

Date: Jan. 25, 2011

Item No. 12 & 13
File No. 10069

SUNSHINE ORDINANCE TASK FORCE

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST*

- William Clark v Arts Commission
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-

Completed by: Chris Rustom

Date: Jan. 21, 2011

***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

JERRY THREET
Deputy City Attorney

Direct Dial: (415) 554-3914
Email: jerry.threet@sfgov.org

**MEMORANDUM
PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL**

TO: Sunshine Ordinance Task Force
FROM: Jerry Threet
Deputy City Attorney
DATE: January 18, 2011
RE: 10069: *William and Robert Clark v. Arts Commission*

COMPLAINT

Complainants William and Robert Clark allege that the San Francisco Arts Commission (the "Commission") violated the Ordinance by failing to adequately respond to their November 8, 2010 public records request for documents and records that show how much salary and benefits were paid to Howard Lazar, Evelyn Russell, and other Commission employees from the \$118, 759 in salaries and \$42, 820 in benefits reported to the Controller (presumably in connection to the Street Artists fee setting process).

COMPLAINANT FILES COMPLAINT:

On December 17, 2010, the complainants filed a complaint alleging a public records violation.

JURISDICTION

The Commission is a department under the Ordinance. Therefore, in general, the Task Force has jurisdiction to hear public records complaints against the Arts Commission. The Commission did not contest jurisdiction.

APPLICABLE STATUTORY SECTION(S):

- Section 67.21 governs the process for gaining access to public records.
- Section 67.25 governs the immediacy of response.
- Section 67.26 governs the withholding of records.
- Section 67.27 governs the written justifications for withholding of records.

APPLICABLE CASE LAW:

None

ISSUES TO BE DETERMINED

Uncontested Facts: Complainants allege that, on or about November 8, 2010, they made a public records request to the Commission for documents and records that show how much salary and benefits were paid to Howard Lazar, Evelyn Russell, and other Commission employees from the \$118,759 in salaries and \$42,820 in benefits reported to the Controller.

**MEMORANDUM
PRIVILEGED & CONFIDENTIAL**

TO: Sunshine Ordinance Task Force
DATE: January 18, 2011
PAGE: 2
RE: 10069: *William and Robert Clark v. Arts Commission*

Complainants further allege that the Commission responded on November 9, 2010 by invoking an additional 14 days to respond. They further allege that on November 22, 2010, the Commission responded by producing two documents, which they allege are not responsive to their request.

Contested Facts: As I had not received a response from the Commission at the time of this memorandum, it is unclear whether they contest any allegations.

QUESTIONS THAT MIGHT ASSIST IN DETERMINING FACTS:

- What is the nature of the documents produced by the Commission in their November 22, 2010 response?
- Were these documents responsive to the request?
- Were other responsive documents withheld by the Commission?
- If so, was any written justification provided for withholding?

LEGAL ISSUES/LEGAL DETERMINATIONS:

- Has the Commission timely responded to the request?
- Did the Commission justify withholding in accordance with the requirements of the Ordinance?
- Are the Commission justifications for withholding reasons allowed by the Ordinance?

CONCLUSION

THE TASK FORCE FINDS THE FOLLOWING FACTS TO BE TRUE:

THE TASK FORCE FINDS THE ALLEGED VIOLATIONS TO BE TRUE OR NOT TRUE.

**MEMORANDUM
PRIVILEGED & CONFIDENTIAL**

TO: Sunshine Ordinance Task Force
DATE: January 18, 2011
PAGE: 3
RE: 10069: *William and Robert Clark v. Arts Commission*

**CHAPTER 67, SAN FRANCISCO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE (SUNSHINE
ORDINANCE)****SEC. 67.21. PROCESS FOR GAINING ACCESS TO PUBLIC RECORDS;
ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS.**

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

SEC. 67.25. IMMEDIACY OF RESPONSE.

(a) Notwithstanding the 10-day period for response to a request permitted in Government Code Section 6256 and in this Article, a written request for information described in any category of non-exempt public information shall be satisfied no later than the close of business on the day following the day of the request. This deadline shall apply only if the words "Immediate Disclosure Request" are placed across the top of the request and on the envelope, subject line, or cover sheet in which the request is transmitted. Maximum deadlines provided in this article are appropriate for more extensive or demanding requests, but shall not be used to delay fulfilling a simple, routine or otherwise readily answerable request.

(b) If the voluminous nature of the information requested, its location in a remote storage facility or the need to consult with another interested department warrants an extension of 10 days as provided in Government Code Section 6456.1, the requester shall be notified as required by the close of business on the business day following the request.

(c) The person seeking the information need not state his or her reason for making the request or the use to which the information will be put, and requesters shall not be routinely asked to make such a disclosure. Where a record being requested contains information most of which is exempt from disclosure under the California Public Records Act and this article, however, the City Attorney or custodian of the record may inform the requester of the nature and extent of the non-exempt information and inquire as to the requester's purpose for seeking it, in order to suggest alternative sources for the information which may involve less redaction or to otherwise prepare a response to the request.

(d) Notwithstanding any provisions of California Law or this ordinance, in response to a request for information describing any category of non-exempt public information, 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. This section is intended to prohibit the withholding of public records that are responsive to a records request until all potentially responsive documents have been reviewed and collected. Failure to comply with this provision is a violation of this article.

**MEMORANDUM
PRIVILEGED & CONFIDENTIAL**

TO: Sunshine Ordinance Task Force
DATE: January 18, 2011
PAGE: 4
RE: 10069: *William and Robert Clark v. Arts Commission*

SEC. 67.26. WITHHOLDING KEPT TO A MINIMUM.

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

SEC. 67.27. JUSTIFICATION OF WITHHOLDING.

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.
- (b) A withholding on the basis that disclosure is prohibited by law shall cite the specific statutory authority in the Public Records Act or elsewhere.
- (c) A withholding on the basis that disclosure would incur civil or criminal liability shall cite any specific statutory or case law, or any other public agency's litigation experience, supporting that position.
- (d) When a record being requested contains information, most of which is exempt from disclosure under the California Public Records Act and this Article, the custodian shall inform the requester of the nature and extent of the nonexempt information and suggest alternative sources for the information requested, if available.

CAL. PUBLIC RECORDS ACT (GOVT. CODE §§ 6250, ET SEQ.)

SECTION 6253

(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.

**MEMORANDUM
PRIVILEGED & CONFIDENTIAL**

TO: Sunshine Ordinance Task Force
DATE: January 18, 2011
PAGE: 5
RE: *10069: William and Robert Clark v. Arts Commission*

- (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.

SECTION 6254

- (a) Public records are open to inspection at all times during the office hours of the state or local agency and every person has a right to inspect any public record, except as hereafter provided. Any reasonably segregable portion of a record shall be available for inspection by any person requesting the record after deletion of the portions that are exempted by law.
- (b) Except with respect to public records exempt from disclosure by express provisions of law, each state or local agency, upon a request for a copy of records that reasonably describes an identifiable record or records, shall make the records promptly available to any person upon payment of fees covering direct costs of duplication, or a statutory fee if applicable. Upon request, an exact copy shall be provided unless impracticable to do so.
- (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.



<complaints@sfgov.org>
12/17/2010 03:05 PM

To <soff@sfgov.org>
cc
bcc
Subject Sunshine Complaint

To:soff@sfgov.orgEmail:complaints@sfgov.orgDEPARTMENT:Arts Commission

CONTACTED:Howard Lazar

PUBLIC_RECORDS_VIOLATION:Yes

PUBLIC_MEETING_VIOLATION:No

MEETING_DATE:

SECTIONS_VIOLATED:

DESCRIPTION:Not providing us with the documents and/or records which show how much salary Howard Lazar was paid, how much salary Evelyn Russell was paid and how much salary any other employees were paid from the \$118,000 in salaries reported to the Controller as well as how much in benefits Howard Lazar was paid, how much in benefits Evelyn Russell was paid and how much in benefits any other employees were paid from the \$42,000 in benefits reported to the Controller.

HEARING:Yes

PRE-HEARING:No

DATE:12/17/2010

NAME:William and Robert Clark

ADDRESS:PO Box 882252

CITY:San Francisco

ZIP:CA 94188

PHONE:415-822-5465

CONTACT_EMAIL:billandbob@access4less.net

ANONYMOUS:

CONFIDENTIALITY_REQUESTED:No



Bill and Bob Clark
<billandbobclark@access4less.net>

To sotf@sfgov.org

cc

bcc

12/02/2010 03:05 PM

Please respond to
Bill and Bob Clark
<billandbobclark@access4less.net>

Subject New Sunshine Ordinance complaint against Howard Lazar

History:

✉ This message has been replied to.

Hi Chris,

We just filed a new complaint against Howard Lazar at the SOTF website. Please let us know whether or not you received it.

The complaint stated that "On November 8, 2010 we requested that Mr. Howard Lazar provide us with the documents and/or records which show what salary and benefits were paid to Howard Lazar, what salary and benefits were paid to Evelyn Russell and what salaries and benefits were paid to other employees from the \$118,759 in employee salaries and from the \$42,820 in employee benefits which were reported to the Controller.

On November 9, 2010, Mr. Lazar sent us an email in which he stated, 'Please be advised that we are hereby invoking an extension of not more than 14 days from November 8, 2010 to respond to your request pursuant to the California Public records Act. Under the Public records Act, the deadline can be extended for up to 14 days due to 'the need to search for, collect and appropriately examine a voluminous amount of separate and distinct records which are demanded in a single request' and '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.'

(See Cal. Gov't Code Sec. 6253 (c) (2) and (3)).'

On November 22, 2010 Mr. Lazar sent us two documents entitled, 'FAML 6450 V5.1 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO-NFAMIS ORGANIZATION SUMMARY INQUIRY 11/09/2010' regarding 'FISCAL MO/YR:14 2010 YREND2010' and 'INDEX CODE: 28STR102 STREET ARTISTS'.

Neither of those documents contained the information we requested.

Since according to Section 67.24(c)(4), any documents and/or records which state the salaries and benefits of public employees must be released when requested, we are filing this complaint."

William J. Clark
Robert J. Clark



SAN FRANCISCO ARTS COMMISSION

GAVIN NEWSOM
MAYOR

LUIS R. CANCEL
DIRECTOR OF
CULTURAL AFFAIRS

January 3, 2011

Honorable Members, Sunshine Ordinance Task Force
Complaint Committee

c/o Chris Rustom, Deputy Administrator
Office of the Clerk, Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

PROGRAMS

CIVIC ART COLLECTION
CIVIC DESIGN REVIEW
COMMUNITY ARTS
& EDUCATION
CULTURAL EQUITY GRANTS
PERFORMING ARTS
PUBLIC ART
STREET ARTISTS LICENSES

ARTS COMMISSION GALLERY
401 VAN NESS AVENUE
415.554.6080

RE: Sunshine Ordinance Task Force - #10069 William and Robert
Clark v. Arts Commission

WWW.SFARTSCOMMISSION.ORG

ARTSCOMMISSION@SFGOV.ORG

Dear Committee Members:

The San Francisco Arts Commission (the "Commission") is submitting this response to Complaint #10069, William and Robert Clark v. Arts Commission, which was received by the Commission on December 22, 2010. With respect to the SOTF's requirement that the Arts Commission is "required to submit a response to the charges to the Task Force within five (5) business days of receipt of this notice", I wrote to Mr. Chris Rustom on December 23, 2010, that the Arts Commission would be unable to furnish a response until the week of January 3 – 7, 2011, as both the Arts Commission's Director of Cultural Affairs and the Chief Financial Officer were out of town, and the Arts Commission's office would be closed (and its staff not present) commencing December 24, 2010 until January 3, 2011. We are now herewith furnishing our response to the charges.

For the reasons discussed below, the Arts Commission contends that the complaint is outside of the jurisdiction of the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force and is without merit.

We note that the Clarks' e-mailed complaint, received by the SOTF on December 17, 2010, entered the word "Yes" next to the heading "PUBLIC RECORDS VIOLATION" and that in a December 2, 2010 e-mail to the SOTF the Clarks stated: "*Since according to Section 67.24 (c)(4), any documents and/or records which state the salaries and benefits of*



CITY AND COUNTY OF
SAN FRANCISCO

public employees must be released when requested, we are filing this complaint.”

Next to the heading “DESCRIPTION” (December 17, 2010 e-mail) the Clarks state: *“Not providing us with the documents and/or records which show how much salary Howard Lazar was paid, how much salary Evelyn Russell was paid and how much salary any other employees were paid from the \$118,000 in salaries reported to the Controller as well as how much in benefits Howard Lazar was paid, how much in benefits Evelyn Russell was paid and how much in benefits any other employees were paid from the \$42,000 in benefits reported to the Controller.”*

The Clarks acknowledged (in their December 2, 2010 e-mail) that Street Artists Program Director Howard Lazar furnished them with *“two documents entitled, ‘FAML 6450 V5.1 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO-NFAMIS ORGANIZATION SUMMARY INQUIRY 11/09/2010’ regarding ‘FISCAL MO/YR:14 2010 YREN2010’ and ‘INDEX CODE: 28STR102 STREET ARTISTS’ ”* and stated that *“Neither of those documents contained the information we requested.”*

Please see the attached copies (pdf files) of the November 22, 2010 letter-response sent to the Clarks by Mr. Lazar and the documents referred to (above) by the Clarks. While the documents do not contain a breakdown or itemization of salaries and benefits of the various employees as requested by the Clarks, these documents were the only documents relevant to the request in the Arts Commission’s possession. The Arts Commission has no documents that show such a breakdown or itemization. Furthermore, the Sunshine Ordinance does not require the Arts Commission to create, compose, produce, or generate a document that it does not already possess in order to fulfill a public records request. **S.F. Administrative Code Section 67.21(1).**

Therefore, we respectfully assert the following:

I. The Sunshine Task Force Lacks Jurisdiction To Hear This Complaint. Because the Sunshine Ordinance does not mandate a department to create, compose, produce, or generate a document that it does not already possess in order to fulfill a public records request, the Clarks’ complaint is outside of the jurisdiction of the Sunshine Task Force.

II. The Clarks’ Complaint Lacks Merit Because the Arts Commission Complied With the Applicable Requirements of the Sunshine Ordinance.

The Arts Commission furnished documents in a timely manner that were relevant to the request. While the documents did not provide for a breakdown or itemization of the salaries and benefits of the employees, such costs were encompassed in the figures shown on the documents, and the documents were the only documents in the Arts Commission's possession relevant to the request.

We reiterate: **No provision in the Sunshine Ordinance requires a Commission to create, compose, produce, or generate a document it does not already possess in order to fulfill a public records request by any individual or member of the public.** Because the Sunshine Ordinance does not impose such a requirement, the Task Force lacks jurisdiction to adjudicate the allegation of the Clarks' complaint.

In summary, the Clarks' complaint is outside of the jurisdiction of the Sunshine Task Force. We, therefore, respectfully request that the complaint be dismissed.

Sincerely,

Howard Lazar
Street Artists Program Director

Enclosures

Cc: The Honorable P. J. Johnston, President, Arts Commission
The Honorable Greg Chew, Chairman, and Commissioners John
Calloway, Amy Chuang, Sherene Melania, and Jessica Silverman
- Street Artists Committee
Mr. Luis R. Cancel, Director of Cultural Affairs
Mr. Kan Htun, Chief Financial Officer
Ms. Jill Manton, Director of Programs

City Atty



SAN FRANCISCO ARTS COMMISSION

GAVIN NEWSOM
MAYOR

LUIS R. CANCEL
DIRECTOR OF
CULTURAL AFFAIRS

November 22, 2010

Mr. William J. Clark
Mr. Robert J. Clark
P. O. Box 882252
San Francisco, CA 94188

PROGRAMS

- CIVIC ART COLLECTION
- CIVIC DESIGN REVIEW
- COMMUNITY ARTS & EDUCATION
- CULTURAL EQUITY GRANTS
- PERFORMING ARTS
- PUBLIC ART
- STREET ARTISTS LICENSES

ARTS COMMISSION GALLERY
401 VAN NESS AVENUE
415.554.6080

WWW.SFARTSCOMMISSION.ORG

ARTSCOMMISSION@SFGOV.ORG

Re: Public Records Request of November 8, 2010

Dear Mr. William J. Clark and Mr. Robert J. Clark:

We are writing in response to the request for documents you e-mailed to us on November 8, 2010.

In your request you state that you are requesting copies of the following items:

(1) "... documents and/or records which were used to determine that the Director of Programs spent 5% of her time to manage and/or supervise the Street Artist Program." In response, we hereby inform you that the Arts Commission has no such document and/or record which was used to make such determination. The figure is based on a reasonable assessment of the Director of Programs's involvement in the activities of all of the programs of the Arts Commission.

(2) "... documents and/or records which were used to determine that the Director of Cultural Affairs spent 5% of his time to manage and/or supervise the Street Artist Program." In response, we hereby inform you that the Arts Commission has no such document and/or record which was used to make such determination. The figure is based on a reasonable assessment of the Director of Cultural Affairs's involvement in the activities of all of the programs of the Arts Commission.

(3) "... documents and/or records which were used to determine that the City Attorney spent 11.75 hours of his time processing Sunshine Disclosures." In response, please find the enclosed copy of (a) July 26, 2010 e-mail entitled "Fw: Arts Commission Payment for Time Billed to Street Artists Program for Public Records Issues - Billing #0000496" from Arts Commission Chief Financial Officer Kan Htun to Dora Okai requesting processing a charge of \$2,516.75 from the Street Artists



CITY AND COUNTY OF
SAN FRANCISCO

Program; (b) attached July 2, 2010 e-mail from Deputy City Attorney Adine Varah informing Kan Htun that "The total amount for the 2009-2010 fiscal year (July 1, 2009 – June 30, 2010) for advice to the Street Artists Program regarding public records issues is: 11.75 hours / \$2,516.75" and requesting Mr. Htun to "coordinate with Susana Martinez regarding the transfer of payment of \$2,516.75 to our office"; and (c) attached July 1, 2010 e-mail from Scott Minty of City Attorney's Office to Deputy City Attorney Varah regarding "a spreadsheet showing the FY10 time for 0000496 – ARTCOM Street Artists Program ... PRA/Sunshine Time: 11/75 hours / \$2,516.75."

(4) "... documents and/or records which show what salary and benefits were paid to Howard Lazar, what salary and benefits were paid to Evelyn Russell and what salaries and benefits were paid to other employees from the \$118,759 in employee salaries and from the \$42,820 in employee benefits which were reported to the Controller." In response, please find the enclosed two printouts from FAMIS screens entitled "FAML 6450 V5.1 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO – NFAMIS ORGANIZATION SUMMARY INQUIRY 11/09/2010" regarding "FISCAL MO/YR: 14 2010 YREND2010" and "INDEX CODE: 28STR102 STREET ARTISTS".

The Arts Commission in Resolution No. 1202-97-427 approved "a copying charge of 10 cents per page for any document requests over ten pages or any request for three or more documents." Because the enclosed documents number only four pages, no copying charge is applied to your request.

Sincerely,



Howard Lazar

Street Artists Program Director

Enclosures (4)

Cc: Arts Commissioners Greg Chew, John Calloway, Amy Chuang,
Sherene Melania, Jessica Silverman – Street Artists Program
Committee

Arts Commissioner P. J. Johnston, President
Director of Cultural Affairs Luis R. Cancel
Director of Programs Jill Manton
Chief Financial Officer Kan Htun
Deputy City Attorney Adine K. Varah

2009-10 CITY ATTY
SUNSHINE COSTS

idget 10-11



Fw: Arts Commission Payment for Time Billed to Street Artists Program for
Public Records Issues - Billing # 0000496

Kan Htun to: Dora Okai

07/26/2010 02:42 PM

Cc: Susana Martinez, Adine Varah, Howard Lazar

Hi Dora,

As per the latest correspondences on this matter, please process on your side to charge the fees due by Arts Commission \$ 2,516.75 for FY2009-10 from the following index Code and project code for the Street Artist program. Since we have no work order account set up already, I cannot process to your subobject code 086CA.

Index Code: 28STR102

Project: PAR102

Subobject: 02731

Thanks, Kan.

Kan Htun, CPA
Director of Finance
Arts Commission
Tel: (415) 252-4604
Fax: (415) 252-2595

Website: <http://www.sfartscommission.org>
e-newsletter: <http://www.sfartscommission.org/lists/?p=subscribe&id=4>
Twitter: <http://www.twitter.com/SFAC>
Facebook: <http://www.facebook.com/sfartscommission>
YouTube: <http://www.youtube.com/ArtsCommission>
Flickr: <http://www.flickr.com/photos/sfac>

— Forwarded by Kan Htun/ARTSCOM/SFGOV on 07/26/2010 02:36 PM —

From: Adine Varah/CTYATT@CTYATT
To: Kan Htun/ARTSCOM/SFGOV@SFGOV
Cc: Susana Martinez/CTYATT@CTYATT, Marisa More/CTYATT@CTYATT, Howard Lazar/ARTSCOM/SFGOV@SFGOV, Scott Minty/CTYATT@CTYATT
Date: 07/01/2010 11:50 AM
Subject: Arts Commission Payment for Time Billed to Street Artists Program for Public Records Issues - Billing # 0000496

Dear Kan,

Thank you for confirming that the Arts Commission has allocated funding to pay for our office's advice on Sunshine and Public Records Act issues for the Street Artists Program for fiscal year 2009-2010 and for this coming fiscal year.

The total amount due for the 2009-2010 fiscal year (July 1, 2009 - June 30, 2010) for advice to the Street Artists Program regarding public records issues is:
11.75 hours / \$2,516.75 (see attached).

Please coordinate with Susana Martinez regarding the transfer of payment of \$2,516.75 to our office.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Adine Varah
Deputy City Attorney
City and County of San Francisco
City Hall, Room 234
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

(415) 554-4670 (tel)
(415) 554-4747 (fax)
Adine.Varah@sfgov.org

Scott Minty Adine Here's a spreadsheet showing the FY10 fi... 07/01/2010 11:02:18 AM

From: Scott Minty/CTYATT
To: Adine Varah/CTYATT@CTYATT
Date: 07/01/2010 11:02 AM
Subject: FY10 Time for 0000496

Adine,

Here's a spreadsheet showing the FY10 time for 0000496 - ARTCOM Street Artists Program:



FY10 Time for 0000496.xls

Total time: 50.25 hours / \$9,522.75

PRA/Sunshine Time: 11.75 hours / \$2,516.75

Hope this helps,
Scott

FAML6450 V5.1
LINK TO:

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO--NFAMIS
ORGANIZATION SUMMARY INQUIRY

11/09/2010
1:49 PM

BALANCE (Y,M,Q,A) : Y CURR/PRIOR PRD : CURRENCY CODE :
FISCAL MO/YEAR : 14 2010 YREND2010 FUNDING PERIOD:
INDEX CODE : 28STR102 STREET ARTISTS
ORGANIZATION :
CHAR / OBJECT : X
FDTP FUND SFND :
PROJECT PROJ DTL :
GRANT GRANT DTL :
USER CD :

S CHAR	DESCRIPTION	BUDGET	ACTUAL	PREENC/ENC	BALANCE
200	LICENSES, PERMITS	245,302	245,302		
300	INTEREST & INVESTM	1,129	1,129		
	REVENUE TOTAL	246,431	246,431		
001	SALARIES	118,759	118,759		
013	MANDATORY FRINGE B	42,820	42,820		
021	NON PERSONNEL SERV	78,263	78,263		
040	MATERIALS & SUPPLI	2,136	2,136		

F1-HELP F2-SELECT F4-PRIOR F5-NEXT
F7-PRIOR PG F8-NEXT PG F9-LINK
G010 - PRIOR PAGE DISPLAYED

FAML6450 V5.1
LINK TO:

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO--NFAMIS
ORGANIZATION SUMMARY INQUIRY

11/09/2010
1:49 PM

BALANCE (Y,M,Q,A) : Y CURR/PRIOR PRD : CURRENCY CODE :
FISCAL MO/YEAR : 14 2010 YREND2010 FUNDING PERIOD:
INDEX CODE : 28STR102 STREET ARTISTS
ORGANIZATION :
CHAR / OBJECT : X
FDTP FUND SFND :
PROJECT PROJ DTL :
GRANT GRANT DTL :
USER : CD

S CHAR	DESCRIPTION	BUDGET	ACTUAL	PREENC/ENC	BALANCE
069	PROJECT CARRYFORWA	30,186			30,186
081	SERVICES OF OTHER	2,722	2,722		
	EXPENDITURE TOTAL	274,886	244,700		30,186
	REVENUE LESS EXPE	-28,455	1,731		30,186

F1-HELP F2-SELECT F4-PRIOR F5-NEXT
F7-PRIOR PG F8-NEXT PG F9-LINK
G012 - NEXT PAGE DISPLAYED