

Date: 02-12-08

Item No. 6  
File No. 08006

**SUNSHINE ORDINANCE TASK FORCE**  
**COMPLAINT COMMITTEE**  
**AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST\***

- Complaint by: Kimo Crossman v Coty Attorney's Office**
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 


Completed by: Chris Rustom

Date: 02-07-08

**\*This list reflects the explanatory documents provided**

~ Late Agenda Items (documents received too late for distribution to the Task Force Members)

\*\* The document this form replaces exceeds 25 pages and will therefore not be copied for the packet. The original document is in the file kept by the Administrator, and may be viewed in its entirety by the Task Force, or any member of the public upon request at City Hall, Room 244.



DENNIS J. HERRERA  
City Attorney

ERNEST H. LLORENTE  
Deputy City Attorney

DIRECT DIAL: (415) 554-4236  
E-MAIL: ernest.llorente@sfgov.org

February 4, 2008

Sue Cauthen, Chair  
Members of the Complaint Committee

Re: Kimo Crossman v. City Attorney's Office (08006)

Dear Chair Cauthen and Members of the Complaint Committee:

This letter addresses the issue of whether the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force ("Task Force") has jurisdiction over the complaint of Kimo Crossman against the San Francisco City Attorney's Office.

### BACKGROUND

On November 30 2007, Kimo Crossman made an Immediate Disclosure Request ("IDR") for public records with Matt Dorsey of the City Attorney's Office. Kimo Crossman's IDR requested all materials related to the DCA Buck Delventhal meeting on 10/9/07 re: Board of Supervisors Sunshine Task Force Hearings re: Supervisor Peskin and Maxwell and any materials or communications before or after this meeting relating to the matters discussed. Kimo Crossman also requested a 15-minute phone call with DCA Delventhal to obtain oral public information.

On December 4, 2007, Alexis Thompson responded on behalf of the City Attorney's Office ("CAO") and based under Section 6253(c) of the Public Records Action and Section 67.25(b) of the Sunshine Ordinance, the CAO invoked an extension of time not to exceed 14 days to respond to the IDR.

Kimo Crossman claimed that he did not receive the records even after the extension. On 1/3/08, Kimo Crossman petitioned the Supervisor of Records from the City Attorney's Office and asked for a determination. DCA Paula Jesson responded to the request. Kimo Crossman stated that DCA Jesson's response was that Kimo Crossman would have to wait until the City Attorney's Office completes their review of records.

### COMPLAINT

On January 10, 2008, Complainant Kimo Crossman filed a complaint against the City Attorney's Office alleging violations sections 67.1; 67.25(d), 67.26, 67.21.(a), (b), (i), 67.24(d), 67.34 of the Sunshine Ordinance and State Government Code Sections 6253 and 6255.

Letter to the Complaint Committee  
Page 2  
February 4, 2008

### SHORT ANSWER

Based on Complainant's allegation and the applicable sections of the Sunshine Ordinance and the California Public Records Act, which are cited below, the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force *does* have jurisdiction over the allegation. The allegations are covered under 67.21 and 67.25 of the Ordinance.

### DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS

Article I Section 3 of the California Constitution as amended by Proposition 59 in 2004, the State Public Records Act, the State Brown Act, and the Sunshine Ordinance as amended by Proposition G in 1999 generally covers the area of Public Records and Public Meeting laws that the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force uses in its work.

The Sunshine Ordinance is located in the San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 67. All statutory references, unless stated otherwise, are to the Administrative Code.

Section 67.21 generally covers requests for documents and Section 67.25-5 covers Immediate Disclosure Requests

In this case Kimo Crossman alleges that he made requests for the communications, advice, involving the City Attorney's Office and Supervisors Peskin and Maxwell on Sunshine Ordinance and State Public records matters and did not receive them. The Task Force has subject matter jurisdiction over this complaint and will have to determine if the City Attorney's Office violated the Ordinance.



kimo <kimo@webnetic.net>  
Sent by:  
kimocrossman@gmail.com

01/10/2008 06:40 PM

Please respond to  
kimo@webnetic.net

To SOTF <sotf@sfgov.org>, cityattorney@sfgov.org, "Paula  
Jesson" <paula.jesson@sfgov.org>  
cc  
bcc  
Subject SOTF complaint Buck Delventhal - Supes/Sunshine

Submitted on: 1/10/2007

Department: City Attorney

Contacted: Matt Dorsey, Paula Jesson, Alexis Thompson

Public\_Records\_Violation: Yes

Public\_Meeting\_Violation: No

Meeting\_Date:

Section(s)\_Violated: 67.1, 67.25 d, 67.22, 67.27,67.26, 67.21(a),(b),(i), 67.21 (d), 67.24 (b) (1)  
(iii)  
67.34, Government Code 6253, 6255

Description: I requested Please provide all materials related to the Buck Delventhal meeting on 10/9 "re Board of Sups Sunshine Task Force hearings re Sup Peskin and Maxwell" 1.75 hours. And any materials or communications before or after this meeting relating to the matters discussed. This includes any correspondence, notes, emails, memos, voicemail, calendars, etc I also requested a 15 min phone call with Mr. Delvethal to obtain Oral public info

After a 14 day extension no additional response was provided by the office, no records have been provided and not incrementally. No notification that my requests were being prioritized. Silence.

On 1/3 I appealed to the Supervisor of Records for determination of 4 requests which were significantly overdue even after extensions at the City Attorney's office. All of these requests were reasonable, for example I requested the communications between the District Attorney and the City Attorney re Sunshine Matters for a period. Another one: all Open Government advice provided to the new Clerk of the Board, or any records of communications with Harrison Sheppard.

Ms. Jesson, the Supervisor or Records claims I have to wait until the city attorney office completes their review of records, that is not correct, if they have not provided a response besides the extension they have failed to comply. And an appeal is valid.

Ms. Jesson does not understand that law. "If the custodian refuses, fails to comply, or incompletely complies" That has occurred, a determination must be processed within ten days of my appeal request.

She apparently is claiming that the office of 200 lawyers plus staff has to prioritize my requests even though I was not notified that they were prioritized, nor the order they were prioritized and she has provided no legal basis for prioritizing my requests.

Ms Jesson:

*You submitted five petitions on January 3, 2008. Four of those relate to requests for records made to this office. This office has not yet responded to this request. As you know, because of the volume of your public records requests to this office, it has become necessary to prioritize them. When this office has completed its review and determined that a record that you have requested falls within a protected category and should be withheld, you may appeal the denial to the Supervisor of Records. Until that time, your appeal is premature*

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.

Please see attached email for more details

Hearing: Yes

Date: 1/10/08

Name: Kimo Crossman

Address:

City:

Zip:

Phone:

Email: [kimo@webnetic.net](mailto:kimo@webnetic.net)

Anonymous:

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **kimo** <[kimo@webnetic.net](mailto:kimo@webnetic.net)>

Date: Jan 3, 2008 9:13 PM

Subject: APPEAL: Immediate Disclosure Request - Buck Delventhal - Supes/Sunshine

To: Alexis Thompson <[Alexis.Thompson@sfgov.org](mailto:Alexis.Thompson@sfgov.org)>, [cityattorney@sfgov.org](mailto:cityattorney@sfgov.org), Matt Dorsey <[Matt.Dorsey@sfgov.org](mailto:Matt.Dorsey@sfgov.org)>, Allen Grossman <[grossman356@mac.com](mailto:grossman356@mac.com)>, " [home@prosf.org](mailto:home@prosf.org)" <[home@prosf.org](mailto:home@prosf.org)>, kimo <[kimo@webnetic.net](mailto:kimo@webnetic.net)>, Paula Jesson <[paula.jesson@sfgov.org](mailto:paula.jesson@sfgov.org)>

Ms. Jesson, this is an appeal for these records.

On Dec 31, 2007 11:28 AM, kimo <[kimo@webnetic.net](mailto:kimo@webnetic.net)> wrote:

>

>

> On Dec 27, 2007 6:22 PM, kimo <[kimo@webnetic.net](mailto:kimo@webnetic.net)> wrote:

>>

>>

>>

>> On Dec 26, 2007 5:09 PM, kimo <[kimo@webnetic.net](mailto:kimo@webnetic.net)> wrote:

>>

>>>

>>>

>>>

>>> On Dec 4, 2007 4:49 PM, Alexis Thompson <[Alexis.Thompson@sfgov.org](mailto:Alexis.Thompson@sfgov.org)>

> wrote:

>>>

>>>>

>>>> Dear Kimo,

>>>>

>>>> Pursuant to Section 6253 (c) of the Public Records Act and Section  
> 67.25 (b) of the Sunshine Ordinance, we are invoking an extension of time to  
> respond to this request in order to consult with another City Department.  
> We are hopeful that we will have a response for you in less than 14 days.

>>>>

>>>> Best,

>>>> ALEXIS THOMPSON

>>>> Deputy Press Secretary

>>>>

>>>>

>

>>>> OFFICE OF CITY ATTORNEY DENNIS HERRERA  
>>>> San Francisco City Hall, Room 234  
>>>> 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
>>>> San Francisco, California 94102-4682  
>>>>  
>>>> (415) 554-4653 Direct  
>>>> (415) 554-4700 Reception  
>>>> (415) 554-4715 Facsimile  
>>>> (415) 554-6770 TTY  
>>>>  
>>>> <http://www.sfgov.org/cityattorney/>  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> "Kimo Crossman" <[kimo@webnetic.net](mailto:kimo@webnetic.net)>  
>>>>  
>>>> 11/30/2007 08:22 PM  
>>>>  
>>>> To "'Cityattorney'" <[CityAttorney@sfgov.org](mailto:CityAttorney@sfgov.org)>, "'Matt Dorsey'"  
> <[Matt.Dorsey@sfgov.org](mailto:Matt.Dorsey@sfgov.org)>  
>>>>  
>>>> cc "'Allen Grossman'" <[grossman356@mac.com](mailto:grossman356@mac.com)>, "'Jeff Ente'"  
> <[jeffente@att.net](mailto:jeffente@att.net)>, <[home@prosf.org](mailto:home@prosf.org)>, "'Comstock Doug'" <[dougcoms@aol.com](mailto:dougcoms@aol.com)>,  
> <[rak0408@earthlink.net](mailto:rak0408@earthlink.net)>  
>>>>  
>>>> Subject Immediate Disclosure Request - Buck Delventhal -  
> Supes/Sunshine  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> Immediate Disclosure Request  
>>>>  
>>>> Please provide all materials related to the Buck Delventhal meeting on  
> 10/9 "re Board of Sups Sunshine Task Force hearings re Sup Peskin and  
> Maxwell" 1.75 hours. And any materials or communications before or after  
> this meeting relating to the matters discussed.  
>>>>  
>>>> This includes any correspondence, notes, emails, memos, voicemail,  
> calendars, etc  
>>>>  
>>>> I also request a 15 min phone call with Mr. Delvethal to obtain Oral  
> public info

>>>>

>>>> Please email information to [kimo@webnetic.net](mailto:kimo@webnetic.net)

>>>>

>>>> Please provide information in its original electronic format, or  
> scanned to pdf if only exists in paper

>>>>

>>>> Please search all backup/archives of digital media including email,  
> voicemail as well

>>>>

>>>> Please provide the search phrases and keywords used to perform  
> searches.

>>>

>>>

>>

>>

>

>





"Kimo Crossman"  
<kimo@webnetic.net>

02/05/2008 06:56 AM

Please respond to  
<kimo@webnetic.net>

<soft@sfgov.org>, <paula.jesson@sfgov.org>,  
To <cityattorney@sfgov.org>, <Alexis.Thompson@sfgov.org>,  
<Matt.Dorsey@sfgov.org>  
cc "Allen Grossman" <grossman356@mac.com>,  
<home@prof.org>

bcc

Subject Amendment to complaints #08004-08007

Please add the additional code sections to each complaint

Government Code 6257 for failure to respond "Promptly"

67.21 (a) for failure to respond without "unreasonable delay"

67.21 (d) for failure to issue a determination by the Supervisor of Records in ten days

67.25 (b) for invalid invocation of extension of time for easily accessible billing reports and calendars

67.26 for assertion that work effort could be queued "The work of responding to a public-records request and preparing documents for disclosure shall be considered part of the regular work duties of any city employee, and no fee shall be charged to the requester to cover the personnel costs of responding to a records request."

For 08006 only 67.22 failure to provide Oral Information



DENNIS J. HERRERA  
City Attorney

MATT DORSEY  
Public Information Officer

February 5, 2008

Honorable Members, Sunshine Ordinance Task Force  
c/o Frank Darby, Jr., Administrator  
Office of the Clerk, Board of Supervisors  
Room 244, City Hall  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Re: Complaint No. 08006

Dear Task Force Members:

This letter addresses the jurisdiction of the Task Force over the subject complaint. We acknowledge that the Task Force has jurisdiction. We will address the merits of the complaint at a later time.

Very truly yours,


DENNIS J. HERRERA  
City Attorney

*[Handwritten signature of Matt Dorsey]*  
MATT DORSEY  
Public Information Officer

RECEIVED  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
SAN FRANCISCO

2008 FEB -5 AM 11:22

BY: *[Handwritten initials]*



"Kimo Crossman"  
<kimo@webnetic.net>

02/05/2008 06:56 AM

Please respond to  
<kimo@webnetic.net>

<soft@sfgov.org>, <paula.jesson@sfgov.org>,  
To <cityattorney@sfgov.org>, <Alexis.Thompson@sfgov.org>,  
<Matt.Dorsey@sfgov.org>  
cc "Allen Grossman" <grossman356@mac.com>,  
<home@prosf.org>

bcc

Subject Amendment to complaints #08004-08007

Please add the additional code sections to each complaint

Government Code 6257 for failure to respond "Promptly"

67.21 (a) for failure to respond without "unreasonable delay"

67.21 (d) for failure to issue a determination by the Supervisor of Records in ten days

67.25 (b) for invalid invocation of extension of time for easily accessible billing reports and calendars

67.26 for assertion that work effort could be queued "The work of responding to a public-records request and preparing documents for disclosure shall be considered part of the regular work duties of any city employee, and no fee shall be charged to the requester to cover the personnel costs of responding to a records request."

For 08006 only 67.22 failure to provide Oral Information

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY



DENNIS J. HERRERA  
City Attorney

MATT DORSEY  
Public Information Officer

February 5, 2008

Honorable Members, Sunshine Ordinance Task Force  
c/o Frank Darby, Jr., Administrator  
Office of the Clerk, Board of Supervisors  
Room 244, City Hall  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Re: Complaint No. 08006

Dear Task Force Members:

This letter addresses the jurisdiction of the Task Force over the subject complaint. We acknowledge that the Task Force has jurisdiction. We will address the merits of the complaint at a later time.

Very truly yours,

DENNIS J. HERRERA  
City Attorney

*[Handwritten signature of Matt Dorsey]*  
MATT DORSEY  
Public Information Officer

RECEIVED  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

2008 FEB -5 AM 11:22

BY: *[Handwritten initials]*