Date: November 30, 2010

Item No. 18 & 19 File No. 10055

SUNSHINE ORDINANCE TASK FORCE

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST*

Ray Hartz v Police Commiss	ion
•	
pleted by: Chris Rustom	Date: Nov. 23, 2010

*This list reflects the explanatory documents provided

 \sim 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.



RECEIVED BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SAN FRANCISCO

2010 OCT 14 AM 8: 05

	AK	
nv		
BY		

SUNSHINE ORDINANCE TASK FORCE

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco CA 94102 Tel. (415) 554-7724; Fax (415) 554-7854

http://www.sfgov.org/sunshine

SUNSHINE ORDINANCE COMPLAINT

Complaint against which Department or Commission Pouce Commission
Name of individual contacted at Department or Commission THOMAS MAZZUCO
Alleged violation public records access Alleged violation of public meeting. Date of meeting
Sunshine Ordinance Section 67.5 Meerings to be ofen 4 Public (If known, please cite specific provision(s) being violated)
Please describe alleged violation. Use additional paper if needed. Please attach any relevant documentation supporting your complaint.
PLEASE SEE ATTACHED
Do you want a public hearing before the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force? Do you also want a pre-hearing conference before the Complaint Committee? yes Ino
(Optional) RAYLO HARTZ, IR Address SANFRANCISCO CA 94109
Telephone No. (45) E-Mail Address RWHARTZ-TR @ SOC GLOBAL, DET
Date 10-10-10 Ray letter
I request confidentiality of my personal information. yes no

NOTICE: PERSONAL INFORMATION THAT YOU PROVIDE MAY BE SUBJECT TO DISCLOSURE UNDER THE CALIFORNIA PUBLIC RECORDS ACT AND THE SUNSHINE ORDINANCE, EXCEPT WHEN CONFIDENTIALITY IS SPECIFICALLY REQUESTED. YOU MAY LIST YOUR BUSINESS/OFFICE ADDRESS, TELEPHONE NUMBER AND E-MAIL ADDRESS IN LIEU OF YOUR HOME ADDRESS OR OTHER PERSONAL CONTACT INFORMATION. Complainants can be anonymous as long as the complainant provides a reliable means of contact with the SOTF (Phone number, fax number, or e-mail address).

Monday, October 11, 2010

At the meeting of the San Francisco Police Commission on October 6, 2010 after agenda item number 11 Election of Commission Officers was called, presiding officer, commission VP Thomas Mazzuco made the following statement:

"Commissioners, we've had a discussion about this briefly. Dr. Marshall, President Marshall is not present this evening. We've agreed to put this matter over, for one week."

On review of the video recording, posted on the commission website, I believe the above referenced discussion and agreement on this matter were conducted in violation of the Brown act.

I find this particularly egregious, due to Commissioner Mazzuco's attempt, prior to the closed session, to interfere with my comments on this very matter. Although I was, on the advice of the deputy city attorney, allowed to continue my comments, those comments were both disrupted and hampered by the actions of a sole member of the commission. Commissioner Mazzuco, from what I have observed, has become the self-appointed censor of public comment at commission meetings.



The Police Commission

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

October 29, 2010

Mr. Chris Rustom Sunshine Ordinance Task Force 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244 San Francisco, CA 94102

RE: SOTF Complaint 10055

Dear Mr. Rustom,

DR. JOE MARSHALL President

THOMAS MAZZUCCO

PETRA DEJESUS

JAMES HAMMER

Commissioner
ANGELA CHAN

Commissioner

CAROL KINGSLEY Commissioner

R. JAMES SLAUGHTER

Lieutenant Joe Reilly Secretary

I am responding to the above referenced complaint with respect to the Police Commission's October 6th meeting.

The complainant alleges that a discussion occurred among members of the Commission that resulted in an agreement in violation of the Brown Act. I was present and heard the same comment that the complainant heard.

The reference made was to a discussion between the Commission President and Vice-President (two Commission members, less than a quorum) with respect to continuing agenda item 11(election of Commission officers) because the President would not be at this particular meeting and unable to participate. It had been the intent of the Commission to have all seven members present for elections.

It is routine for the President and Vice-President to consult with each other before a meeting regarding the agenda, especially if the President is to be absent, since the Vice-President becomes the chairperson. The Vice-President was merely informing the other Commissioners that he had a conversation with the President on the subject.

What the complainant fails to note is that the Vice-President ended his comments in open session by seeking agreement among the other five Commissioners present to continue agenda item 11. This action alone contradicts the complainant's assertion.

I anticipate that this review of events at the Commission's October 6th meeting addresses the issues raised in the above referenced complaint.

Please call if you have any questions.

Very truly yours,

Lt. Joseph Reilly

Secretary

San Francisco Police Commission