it actually worked out fine. She was being ridiculous and it made us both look bad. But I don’t even mind because she pushed me into it! Don’t let it weigh on you!

Darlene Frohm: Too late!! But thank you. It’s always been finance

Try to let it go and enjoy your time off!

Hi,
I just sent Jonathan a text regarding 23rd & Iowa. I’ll

Way to many folks involved. I will step back.
It is Jeff who keeps pester ing people because I am not giving him the answer he wants.

Ma'am,
That should not be us it should be a part of HSOC's plan?

Do you want me to stay on as a follow up?

Sure

Do you have a minute regarding CYC?

Sure want me to come to you?

Or me to you or phone if easier for you?

Do you have this DT meeting on your calendar?

Would this be yard network discussion?

Yes

It shows recurring but I will attend if you like?

It is on my calendar but I can't figure out why, it looks like it should be from his email, unless Anna declines it for me

If you can make it would be great

Will do.
Check Chronicle Harlan Kelly
11/30/20 1:59:03 PM PST

Yep, saw it already. Examiner says he has actually been charged.

11/30/20 1:59:45 PM PST

Darlene Frohm: Not good

11/30/20 2:00:08 PM PST

Oh, now Chronicle does too. A few minutes ago it just said his house was searched. Wow!

11/30/20 3:35:35 PM PST

Are you on budget call?

11/30/20 3:35:45 PM PST

12/1/20 7:14:45 AM PST

Yes

12/1/20 7:15:37 AM PST

Good morning Ma'am, Just a reminder for Sup 2 meeting Masks Entering through pedestrian gates Trucks coming back after shift with trash still in trucks (trash should be emptied at the end of shift)

12/1/20 7:17:17 AM PST

Thank you.

12/1/20 9:09:11 AM PST

Rephrase 2nd item, supervisors are not inspecting vehicles at the end of shift

12/1/20 9:32:54 AM PST

12/1/20 9:09:51 AM PST

Ok.

12/2/20 11:04:41 AM PST

Hi, My apologies for the late notice. Personnel Records - CA Govt Code Secs. I will be out of office this afternoon. Tomorrow 7am, I have an EEO interview

12/2/20 11:09:11 AM PST

No problem!

12/2/20 11:09:11 AM PST

Hi, The Hastings settlement is on my calendar, would you like me to join in?
12/2/20 11:06:34 AM PST  
Up to you, but not essential

12/2/20 11:06:40 AM PST  
Peter is on

12/2/20 11:07:09 AM PST  
Darlene Frohm  
Thank you

12/2/20 11:18:51 AM PST  
Darlene Frohm  
I'll join in,

12/2/20 11:19:17 AM PST  
I just let you in but now I don't see you

12/2/20 11:29:07 AM PST  
Darlene Frohm  
I will jump off, I do not have that document

12/2/20 11:29:24 AM PST  
I can send it to you, if you want.

12/2/20 11:29:50 AM PST  
Darlene Frohm  
Okay

12/2/20 11:49:30 AM PST  
Darlene Frohm  
Hi,  
The posting of these notices should not be on Public Works and should fall under HSOC.

12/2/20 11:51:49 AM PST  
Yep, all agree

12/2/20 12:07:22 PM PST  
Darlene Frohm  
Will they remove page 8?

12/2/20 12:10:12 PM PST  
Good catch

12/2/20 12:10:30 PM PST  
Darlene Frohm  
Thank you

12/3/20 9:06:20 AM PST  
Darlene Frohm  
Hi,  
Didn't you send the questions for the 9922? I thought you did
12/3/20 9:06:56 AM PST

I see on the 19th, she's saying she doesn't have them so I will resend?

12/3/20 9:07:24 AM PST

Sure

12/3/20 9:07:33 AM PST

It's your department and Alaric needs to include you. She should not be making decisions for Operations

12/3/20 9:25:06 AM PST

I know and what is this Action Plan?!

12/3/20 9:25:47 AM PST

I was texting you the same thing?? Is he changing community programs?

12/3/20 9:27:21 AM PST

I think he means what we proposed?

12/3/20 9:28:07 AM PST

Maybe ask, just so we are ALL on the same page?? Just a thought

12/3/20 9:30:45 AM PST

I'm a bit concerned but I'll

12/3/20 9:41:02 AM PST

I asked Alaric his thoughts on our proposed plan. I'm hoping that he did not include Julia & Rachel's thoughts? That's a concern.

12/3/20 10:25:11 AM PST

I would suggest talking with Peter and Darryl. There hasn't been much discipline on Eric??

12/4/20 10:07:33 AM PST

Ma'am,
Are you on the vehicle call?

12/4/20 10:07:49 AM PST

No, Nick is covering
Larry didn’t use to go, right? You cover DDO?

Okay just checking. That’s right. I saw your name so I thought I’d ask

I was there for a minute and left! I’m on the list for BUF

I will continue to reinforce with you that I am here to support you ALWAYS!! Let me

Yes, ma’am. Thank you!

Still on Director’s call

Okay would you look at Bruce’s agenda, again I ask what is Sam Dodge role?

It is a good point.

Bruce’s agenda is not correct

Just an FYI
His information is incorrect with spreadsheet
Potential moves have nothing to do with this call
Confirm CYC contract prior to Operations taking over? I just told Bruce you will be joining the call

I’m here now

We ran a little long

Please stop this now
Now I see what you were talking about

Still this should not be Sam

Has Alaric explained Sam's role?

No. No idea. I will ask.

We did not place units based on FEMA

Yep. I have said that over and over.

This is a problem??!

We cannot deal with CYC until Bruce says the contract is updated?

Both contacts

We need to figure out who should take that why is Sam Peoples overseeing any contracts?!

I agree

This is a problem and it should not be them roles responsibility

You do realize he is not being honest

You handled that well, thanks!
Thank you I am really trying!!!

She can’t it’s in Bruce’s hands

These poor teams are so frustrated. It is clear!

Julia’s pretty quiet???

Except that is her crazy keyboard scrolling!

I am going to bang my head against the wall! Why is she trying to figure out if I have budget?! RU kidding me?!

Do we have any other RFPs that need to get issued?

I’ll look into it

They should not be figuring out your budget

Ok. I think the three biggies were TL Clean, and then tree watering and planting. But if we have any others LMK!

PitStop sites do not belong on this conversation

I am going to talk to Alaric after this.

And not with Sam

Major issue we did not place units for FEMA
We cannot buy into that, these units are important due to staff. If we stop they will have concerns with homeless urinating on the streets.

And who do they think we should communicate with at CCC?

Yes they are!!! That's not our concern. Who is asking for this to happen? Julia??

We don't have to do this and if you want this who is that person you? It's not a CCC driven request.

That's why YOU should be in those meetings.

Yes from operations YOU

Just an FYI those conversations should include OPS take as well. They have already said they don't know operations.

Only because folks were complaining no toilets and handwashing.

They were. We were told we can only rent if there were sinks this was from Darlene FA

Per COVID requirement

Not Sam he's not helping us

When we get requests an complaints from Supervisors what do we do?
We tell them talk to the controller.

Was that for me?

Yes Ma'am but we had hung up. I think my phone was on overload 😊

I believe!

Are you going to join put stop app meeting?

Been trying to my phone fudge!!

No worries. You can skip it, it is all going fine for now

I keep getting disconnected

I’m back

Don’t worry, we are almost done - ok.

Hello Ma'am, IT is on the call

I’m having trouble connecting

Please start, I’m trying to call in now
Darlene Frohm  Privacy
Anything for IT?

12/14/20 11:04:58 AM PST

12/14/20 11:05:33 AM PST

Computer set up for James Keenan

I do know they're working on it

12/14/20 11:08:48 AM PST

Darlene Frohm  Privacy
Anything you want to start with

12/14/20 11:13:36 AM PST

I'll be right and go ahead and start with and we can start with Peter I guess her start with Matt

12/14/20 11:14:40 AM PST

Darlene Frohm  Privacy
Matt, Peter, now we with Bill, almost done, I'll ask the new guy if he'd like to say something?

12/14/20 11:16:45 AM PST

Darlene Frohm  Privacy
We are done

12/14/20 11:17:24 AM PST

Darlene Frohm  Privacy
Do you want to add

12/14/20 11:52:40 AM PST

Darlene Frohm  Privacy
Have you heard anything about Christmas Eve bring a holiday from the president?

12/14/20 11:53:13 AM PST

? No. What is that about?

12/14/20 11:53:52 AM PST

Darlene Frohm  Privacy
It came up on superintendents call??

12/14/20 11:56:03 AM PST

Before I got there?

12/14/20 11:56:41 AM PST

Darlene Frohm  Privacy
Yes Ma'am, Peter brought it up?
Darlene Frohm: Maybe HR can shed some light?

I'll try to find out. I think urban legend

Darlene Frohm: Trump issued an executive order to make it holiday for federal workers

Darlene Frohm: Good morning Ma'am, Are you on contracts call? If not do you have a minute?

I'm on call. Trying to catch City Atty about Nordsense

Darlene Frohm: Okay maybe later

Finishing up with Rachel

Darlene Frohm: Told them you are finishing a call

Darlene Frohm: Roles & Responsibilities call

Thanks, yep

Darlene Frohm: Can you forward to me

Yep

Darlene Frohm: Only if you have it handy
12/15/20 10:15:28 AM PST

Darlene Frohm Privacy

Thank you
This is indirect And should be contract admin

12/15/20 10:20:53 AM PST

Darlene Frohm Privacy

I'm done you can handle this. She's not getting it.

12/15/20 10:24:59 AM PST

Darlene Frohm Privacy

Ops should not be responsible to confirm MCO OR OTHERS RATES

12/15/20 10:25:22 AM PST

Yes! Forgot that part, but glad Alaric is on it

12/15/20 10:26:47 AM PST

Darlene Frohm Privacy

Should remove operations on that box

12/15/20 10:27:34 AM PST

Liked “Should remove operations on that box”

12/15/20 10:29:38 AM PST

Darlene Frohm Privacy

Line 8 is not Ops

12/15/20 10:33:22 AM PST

Darlene Frohm Privacy

That's based on the multiple conversations on their side.

12/15/20 10:33:45 AM PST

Darlene Frohm Privacy

She's not aware of what's going on

12/15/20 10:34:42 AM PST

Darlene Frohm Privacy

Do we want to throw them under the bus? I'll say no but it is the conversation with her as well

12/15/20 10:36:20 AM PST

Darlene Frohm Privacy

They will blame Aaron but these two are having conversations as well

12/15/20 10:36:39 AM PST

Darlene Frohm Privacy

She's wrong

12/15/20 10:45:27 AM PST

Darlene Frohm Privacy

MCO/HCAO is not OPS and should not fall with OPS
The vendor knew what they were doing regarding paying their staff.

That was Lena and I was at that meeting when they were placing all that blame.

The nonprofits are aware when the MCO rates increase.

My apologies I see you are on a call. Will you have a moment today or shall we chat tomorrow? Thank you.

Sorry, I thought I would finish SES early, but not looking like it. Tomorrow is better for me, today I am back to back.

Okay tomorrow will be fine. Breathe.

Thank you.

My apologies I missed something?

Yep. Talking about BBR, but Julia is trying to give away the Community programs 0932.

Stand your ground. She just promoted an 0922.

Also, operations positions are not hers to give away.

Right! Which she says herself, but then continues to push.

This was agreed it would happen.
12/17/20 9:20:52 AM PST
The step 5? I don't think so.

12/17/20 9:21:15 AM PST
I told Peter we were not committing until we saw the financial impact

12/17/20 9:28:48 AM PST
This is what happens when they take so long to do what the department asks

12/17/20 9:29:04 AM PST
Personnel Records - CA Govt Code Secs 6254(c), 6254(k); CA Const., Art I, Sec 1

12/17/20 9:31:53 AM PST
Personnel Records - CA Govt Code Secs 6254(c), 6254(k); CA Const., Art I, Sec 1

12/17/20 9:36:05 AM PST
Personnel Records - CA Govt Code Secs 6254(c), 6254(k); CA Const., Art I, Sec 1

12/17/20 9:36:36 AM PST
Personnel Records - CA Govt Code Secs 6254(c), 6254(k); CA Const., Art I, Sec 1

12/17/20 9:40:35 AM PST
Personnel Records - CA Govt Code Secs 6254(c), 6254(k); CA Const., Art I, Sec 1

12/17/20 9:41:51 AM PST
Yep.

12/17/20 9:41:58 AM PST
Personnel Records - CA Govt Code Secs 6254(c), 6254(k); CA Const., Art I, Sec 1

12/17/20 9:42:06 AM PST
Yes, exactly

12/17/20 9:51:00 AM PST
Great you are on
Darlene Frohm: This is for the Yard. There should be 2 / 2017

Darlene Frohm: For the OnE Team

Darlene Frohm: Ma'am, I will work with anyone and everyone. Remember Sandra, Ian, & Mike were the challenge for the OnE Team

Darlene Frohm: This is coming from the OnE Team staff

Darlene Frohm: You should do this not Julia

Darlene Frohm: Are you still on the call? I don’t see you?

Darlene Frohm: Yes Ma’am

Darlene Frohm: She’s asking to do Sam Dodges RFP and it should be you. Same as the exempts, you make that call and she’s saying let them go

Darlene Frohm: I can help you with that list if you like.

Darlene Frohm: That would be great.

Darlene Frohm: Let Mario know.

Darlene Frohm: Yep, I will offline, don’t need others weighing in!
12/17/20 10:07:53 AM PST
Darlene Frohm Privacy
I agree

12/17/20 10:08:48 AM PST
Darlene Frohm Privacy
Not sure why I'm not showing up on call

12/17/20 10:09:11 AM PST
Now I see you. Maybe there were too many people for the phone to show me.

12/17/20 11:39:30 AM PST
Darlene Frohm Privacy
I appreciate you Ma'am

12/17/20 11:40:00 AM PST
Thank you. Likewise!

12/17/20 11:42:18 AM PST
Darlene Frohm Privacy
Thank you and I hope all goes well with your cat

12/17/20 11:44:46 AM PST
Thanks. Just hung up with the vet, they are giving her some fluids and anti-nausea and will call me later today. So I will do the webinar from home - hopefully I don't have any WiFi issues!

12/17/20 4:04:29 PM PST
Darlene Frohm Privacy
That's great news!!

12/18/20 4:07:32 PM PST
Lost you again. Have a great weekend! You're off next week, right? So merry Christmas and happy holidays too!

12/18/20 5:18:30 PM PST
Darlene Frohm Privacy
Hello Ma'am. No I'm back at work next week. I've had some issues with phone and laptop today. I hope you have a restful weekend.

12/18/20 6:22:15 PM PST
Thank you, you too! Ok, see you Monday. Enjoy the weekend!

12/18/20 7:01:12 PM PST
Darlene Frohm Privacy
I hope you cat is doing better. Haven't had a chance to chat with you lately.
I know! I'm sorry this week has been back to back. Well, she is still not eating so I'm going to have to call the vet back tomorrow morning. But she is drinking water, and her energy is low but not awful. So I just need to figure out how to stimulate her appetite! They gave her anti nausea yesterday but that didn't really seem to change anything. So hopefully tomorrow we can get an appetite stimulant!

I will keep her in my prayers.

Thank you! I truly appreciate it!

You are welcomed!!

Bill & Jim didn't know time changed give them a minute

I sent them an email and the invite

But ok

Ma'am,
Did you respond to the Director regarding the 1312 for Supervisor Safai?

Julia beat me to it

Oh my will they ever stay out of our yard??

Probably not

Okay I'll leave to you then

Did you know about this?

The Leo situation?
Chanda brought it up last week? Also for 2917 Mike Lennon

Do you know who the other person is?

I think Mike Lennon

For the 1312? They are trying to place

Oh, sorry. Supervisor Safai has a candidate

I don't know anything about that

They have been trying to place this person for a long time from mayor's office

Who is that?

Ask they would never say

I don't think Safai's person is mayor's office

No that's a totally separate person

That's not how it's been, it's really up to you and director

Hmmm

and/or director
12/24/20 9:37:24 AM PST
From John Leal: Hi Carla, Merry Christmas and happy holidays. I have not heard back about working remotely. It would be nice to start next week since we are starting the gps cutover. The user activations will be sent out next week and install start the week after. This is a good opportunity to cleanup the data. Thanks John

12/24/20 9:37:29 AM PST
What do you think?

12/24/20 9:38:37 AM PST
Darlene Frohm: I will send him an email, I was double checking what you agreed with him.

12/24/20 9:40:10 AM PST
I didn’t agree anything, I will try to never make any agreements with your people without you!

12/24/20 9:41:28 AM PST
Darlene Frohm: I know and I totally get that so telecommute 1-2 days?

12/24/20 9:42:02 AM PST
Sure! Whatever you think is best

12/24/20 10:03:15 AM PST
Darlene Frohm: Do you have anything else for HR?

12/24/20 10:25:56 AM PST
Wow! That was not what I expected, sorry! I thought he was just calling me to get into the building but then he had questions about a project I had referred to him, and I couldn’t get out of there!

12/24/20 10:31:04 AM PST
Darlene Frohm: It’s okay. Jason asked about the removal of unwanted items from offices? BBR?? I said we were very busy this week but I would double check with you?

12/24/20 11:16:42 AM PST
Darlene Frohm: That time applying one team right?

12/24/20 11:19:45 AM PST
Darlene Frohm: Everyone right? PitStop?

12/24/20 11:22:12 AM PST
Yep, everyone!
I walked it with Jim yesterday, everyone except carpenters cleaned up their act. Jim is going to follow up with Carpenters and make them remove the items!

Good morning Ma'am,
I believe the PitStop amendments are in DocuSign, just an FYI

Yep, I signed one yesterday didn’t get the others yet, but I’ll check again now

Hello Ma'am,
Just checking on approval of Coach Q?
Thank you

Just checking if you need any assistance with anything?

Call over, we can chat

Liked “Call over, we can chat”

Sorry, I’m still in with Recology

Oops misunderstood.

Superintendent meeting?

Thank you had computer issues😊

No problem, thanks
1/4/21 11:32:36 AM PST

Darlene Frohm Privacy
Can we talk about FixIt? Any update?

1/4/21 11:35:06 AM PST

Yes we can. Talked with Alaric yesterday, need to chat with you!

1/4/21 11:39:43 AM PST

Darlene Frohm Privacy
When are free would you like me to come down or phone call?

1/4/21 11:41:51 AM PST

Either one. I’m free now.

1/5/21 11:11:43 AM PST

Darlene Frohm Privacy
Ma’am, Have you seen the contract with JCDECAUX?

1/5/21 11:11:54 AM PST

No

1/5/21 11:17:46 AM PST

Darlene Frohm Privacy
He never mentioned a May 2021 end date?

1/5/21 11:19:56 AM PST

Hmm

1/5/21 11:25:34 AM PST

Darlene Frohm Privacy
Not to beat a dead horse, pit stops are not just for fea reimbursements

1/5/21 11:25:48 AM PST

I know

1/5/21 11:25:56 AM PST

I was going to chime in

1/5/21 11:26:21 AM PST

Darlene Frohm Privacy
Also we are working on lowering hours

1/5/21 11:26:40 AM PST

Right. For sure wanted to say that. I will

1/5/21 11:27:06 AM PST

Darlene Frohm Privacy
Try raising your hand 😊
Keep in mind business are not open for public restrooms

Teams just kicked me out

I had to use my phone

Hi,
Is your work phone working?

Yes, did you try to call me? Sorry!

Hi,
Yes but it's okay

I've been in meetings all day, even when I was supposed to have a break, meeting went long or someone came to my office!

It's okay, Ma'am take a breather

Did you see text from Jeff?

If we can get two plexiglass shields that cover registration tables that are about 6 feet long or so.

Okay, thank you

Where are they going to be installed?

At the port the exam is happening on a pier
Can you see Jeff’s email he just sent? He texted about it, calling it time sensitive.

Good morning Ma’am, We should have a response by 10?

Ok. Thanks. Can I tell him that? Not that he deserves it

Yes but we have nothing to do with the water manifolds.

I think he means hand washing stations. We didn’t install water manifolds there I don’t think.

From Sam Peoples: Good morning, are we still planning to get the porta potty removed from Vermont and 16th today?

Yes Ma’am, Jeff sent an email yesterday asking it be removed after 11:30am.

Ah perfect! Thank you.

YIKES 2 more cases!!!!!!! Make it stop.

I know. I’m so stressed about it!

Now you know you can it stress. We will be okay😊

I know it doesn’t help- but easier said than done!

What did I miss

Leo and “Lupino”
Darlene Frohm: Who is Lupino?

I will ask about Jimmer

I'm going to kick something

Darlene Frohm: Ma'am,
You look totally disgusted!!! I totally understand

How weird I was texting this and you felt me

Your hair looks very pretty

That's very sweet of you

YES that is the person 😅. I agree why can't these folks go to budget and finance and communications?? Oh right I forgot we are the dumping grounds
Emphasized "YES that is the person. I agree why can't these folks go to budget and finance and communications?? Oh right I forgot we are the dumping grounds."

Darlene Frohm Privacy
Hello Ma'am, Did you get the email regarding telecommuting through Inauguration Day?

Darlene Frohm Privacy
So what do you think?

Darlene Frohm Privacy
That sounds good. What do you think about OneTeam, Community Programs, and PitStop?

Darlene Frohm Privacy
Seems like they could telecommute for those 2 days, right?

Darlene Frohm Privacy
Yes but let me read that email again. I'm just shocked that you didn't get it.

Darlene Frohm Privacy
Seems hard to argue that they should come in if they could do remote work- but esp for OnE team we should figure out what we expect the. To accomplish!

Darlene Frohm Privacy
Well, Alaric cancelled the afternoon call on Friday, so I'm thinking he didn't see it to send out to us?

Darlene Frohm Privacy
I'll text him to see what he thinks. And I can loop in Jada too

Darlene Frohm Privacy
I sent to Jada BUF let me know. I can assist with reaching out to staff
1/16/21 3:49:38 PM PST

Thanks. Will do. Thanks for the heads up! Seems like you’re the only one who saw that on Friday!

1/16/21 7:40:28 PM PST

Ok, just confirmed with Alaric. So he said we should allow/encourage people to the extent possible. I’ll send a group text to Superintendents now.

1/16/21 7:56:30 PM PST

Thank you
What are your thoughts?
Warren
Anna
OnE Team
Community Programs
PitStop?

1/16/21 7:57:30 PM PST

Yep. That makes sense. I can let Anna know, can you let the others?

1/16/21 7:57:47 PM PST

PitStop also?

1/16/21 7:58:17 PM PST

I think so. For 2 days should be ok, right?

1/16/21 7:58:35 PM PST

Okay

1/16/21 7:58:46 PM PST

Unless you disagree

1/16/21 7:59:33 PM PST

Nope I agree I just wanted your approval.

1/16/21 7:59:42 PM PST

You got it!

1/16/21 8:10:07 PM PST

Storeroom?

1/16/21 8:10:29 PM PST

Hmm. Skeleton staff?

1/16/21 8:11:09 PM PST

Yes, I’ll send John an email.
1/16/21 8:11:42 PM PST

Liked "Yes, I'll send John an email."

Delivered

1/26/21 9:34:55 AM PST

Darlene Frohm  Privacy

Hi Ma'am,
Did I miss PitStop?
We have withheld records responsive to your request [and/or redacted parts of the records provided in response to your request] that constitute private personnel records of a City employee. Cal. Govt. Code Secs. 6254(c), 6254(k); California Constitution, Art. I, Sec 1.
Due to privacy concerns, personal information, such as personal phone numbers, cell numbers and email addresses, has been redacted from the documents that we are making available to you. We redacted this personal information pursuant to Section 6254(c) and Section 6254(k) of the California Public Records Act and Article 1, Section 1 of the California Constitution.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Page (# of occurrences)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ma'am,
This is going on WAY to long and they need to honor your request and
Larry's

TWO YEARS!!

The conversations that staff feels there is no confidentiality in SSR and
HR?

Yes and the folks on previous call

Ah right

Speaking of Coach Q, Julia has pushed back on funding, can you bring
this up with Alaric. We were told it was a go then no go??

I hid it in the budget: I think we have it. I'll check
From: Anonymoose (@journo_anon) 🦌🔍 <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, December 18, 2021 8:01 AM
To: Supervisor Records (CAT)
Subject: 2 redactions
Attachments: Redactions__-_Immediate_Disclosure_Request_1_(002)_Redacted.pdf; signature.asc

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Please determine in writing the two redactions in that Mayor's Office record are public and order them disclosed.

Sent from ProtonMail mobile
Supervisor of Records Chiu,

I am petitioning for a written determination that the text message between London Breed and Mohammed Nuru on page 3 of the attached production is public and an order for its production.

Regards,

Anonymous

Twitter @journo_anon

**IMPORTANT:**

1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.
2. If you are NOT a public official: This communication is confidential and may contain unpublished information or confidential source information, protected by the California Shield Law, Evidence Code sec. 1070. I am a member of the electronic media and regularly publish information about the conduct of public officials.
3. I am not a lawyer. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.
4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sent with ProtonMail Secure Email.
Do you have people working today?

Yes, we people Handling the down town. Let me know area of concern.
You are cordially invited to the Office of the City Administrator Holiday Party.

- Friday, December 20th
- 8pm-9pm
- Pier 27

*For 21 & older accessible via paid transportation*

If you would prefer to drive, parking is available on site for $10.

Thu, Dec 19, 9:01 AM

Send all invitations to Selina please

Delivered

Will do.

Mon, Dec 23, 9:25 AM

Morning, think I missed a call from you. Hope all is well.

Morning, think I missed a call from you. Hope all is well.
The material withheld is unrelated to City business and redacted for privacy per See Gov Code § 6254(c), California Constitution, Art. I, Sec. 1.

Sorry, I meant to include that cite as I had the last two times I produced it to you.

From: Anonymoose (@journo_anon) <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 20, 2021 7:12 PM
To: Heckel, Hank (MYR) <hank.heckel@sfgov.org>
Cc: MayorSunshineRequests, MYR (MYR) <mayorsunshinerequests@sfgov.org>
Subject: Personal Info. - Immediate disclosure request

What's the redaction cited as?

Regards,

Anonymous
Twitter @journo_anon

**IMPORTANT:**
1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.
2. If you are NOT a public official: This communication is confidential and may contain unpublished information or confidential source information, protected by the California Shield Law, Evidence Code sec. 1070. I am a member of the electronic media and regularly publish information about the conduct of public officials.
3. I am not a lawyer. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.
4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sent with ProtonMail Secure Email.

------- Original Message -------
On Monday, December 20th, 2021 at 6:53 PM, Heckel, Hank (MYR) <hank.heckel@sfgov.org> wrote:
Anonymous,

Please see the attached records responsive to your request below. We have not located any other responsive records.

Regards,

Hank Heckel
Legal Compliance Officer
Office of the Mayor
City and County of San Francisco

From: Anonymoose (@journo_anon) 🐘🔍
<arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 25, 2021 10:28 AM
To: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Subject: Personal Info. - Immediate disclosure request

Read carefully, and when you respond, be sure to specify who you are responding on behalf of.

Produce on rolling basis complete and exact copies of any texts, iMessages, Google Chat/Hangouts, Messenger, WhatsApps, Signals, WeChats, Telegrams, SMS, MMS, or any other form of chats (including groups), on government or personal property, that:

(1) you (each person receiving this email);
(2) your department head (or elected official); or

(3) anyone who reports directly to your department head;

have ever had with the phone number [Personal Info.], including but not limited to the complete text, all the identities of the persons in the chat (sender and recipients), date and time stamps, attachments (each an exact copy, in their own original electronic format, not converted to PDF, and not just a screenshot of them), hyperlinks, formatting, images, urls, audio, and video. If you fail to disclose any of these parts of the record, because it doesn't fit on a screen, or doesn't get captured by a screenshot, you have incompletely complied and withheld otherwise disclosable information. You must produce the ORIGINAL image files - not just cropped/low res screenshots of images in chats. If you cannot capture this information by screenshot, you must use message extraction tools - your fellow agencies know how to do this, consult with your custodian working group. Some of your agencies have signed agreements to comply -- you must comply with those agreements.

Prior SOTF orders:

You must disclose the sender and recipients of each message - see SOTF Order 19098.

You must disclose images, hyperlink, urls, and email addresses - see SOTF Order 19097.

Don't forget to make any NextRequest/GovQA/file share you use for this completely accessible to me without any login or agreements.

Regards,

Anonymous

Twitter @journo_anon
IMPORTANT:

1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.

2. If you are NOT a public official: This communication is confidential and may contain unpublished information or confidential source information, protected by the California Shield Law, Evidence Code sec. 1070. I am a member of the electronic media and regularly publish information about the conduct of public officials.

3. I am not a lawyer. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.

4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sent with ProtonMail Secure Email.
+ the still missing 3rd attachment

Original Message

On Wednesday, December 22nd, 2021 at 9:29 AM, Anonymoose (@journo_anon) <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:

Weird. Seems like the attachments didn't come through. Resending attachments.

Regards,

Anonymous
Twitter @journo_anon

IMPORTANT:
1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.
2. If you are NOT a public official: This communication is confidential and may contain unpublished information or confidential source information, protected by the California Shield Law, Evidence Code sec. 1070. I am a member of the electronic media and regularly publish information about the conduct of public officials.
3. I am not a lawyer. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.
4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sent from ProtonMail for iOS

On Tue, Dec 21, 2021 at 11:56 PM, Anonymoose (@journo_anon) <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:

Supervisor of Records Chiu,

As part of request NextRequest 21-6975, DPW produced to me certain communications with Jeff Kositsky after his employment termination. Some of the records disclose a phone number 415-559-7435, while others redact the phone numbers in a similar location.
It is unclear if the redacted numbers are government or personal numbers.
This is a 67.21(d) petition to determine in writing some or all of the redacted numbers in 21-6975 are public and order them disclosed. If the other redacted numbers are the -7435 number, they should be unredacted based on waiver. (It is released many times in that request). If the other redacted numbers are a City-owned number, they should be unredacted based on the fact they are not personal at all.

Examples attached (there are a ton of similar records in 21-6975).

Regards,

Anonymous
Twitter @journo_anon

**IMPORTANT:**
1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.
2. If you are NOT a public official: This communication is confidential and may contain unpublished information or confidential source information, protected by the California Shield Law, Evidence Code sec. 1070. I am a member of the electronic media and regularly publish information about the conduct of public officials.
3. I am not a lawyer. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.
4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sent from ProtonMail for iOS
Request #21-6975

Immediate disclosure request - produce any communications of any form with Jeff Kositsky (including at a new employer) AFTER his termination of employment with the City.

Received December 15, 2021 via web

Departments Public Works

Documents

- Canceled MLB Street Conditions Meeting (Staff: Sean Elsbernd 415.559.7435)-redacted.txt.pdf
- Canceled MLB Street Conditions Meeting (Staff: Sean Elsbernd REDACTED FOR PRIVACY)-redacted.txt.pdf
- Canceled MLB Street Conditions Meeting (Staff: Sean Elsbernd REDACTED FOR PRIVACY)-redacted.txt.pdf
- Canceled MLB Street Conditions Meeting (Staff: Sean Elsbernd REDACTED FOR PRIVACY)-redacted.txt.pdf
- Mayor Breed's Monthly Department Head Meeting Mayor Breed's Monthly Department Head Meeting.txt
- Mayor Breed's Monthly Department Head Meeting Mayor Breed's Monthly Department Head Meeting.txt
- Mayor Breed's Monthly Department Head Meeting Mayor Breed's Monthly Department Head Meeting.txt
- Mayor Breed's Monthly Department Head Meeting Mayor Breed's Monthly Department Head Meeting.txt
- Mayor Breed's Monthly Department Head Meeting Mayor Breed's Monthly Department Head Meeting.txt
- Mayor Breed's Monthly Department Head Meeting Mayor Breed's Monthly Department Head Meeting.txt
- Mayor Breed's Monthly Department Head Meeting Mayor Breed's Monthly Department Head Meeting.txt
- MLB Street Conditions Meeting (Staff: Sean Elsbernd Mayor Breed's Monthly Department Head Meeting.txt
- MLB Street Conditions Meeting (Staff: Sean Elsbernd Mayor Breed's Monthly Department Head Meeting.txt
Buta, Odaya (CAT)

From: Anonymoose (@journo_anon) 🦌🔍 <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 22, 2021 9:29 AM
To: Supervisor Records (CAT)
Subject: Re: 67.21(d) petition - DPW-Kositsky communications
Attachments: Canceled MLB Street Conditions Meeting (Staff Sean Elsbernd REDACTED FOR PRIVACY)-redacted.txt.pdf; Canceled MLB Street Conditions Meeting (Staff Sean Elsbernd 415.559.7435)-redacted.txt.pdf; Screenshot_20211222-092757.png; signature.asc

Weird. Seems like the attachments didn't come through. Resending attachments.

Regards,

Anonymous
Twitter @journo_anon

**IMPORTANT:**
1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.
2. If you are NOT a public official: This communication is confidential and may contain unpublished information or confidential source information, protected by the California Shield Law, Evidence Code sec. 1070. I am a member of the electronic media and regularly publish information about the conduct of public officials.
3. I am not a lawyer. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.
4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sent from ProtonMail for iOS

On Tue, Dec 21, 2021 at 11:56 PM, Anonymoose (@journo_anon) 🦌🔍 <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com> wrote:
-------- Original Message --------

Supervisor of Records Chiu,

As part of request NextRequest 21-6975, DPW produced to me certain communications with Jeff Kositsky after his employment termination. Some of the records disclose a phone number 415-559-7435, while others redact the phone numbers in a similar location.

It is unclear if the redacted numbers are government or personal numbers.

This is a 67.21(d) petition to determine in writing some or all of the redacted numbers in 21-6975 are public and order them disclosed.

If the other redacted numbers are the -7435 number, they should be unredacted based on waiver. (It is released many times in that request).
If the other redacted numbers are a City-owned number, they should be unredacted based on the fact they are not personal at all.

Examples attached (there are a ton of similar records in 21-6975).

Regards,

Anonymous
Twitter @journo_anon

**IMPORTANT:**

1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.
2. If you are NOT a public official: This communication is confidential and may contain unpublished information or confidential source information, protected by the California Shield Law, Evidence Code sec. 1070. I am a member of the electronic media and regularly publish information about the conduct of public officials.
3. I am not a lawyer. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.
4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sent from ProtonMail for iOS
Message:
Client submit time: Sep 21, 2021 20:43:46.000000000 UTC
Delivery time: Sep 21, 2021 20:43:49.143717700 UTC
Creation time: Sep 21, 2021 20:43:47.721969900 UTC
Modification time: Sep 21, 2021 20:43:49 960127100 UTC
Size: 63662
Flags: 0x00000002 (Unread, Unmodified)
Conversation topic: MLB Street Conditions Meeting (Staff: Sean Elsbernd)
Subject: Canceled: MLB Street Conditions Meeting (Staff: Sean Elsbernd)
Sender name: Murray, Ashley (MYR)
Sender email address: /O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=983AF6FE4C5A4229AA8E8D645CAA768-ASHLEY MURR
Sent representing name: Elsbernd, Sean (MYR)
Sent representing email address: /O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=3EED4028456848EC8C01439E4841E274-SEAN ELSBER
Importance: High
Priority: Urgent
Sensitivity: None
Reminder time: Sep 30, 2021 21:00:00.000000000 UTC
Is private: no
Status: 0x00000000 ()
Meeting:
Message:
Size: 75477
Flags: 0x000000002 (Unread, Unmodified)
Conversation topic: MLB Street Conditions Meeting (Staff: Sean Elsbernd)
Subject: Canceled: MLB Street Conditions Meeting (Staff: Sean Elsbernd)
Sender name: Elsbernd, Sean (MYR)
Sender email address: /O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIB0HF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=3EED4028456848EC8C01439E4841E274-SEAN ELSPER
Sent representing name: Elsbernd, Sean (MYR)
Sent representing email address: /O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIB0HF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=3EED4028456848EC8C01439E4841E274-SEAN ELSPER
Importance: High
Priority: Urgent
Sensitivity: None
Is a reminder: No
Reminder time: Oct 28, 2021 21:00:00.000000000 UTC
Is private: No
Status: 0x00000000 ()

Meeting:
Documents

- Canceled: MLB Street Conditions Meeting (Staff: Sean Elsbernd)

- Canceled MLB Street Conditions Meeting (Staff Sean Elsbernd REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) - redacted.txt.pdf

- Canceled MLB Street Conditions Meeting (Staff Sean Elsbernd REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) - redacted.txt.pdf

- Canceled MLB Street Conditions Meeting (Staff Sean Elsbernd REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) - redacted.txt.pdf

- Canceled MLB Street Conditions Meeting (Staff Sean Elsbernd REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) - redacted.txt.pdf
Supervisor of Records Chiu,

As part of request NextRequest 21-6975, DPW produced to me certain communications with Jeff Kositsky after his employment termination. Some of the records disclose a phone number 415-559-7435, while others redact the phone numbers in a similar location.

It is unclear if the redacted numbers are government or personal numbers.

This is a 67.21(d) petition to determine in writing some or all of the redacted numbers in 21-6975 are public and order them disclosed.

If the other redacted numbers are the -7435 number, they should be unretracted based on waiver. (It is released many times in that request).

If the other redacted numbers are a City-owned number, they should be unretracted based on the fact they are not personal at all.

Examples attached (there are a ton of similar records in 21-6975).

Regards,

Anonymous

Twitter @journo_anon

**IMPORTANT:**

1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.
2. If you are NOT a public official: This communication is confidential and may contain unpublished information or confidential source information, protected by the California Shield Law, Evidence Code sec. 1070. I am a member of the electronic media and regularly publish information about the conduct of public officials.
3. I am not a lawyer. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.
4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.
Message:
Modification time: Oct 28, 2021 19:57 14 362916500 UTC
Size: 75477
Flags: 0x00000002 (Unread, Unmodified)
Conversation topic: MLB Street Conditions Meeting (Staff: Sean Elsbernd)
Privacy
Subject: Canceled: MLB Street Conditions Meeting (Staff: Sean Elsbernd)
Sender name: Elsbernd, Sean (MYR)
Sender email address: /O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIB0H23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=3EED40284565848EC8C01439E4841E274-SEAN ELSBER
Sent representing name: Elsbernd, Sean (MYR)
Sent representing email address: /O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIB0H23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=3EED40284565848EC8C01439E4841E274-SEAN ELSBER
Importance: High
Priority: Urgent
Sensitivity: None
Is a reminder: no
Reminder time: Oct 28, 2021 21:00:00.000000000 UTC
Is private: no
Status: 0x00000000 ()

Meeting:
Immediate disclosure request - produce any communications of any form with Jeff Kositsky (including at a new employer) AFTER his termination of employment with the City.

Received
December 15, 2021 via web

Departments
Public Works

Documents

- alaric.degrafenried@sfdpw.org-extracted
- Canceled: MLB Street Conditions Meeting (Staff: Sean Elsbernd Personal Info.)
  - Canceled MLB Street Conditions Meeting (Staff Sean Elsbernd 415.559.7435)-redacted.txt.pdf
  - Canceled MLB Street Conditions Meeting (Staff Sean Elsbernd REDACTED FOR PRIVACY)-redacted.txt.pdf
  - Canceled MLB Street Conditions Meeting (Staff Sean Elsbernd REDACTED FOR PRIVACY)-redacted.txt.pdf
Buta, Odaya (CAT)

From: Anonymoose (@journo_anon) 🦌🔍 <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 23, 2021 3:18 PM
To: Supervisor Records (CAT)
Subject: False Attorney-Client Privilege, 67.21(d) petition - Fw: Public Records Request :: P057134-121521
Attachments: P57134__;_responsive_document.pdf; P57134__;_sfpd_response_12-23.pdf; signature.asc

Supervisor of Records Chiu:

This is a 67.21(d) petition for written determination that the redactions attached on page 3 are public and order them disclosed (unredacted).

Neither Fountain nor Caravelli appear to be attorneys, at least in the State of California. 
https://apps.calbar.ca.gov/attorney/LicenseeSearch/_uickSearch_FreeText_christine_fountain_SoundsLike_false
https://apps.calbar.ca.gov/attorney/LicenseeSearch/_uickSearch_FreeText_Linda_20Caravelli

There is no attorney-client privilege here.
Caravelli may be a paralegal. However, under Business and Professions Code § 6450(b) Caravelli cannot provide legal advice (and thus cannot be providing confidential legal advice).
While the privilege may apply if she was doing this work under a supervising attorney, no attorney was asked for advice here - no attorney is even on the thread.

Regards,

Anonymous
Twitter @journo_anon

IMPORTANT:
1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.
2. If you are NOT a public official: This communication is confidential and may contain unpublished information or confidential source information, protected by the California Shield Law, Evidence Code sec. 1070. I am a member of the electronic media and regularly publish information about the conduct of public officials.
3. I am not a lawyer. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.
4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer it merely authenticates the sender.

Sent with ProtonMail Secure Email.

------ Original Message ------
On Thursday, December 23rd, 2021 at 2:38 PM, San Francisco Police Records Portal <sanfranciscopd@mycusthelp.net> wrote:

Attachments: P57134__;_responsive_document.pdf
December 23, 2021

Via email arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com

Anonymous,

RE: Public Records Request, dated December 15, 2021, Reference # P057134-121521

Dear Anonymous:

In response to your request, please see attached document(s).

Sincerely,

Lieutenant Arran Pera #531
Officer in Charge
Risk Management - Legal Division

To monitor the progress or update this request please log into the SFPD Public Records Center.

This is an auto-generated email and has originated from an unmonitored email account. Please DO NOT REPLY.
Hi Chris,

Yes. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Briseida Walton
San Francisco Police Department | Legal Division
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
Desk: 415.837.7180
Email: briseida.walton@sfgov.org

Notice: The information contained in this electronic message may be confidential and may be subject to the attorney-client privilege and/or the attorney work product doctrine. It is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this electronic message in error, please delete the original message from your e-mail system. Thank you.

Can you get an extension. Thank you.

Christine Fountain
Office of the Chief of Police
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
415.837.7000
christine.fountain@sfgov.org

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This communication and its contents may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information. It is solely for the use of the intended recipient(s). Unauthorized interception, review, use or disclosure is prohibited and may violate applicable laws, including the Electronic Communications Privacy Act. If you are not
Hi Chris,

I hope you are well. I am following up on this request, due today. I can invoke an extension for a due date of 12/29/21 if we need to. Below is the email chain from Linda for your recollection. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Briseida Walton
San Francisco Police Department | Legal Division
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
Desk: 415.837.7180
Email: briseida.walton@sfgov.org

Notice: The information contained in this electronic message may be confidential and may be subject to the attorney-client privilege and/or the attorney work product doctrine. It is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this electronic message in error, please delete the original message from your e-mail system. Thank you.

Thanks – I will gather the other info

Christine Fountain
Office of the Chief of Police
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco CA 94158
415.837.7000
christine.fountain@sfgov.org
Hi Chris,

Yes, we are not obligated to create a document in response to a PRA request. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Linda Caravelli
LEGAL DIVISION
SAN FRANCISCO POLICE DEPARTMENT HEADQUARTERS
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
(415) 837-7147
Linda.Caravelli@sfgov.org

Received.

Linda – can you refresh my memory –

Thank you.

Christine Fountain
Office of the Chief of Police
San Francisco Police Department
Good afternoon Chris,

Legal received the attached public records request. Please let us know if you have any responsive documents re the following.

**Records requested:**

1. Every text, chat, private, direct, group, iMessage, SMS, MMS or other message Between any Responsible Person and (London Breed or Sean Elsbernd) (of EVERY FORM OR APP, EXCEPT email, Signal, or government Microsoft Teams which are covered separately below). If you refuse to conduct a search based on this info alone or claim you cannot do so without Breed's phone number, I would encourage you to contact the Mayor's Office for the information and then conduct the complete informed search. Otherwise, DPW has disclosed Breed's number to me at least twice. Breed uses this number for the conduct of public business.

2. A full and exact copy of the Signal inbox page of every Responsible Person (if Signal is ever used to communicate about public business). Each Signal installation on each device can store DIFFERENT records - I want copies of all of them. You may of course redact purely personal messages or names etc. under appropriate justifications. See my own completely redacted Signal inbox in Exhibit C for an example. It's just the front page of the Signal app summarizing all of your conversations; all I need is a screenshot. You cannot hide who you are talking to about public business.

3. A full and exact copy of the SMS, MMS, Messages, Google Hangouts, Google Chat, iMessage, WhatsApp, Facebook Messenger (including Secret messages), Twitter Direct Message, Telegram, and WeChat inbox page of every Responsible Person (if any of those is used to communicate about public business). You must search EACH phone, tablet, and computer device of each Responsible Person. Each app installation on each device can store DIFFERENT records - I want copies of all of them. You may of course redact purely personal messages or names etc. under appropriate justifications. The inbox page is just the front page of the app showing a summary of all the conversations; all I need is a screenshot. You cannot hide who you are talking to about public business.
4. Dec 5, 2017 to present: Every email Between any Responsible Person and either londonbreed@gmail.com or london.breed@gmail.com (case insensitive), which is publicly stated by Breed herself to be her personal email here: https://mobile.twitter.com/londonbreed/status/953517854061608960?lang=en, https://archive.is/xoiLB, https://tweetstamp.org/953517854061608960, http://web.archive.org/web/20210803145709/https://mobile.twitter.com/londonbreed/status/953517854061608960?lang=en. DPW has shown that Breed uses this account for the conduct of public business in a prior request.

5. A full and exact copy of the entirety of the Signal thread Between every Responsible Person and every Target Person. You must search EACH phone, tablet, and computer device of each Responsible Person. Each Signal installation on each device can store DIFFERENT records - I want copies of all of them. I want complete screenshots (with all parts of the screen) of every screen of every Signal thread Between every Responsible Person and every Target Person, even if most of the messages are deleted and all that remains is the timer messages. Any attachments within Signal must also be provided separately in their original electronic format. You may of course redact purely personal messages under appropriate justifications. **When either party in Signal changes the auto-deletion timer a visible, textual, human-readable message is sent to the other party and stored in the thread, and is visible in the top-left corner of the screen, and I want those too.** There’s no issue of invisible metadata here: it’s right on the face of the conversation. Please see Exhibit A (which is an example of my own conversation in Signal when the messages have not yet been auto-deleted) and Exhibit B (which is what the conversation looks like when the messages are old and auto-deleted - note that the messages back and forth changing the auto-delete timer are preserved and still visible). All dates are relevant.

6. A full and exact copy of the SMS, MMS, Messages, Google Hangouts, Google Chat, iMessage, WhatsApp, Facebook Messenger (including Secret messages), Twitter Direct Message, Telegram, and WeChat thread Between every Responsible Person and every Target Person. You must search EACH phone, tablet, and computer device of each Responsible Person. Each installation on each device can store DIFFERENT records - I want copies of all of them. I want complete screenshots (with all parts of the screen) of every screen of every thread Between every Responsible Person and every Target Person, even if most of the messages are deleted. Any attachments within messages must also be provided separately in their original electronic format. You may of course redact purely personal messages under appropriate justifications. **Dates:** For messages with Breed or Elsbernd, all dates are relevant; For all other Target Persons, Jan 1, 2020 to present.

7. Dec 5, 2017 to present: Every screenshot taken by Sean Elsbernd of a text message to or from London Breed in the constructive possession of any Responsible Person (search at least their texts, chat, their iPhotos, their Google Photos, their device's camera, screenshots, and photos folder). Elsbernd appears to screenshot Breed's messages and then send those screenshots as images/texts to other people. He then boasts about deleting these screenshots (see https://twitter.com/journo_anon/status/1421220560919437312, https://tweetstamp.org/1421220560919437312).

8. Jan 1, 2020 to present: Every government Microsoft Teams message Between any Responsible Person and each Target Person. If you claim these are in DT’s, and not your, constructive possession, I will use that argument to have DT turn over all of your
department's communications themselves.

9. Jan 1, 2020 to present: Every recording (audio, video, and/or phone) of a meeting (EXCEPT open sessions open to the public under the Brown Act, press conferences, or recordings already posted by your agency online open to any member of the public) having a Designated Person and (London Breed or Sean Elsbernd) in attendance. If you claim these are in DT’s, and not your, constructive possession, I will use that argument to have DT turn over all of your department’s meetings themselves. Every closed session is a responsive record and will have to be justified as exempt under a PRA exemption if you withhold it. This ALSO includes voicemails received from London Breed or Sean Elsbernd by Designated Persons.

Definitions:

- "Between": When communications "between" 2 parties are requested, this includes communications sent by either party To/Cc/Bcc the other party (and potentially additional recipients as well), or sent by some third party To/Cc/Bcc both mentioned parties. Group communications are responsive.

- "Target Person(s)”: London Breed, Sean Elsbernd, Andrea Bruss, Jeff Cretan, Andres Power, Jeff Kositsky, William Scott, David Lazar, Chesa Boudin, David Campos, Rachel Marshall, Kasie Lee, Alaric Degrafinried, David Steinberg, John Cote, Noreen Ambrose, Hank Heckel, Sophia Kittler, Jeff Pierce, Grant Colfax, Tomas Aragon

- "Responsible Person(s)”: (a) The Designated Person, (b) each administrative/executive assistant of the Designated Person, (c) each chief of staff or deputy chief of staff of the Designated Person, (d) each director of communications, press director, media director, PR director, or spokesperson of the Designated Person, and (e) any of the Target Persons who are in your department. For many agencies, Target Persons are also Responsible Persons -- Conversations between them must still be produced.

- "Designated Person(s)" means:
  1. If your agency is a commission, board, task force, committee, or other "policy body" or "passive meeting body" as defined by the Sunshine Ordinance: your clerk or secretary, or if you have neither a clerk nor a secretary, your chair or president.
  2. If your agency has a department head: your department head.
  3. If both (1) and (2) apply, then your agency should respond once for each applicable definition (for example, the Public Utilities Commission has both a general manager and also a commission secretary and should respond for each)
  4. If somehow you believe none of 1 through 3 apply to your agency, you may contact me for clarification.
If another staff member is responsible for sending or receiving electronic communications on their account on behalf of the Designated Person, that other staff member's government accounts must be searched. For example, Dennis Herrera is the Designated Person for the Office of the City Attorney; but Brittany Feitelberg apparently sends and receives his communications on her account, and thus her accounts, in addition to his, must be searched.

PRESERVE ALL RESPONSIVE RECORDS THAT EXIST WHEN YOU RECEIVE THIS REQUEST. Do not allow any retention or auto-deletion policy to delete them after the time you receive this message. Even the Good Govt Guide tells you that you must do this.

Sadly Mayor Breed, Chief of Staff Elsbernd, and certain other public officials delete their public records, so I have to go to the entire rest of the City to find them. Complaints will be filed pursuant to Admin Code 67.29-7(a) against each department head that has failed to preserve and maintain ALL documents and correspondence in a professional and businesslike manner. I'm aware of Herrera's interpretation that this law is essentially meaningless - luckily for the public Herrera is not the final word, and as you may have seen through the last 2 years, he is often wrong, interpreting the Sunshine Ordinance in an unlawfully narrow manner.

You all are very clever in deleting and obfuscating records, so this is a very carefully worded request, and your search will indeed be complicated as a direct result of the work that you and/or your peers put into thwarting public disclosure. Read the entirety of the requests very carefully. All responses will be cross-checked against other agencies and other information I already have. Many of you have ignored these requests previously. Complaints for every violation will be filed.

Provide all records in the constructive possession of your department or agency. You have the responsibility to conduct a sufficient search (an IT search, a personal and govt property, instruct employees/contractors to search, and look in any not-yet-finally destroyed records in any Trash, Recycle Bin, Deleted Items, or similar folder, etc.) to find all of those records in your agency's and employees' constructive possession.

It is possible that even if a Responsible Person (defined below) deleted their own copy of a record that your IT search or other employees in your agency who are not Responsible Persons still possess the record and thus all employees and IT servers must be searched as well. For example if London Breed, your department head, and some other agency employee Bob were in a group text, and even if Breed and your dept head may have deleted their copy of the record, the other person Bob (or your IT servers) may not have deleted the record, and they must be searched and turn over the record. Boudin specifically appears to have tried to fool a prior requester this way - it won't work here.

Provide EXACT copies of every record. For records that are emails, be sure to preserve at least all text, hyperlinks, images, audio, video, formatting, attachments, email addresses, To, From, Cc, and Bcc, and date/time stamps. For other forms of digital messaging, be sure to preserve at least all text, hyperlinks, images, audio, video, formatting, attachments,
date/time stamps, and the name of the sender of each message, and the names of all recipients of each message. You must provide the list of participants in any group message, which is also a responsive record. If you refuse to provide the name of any participant in any communication, then I am also requesting any contact cards/records in the constructive possession of your office that would identify the unnamed participant. Every attachment, image, audio, video, or hyperlink to a responsive record is also a responsive record - and each of those must also be provided as an exact copy in its original electronic format (for example: Word documents must be provided as such, not converted to PDFs). Do not combine distinct public records into a single PDF if doing so removes any of the metadata. Preserve all original file names of all records - those names are themselves a non-exempt record.

Provide incremental response pursuant to SFAC 67.25(d). You may prioritize responses in the order requests are listed but you CANNOT let any responsive record be destroyed after you receive this request. You may also prioritize more recent messages over older ones in your rolling response.

Answer EACH of the following distinct numbered requests, referencing the definitions below for capitalized terms. EACH request must have a separate response under Gov Code 6253(c) indicating the responsive records, whether they are disclosable, and a reason. Do not mix them up or jumble together the results or records; provide each record associated with its request. There is no rule that I have to send a separate email for each request.

Thank you for your assistance with this PRA request.

Sincerely,

Linda Caravelli
LEGAL DIVISION
SAN FRANCISCO POLICE DEPARTMENT HEADQUARTERS
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
(415) 837-7147
Linda.Caravelli@sfgov.org
December 23, 2021

Via email arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com

Anonymous

RE: Public Records Request, dated December 15, 2021
   Reference # P057134-121521

Dear Anonymous:

The San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) received your Public Records Act request, dated December 15, 2021.

You requested, “This is a separate immediate disclosure request. Please produce any IT/service provider tickets, internal requests/replies, communications with City contractors, discussions of what to produce, searches, etc. used to process P043647-080421
I want to understand your process for searching and producing these kinds of text records and why it takes so long.
Regards,
Anonymous
Twitter @journo_anon

IMPORTANT:
1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary.
2. If you are NOT a public official: This communication is confidential and may contain unpublished information or confidential source information, protected by the California Shield Law, Evidence Code sec. 1070. I am a member of the electronic media and regularly publish information about the conduct of public officials.
3. I am not a lawyer. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever.
4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.
Sent with ProtonMail Secure Email.”

On December 16, the SFPD acknowledged your request, and informed you that the 10-day maximum deadline to respond applies. Please refer to California Government Code Section 6253(c).
Responsive documents are included in this correspondence. Please note that redactions have been made and documents have been withheld in these materials pursuant to California Government Code §§ 6254(k), 6254.25, 6276.04, Evidence Code § 954 - attorney-client privilege.

If you have any questions, please contact the Legal Division at (415) 837-7394.

Thank you for your courtesy in this regard.

Sincerely,

Lieutenant Arran Pera #531
Risk Management - Legal Division