

SF Admin Code 67.21(d,e) petition and complaint

Anonymous v FAMSF, FAMSF Board of Trustees, Jason Moment, Thomas Campbell

SOTF - it is believed you have jurisdiction over all parts of this complaint.

Supervisor of Records - since your jurisdiction is narrower, and since you have already denied certain parts of this complaint, there are specific callouts below for you.

- Allegations:
 - SFAC 67.21(b) - failure to respond in a timely or complete manner to a records request
 - 67.21(c) - failure to assist
 - 67.29-7(a) - failure to retain records
 - 67.29-7(c) - failure to record 3rd party transactions
 - 67.25 - failure to respond in a timely or complete manner to an IDR
 - 67.26 - withholding more than the minimum exempt record or portion
 - 67.27 - failure to justify withholding
 - 67.21(k), CPRA Gov Code 6270.5 - failure to maintain enterprise systems catalog
- Complainant: Anonymous (79999-25916958@requests.muckrock.com)
- Respondent Depts: Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco, FAMSF Board of Trustees
- Respondent Individuals:
 - Jason Moment, President (department head; custodian of his own calendar and emails)
 - Thomas P. Campbell, CEO/Director (department head; custodian of his own calendar and emails)
 - Note that the employee originally working on these requests appears no longer to work for FAMSF so she is not named as respondent
- Email Metadata is **not** at issue in this complaint - but may be filed later as a separate complaint.
- I am not a representative of MuckRock News; I am merely an anonymous user of MuckRock.com's FOIA service.

This complaint arises out of a series of requests made by me to FAMSF (appendices A and B):

- Sept. 10, 2019 - for selected emails and contracts
- Sept. 12 - for directories, selected communications, catalogs, and selected accounting records
- Oct. 8 - for communications regarding past agency controversies
- Oct. 8 - for selected calendars of Moment and Campbell
- Oct. 9 - for communications with foreign officials
- Oct. 9 - for selected calendars of the Chair Emerita

The email addresses of the requests for FAMSF's reference are:

- 79999-25916958@requests.muckrock.com (please use this for complaint correspondence)
- 81409-34984353@requests.muckrock.com
- 81474-03682094@requests.muckrock.com

Anonymous v FAMSF, FAMSF Board of Trustees, Jason Moment, Thomas Campbell

Please issue a written determination that all or some of the records not yet produced in response to these requests are public, and that the respondents violated one or more of:

1. Violations of 67.29-7(a) - failure to retain records

Supervisor of Records: a prior petition for this issue is currently pending.

On Sept. 10, I requested “all legal/contractual relationships between your agency (or the City as a whole) and Corporation of the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco (COFAM)” and “all legal/contractual relationships between your agency (or the City as a whole) and Fine Arts Museums Foundation (FAMF)” FAMSF provided “Board Resolution 1857” and its associated MOU and a "Lease and Facilities Agreement" of June 2002. Later the City Attorney’s office, in response to a distinct but similar records request, produced a document "Agreement Governing Reimbursement ..." between the City/FAMSF and COFAM dated July 1, 2002. FAMSF failed to provide this document.

In response to a Supervisor of Records petition regarding FAMSF’s failure to provide the document, DCA Russi stated:

“FAMSF has stated it does not have a copy of this document.”

However, it appears FAMSF’s retention policy (<https://index.sfgov.org/taxonomy/term/50>) requires retention of agreements for 20 years past expiration:

Contracts/Agreements/MOUs

Category: Contracts

Retention Type: 2 - Current

Retained On-Site: 20 years after expiration of contract

Retained Off-Site: N/A

FAMSF’s failure to retain its contracts for at least 20 years after expiration of the contract is a failure to “maintain and preserve in a professional and businesslike manner all documents and correspondence” and to “...disclose all such records in accordance with this ordinance.” and is a violation of SF Admin Code 67.29-7(a).

Alternatively, please determine that these records do exist and should be turned over to the public.

2. Violations of 67.29-7(c) - failure to accurately record 3rd party transactions

Supervisor of Records: please determine that these records responsive to requests #24, 25, and 26 do exist and are public records.

SFAC 67.29(c) requires:

“In any contract, agreement or permit between the City and any outside entity that authorizes that entity to demand any funds or fees from citizens, the City shall ensure that accurate records of each transaction are maintained in a professional and

businesslike manner and are available to the public as public records under the provisions of this ordinance.”

Requests of Sept. 12 numbered 24 through 26 asked for:

24. A record of FAMSF "transactions" for the period April 2019 to June 2019 (Q2), within the meaning of SFAC 67.29-7(c): “In any contract, agreement or permit between the City and any outside entity that authorizes that entity to demand any funds or fees from citizens, the City shall ensure that accurate records of each transaction are maintained in a professional and businesslike manner and are available to the public as public records under the provisions of this ordinance.”

25. A record of COFAM "transactions" for the period April 2019 to June 2019 (Q2), within the meaning of SFAC 67.29-7(c)

26. A record of FAMF "transactions" for the period April 2019 to June 2019 (Q2), within the meaning of SFAC 67.29-7(c)

FAMSF claims it has no records of any of these transactions. The 2002 lease nor the Board MOU appear to discuss a requirement to maintain these transactions according to 67.29-7. This is a violation of SFAC 67.29-7(c).

3. Violations of 67.26 and/or 67.27 - improper withholding

Supervisor of Records: a petition for this contract has already been denied.

On Sept. 23, a contract between FAMSF and COFAM was withheld for privacy reasons. On Sept. 30, that same contract was withheld but “[t]he basis for withholding has been updated to also include attorney-client privilege.” A contract between FAMSF and COFAM should not be withheld and must be turned over to the public. If a particular person/employee’s name needs to be redacted, the entire rest of the document must be turned over regardless. Furthermore, neither FAMSF nor COFAM can reasonably be each other’s attorney - neither entity is believed to be a law firm.

4. Violations of 67.21(c) - failure to assist in a timely manner

Supervisor of Records: no jurisdiction on this matter.

I requested 67.21(c) statements of nature, quantity, etc. of records on the following dates:

- Oct. 8 - for communications regarding past agency controversies
- Oct. 9 - for communications with foreign officials

These requests did not receive responses within 7 days as required by the ordinance. Other 67.21(c) requests have received timely responses.

5. Violations of 67.21(c) - refusal to provide quantity of exempt records

Supervisor of Records: please determine that records responsive to request #18 do exist and are public records.

I requested 67.21(c) statements of nature, quantity, etc. of records responsive to request #18 of Sept 12. On Sept. 20th FAMSf stated:

“As far as 67.21(c) for request 18, yes, there are responsive records in the form of emails. As stated, they are being withheld on basis of attorney client privilege.”

67.21(c) requires that the statement of quantity be provided “whether or not the contents of those records are exempt from disclosure.” Respondents will probably cite *St. Croix v Grossman* for the proposition that the attorney-client privilege inherent in the City Charter may override the 67.21(c) requirement. However, in *St. Croix* a quantity is stated in the case: “24 written communications between the commission and the San Francisco City Attorney’s Office.” Respondents must provide the quantity of exempt documents.

6. Violations of 67.21(b) and/or 67.25 - failure to respond in a timely or complete manner

Supervisor of Records: please determine that records responsive to the requests do exist and are public records.

Finally, numerous requests have not received a substantive response:

- Oct. 8 - for communications regarding past agency controversies
 - FAMSf stated “Accordingly, we will be in touch with you regarding the request by no later than October 21.” but they have not done so.
- Oct. 8 - for selected calendars of Moment and Campbell
 - FAMSf stated “Regarding your immediate disclosure requests, 1a and 1b, for FAMSf Calendars and Meetings for FAMSf Director received on October 9, FAMSf has 60 responsive calendar entries. Three entries will be withheld because they are personal. Two entries will be partially redacted to protect personal privacy (home addresses, phone numbers). Responsive documents will be provided to you by October 24.” but they have not done so.
- Oct. 9 - for communications with foreign officials
 - FAMSf stated “Accordingly, we will be in touch with you regarding the request by no later than October 21” but they have not done so.

While FAMSf may provide records themselves in a rolling manner (if voluminous) *after* responding, they must follow the CPRA/Ordinance deadlines and extension process.

7. Violations of 67.21(k) and CPRA Gov Code 6270.5

Supervisor of Records: please determine that records responsive to request #21 do exist and are public records.

I requested:

21. the SB 272/ Gov Code 6270.5 enterprise systems catalog for FAMSF you are required to create and disclose. Please provide a copy in PDF or spreadsheet format; do not provide a URL.

FAMSF stated they have no responsive documents. FAMSF failed to create an enterprise systems catalog (even an empty list that states they believe they have 0 such systems).

APPENDIX A

Numbered requests Sept 10-12, 2019

Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco; Corporation of the Fine Arts Museums; Fine Arts Museums Foundation
Custodian of Records and/or Corporate Secretary
50 Hagiwara Tea Garden Drive
San Francisco CA 94118
mpowers@famsf.org
sent via email

Our ref.
#79999

Date
2019-09-12

RE: SF Sunshine Ordinance request - ref #79999- Immediate Disclosure Request

To the FAMSF, COFAM, and FAMF:

NOTE: 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.

For your convenience, I am memorializing all requests made by me between Sept. 10 and 12 in this letter. This letter supersedes those prior emails – please use the numbers below to refer to the requests.

Pursuant to the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA, I hereby request the following records as 26 distinct Immediate Disclosure Requests from FAMSF, from COFAM, and from FAMF. They are each a separate request. Deadlines, rolling production, determination of immediacy of response, and any assertion of the so-called “rule of reason” to delay responses must apply to the volume of responses required by each request separately. If you fail to do so, I will need to send each request individually and then receive that treatment.

Previously sent, Dated Sept. 10:

1. all legal/contractual relationships between your agency (or the City as a whole) and Corporation of the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco (COFAM)
2. all legal/contractual relationships between your agency (or the City as a whole) and Fine Arts Museums Foundation (FAMF)
3. all records of how city employees use IT systems owned or operated by FAMF and/or COFAM
4. all records of how city employees retain records owned, used, or prepared by the city agency, but stored on IT systems owned or operated by FAMF and/or COFAM
5. the last 10 emails from , and the last 10 emails to, Diane B. Wilsey, President, on their

official AND personal email (under City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017)) re: the public's business

6. the last 10 emails from , and the last 10 emails to, Belva Davis, Vice President, on their official AND personal email (under City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017)) re: the public's business

.
Previously sent, Dated Sept. 12:

7. full employee directory with name, title, and email of all FAMSF employees
8. full employee directory with name, title, and email of all FAMF employees
9. full employee directory with name, title, and email of all COFAM employees
10. full officer/board/trustees directory with name, title, and email of all FAMSF officers/board/trustees
11. full officer/board/trustees directory with name, title, and email of all FAMF officers/board/trustees
12. full officer/board/trustees directory with name, title, and email of all COFAM officers/board/trustees
13. all correspondence (including all attachments, exhibits, memos, metadata, headers, emails, physical mail/notes, text, SMS, MMS, or any chat app messages, and in their original electronic format or scan of physical documents) between FAMSF* (the asterisk here and below means this request includes each and every employee, board member, or officer in addition to the entity as a whole, and also requires a City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017) search of private property for records re: the public's business) and Robert M. Smith between Jan. 1, 2018 and Sept. 12 2019 (inclusive)
14. all correspondence (including all attachments, exhibits, memos, metadata, headers, emails, physical mail/notes, text, SMS, MMS, or any chat app messages, and in their original electronic format or scan of physical documents) between COFAM* and Mr. Smith between Jan. 1, 2018 and Sept. 12 2019 (inclusive)
15. all correspondence (including all attachments, exhibits, memos, metadata, headers, emails, physical mail/notes, text, SMS, MMS, or any chat app messages, and in their original electronic format or scan of physical documents) between FAMF* and Mr. Smith between Jan. 1, 2018 and Sept. 12 2019 (inclusive)
16. all correspondence (including all attachments, exhibits, memos, metadata, headers, emails, physical mail/notes, text, SMS, MMS, or any chat app messages, and in their original electronic format or scan of physical documents) between FAMSF* and COFAM* re: Mr. Smith or his requests/complaints, or the Sunshine Ordinance, or CPRA between Jan. 1, 2018 and Sept. 12 2019 (inclusive). Use the following case insensitive query: "smith" OR "cpra" OR "sunshine"

17. all correspondence (including all attachments, exhibits, memos, metadata, headers, emails, physical mail/notes, text, SMS, MMS, or any chat app messages, and in their original electronic format or scan of physical documents) between FAMSF* and FAMF* re: Mr. Smith or his requests/complaints, or the Sunshine Ordinance, or CPRA Jan. 1, 2018 and Sept. 12 2019 (inclusive). Use the following case insensitive query: "smith" OR "cpa" OR "sunshine"
18. all correspondence (including all attachments, exhibits, memos, metadata, headers, emails, physical mail/notes, text, SMS, MMS, or any chat app messages, and in their original electronic format or scan of physical documents) between FAMSF* and the City Attorney's office* or Sup. of Records' office*, between Jan. 1, 2018 and Sept. 12 2019 (inclusive). I anticipate you may use Attorney-Client privilege as a shield here. However: the City has waived the privilege if you already provided any of these communications to anyone else, whether that anyone is Mr. Smith or private entities COFAM or FAMF. If you waived the privilege by providing the record to member of the public Mr. Smith, that record is now permanently a public record and you must also give it to me (Gov Code 6254.5). If FAMF or COFAM or their employees have the purportedly privileged communication (for example by including them in an email thread or cc-ing or bcc-ing or forwarding the message to them), you also have waived the privilege and must provide me the documents. If the City's argument for privilege is that the City Attorney is also representing FAMF or COFAM, then also produce records of such a contract (your MOU says no such thing) and every associated invoice (which is not protected by privilege). If no such contract exists, and the representation is provided for free by the City to these private entities, a variety of other statutes regarding use of public funds for a private purpose may be in play.
19. all correspondence (including all attachments, exhibits, memos, metadata, headers, emails, physical mail/notes, text, SMS, MMS, or any chat app messages, and in their original electronic format or scan of physical documents) between COFAM* and the City Attorney's office* or Sup. of Records' office*, between Jan. 1, 2018 and Sept. 12 2019 (inclusive).
20. all correspondence (including all attachments, exhibits, memos, metadata, headers, emails, physical mail/notes, text, SMS, MMS, or any chat app messages, and in their original electronic format or scan of physical documents) between FAMF* and the City Attorney's office* or Sup. of Records' office*, between Jan. 1, 2018 and Sept. 12 2019 (inclusive).
21. the SB 272/ Gov Code 6270.5 enterprise systems catalog for FAMSF you are required to create and disclose. Please provide a copy in PDF or spreadsheet format; do not provide a URL.
22. the SB 272/ Gov Code 6270.5 enterprise systems catalog for COFAM you are required to create and disclose. Please provide a copy in PDF or spreadsheet format; do not provide a URL.
23. the SB 272/ Gov Code 6270.5 enterprise systems catalog for FAMF you are required to create and disclose. Please provide a copy in PDF or spreadsheet format; do not provide a URL.
24. a record of FAMSF "transactions" for the period April 2019 to June 2019 (Q2), within the meaning of SFAC 67.29-7(c): "In any contract, agreement or permit between the City and

any outside entity that authorizes that entity to demand any funds or fees from citizens, the City shall ensure that accurate records of each transaction are maintained in a professional and businesslike manner and are available to the public as public records under the provisions of this ordinance.”

25. a record of COFAM "transactions" for the period April 2019 to June 2019 (Q2), within the meaning of SFAC 67.29-7(c)
26. a record of FAMF "transactions" for the period April 2019 to June 2019 (Q2), within the meaning of SFAC 67.29-7(c)

General Provisions

I would like to remind you that you need to indicate for each request above, whether you did or did not have responsive records (separate from whether or not you withheld them). The Sunshine Ordinance requires you to indicate to me the existence or non-existence of records, regardless of whether they are exempt from disclosure.

Remember any record retained, owned, used, or prepared by your office must be included. If a city employee possesses a COFAM or FAMF document, you must disclose it. If COFAM or FAMF are holding records prepared or used by your office, you must disclose it. You also must justify each and every withholding or redaction with particularity. Use footnotes or inline markings for example.

We remind you of your obligations to provide electronic records in any format we request them in, as long that format is available to you OR easy to generate (Admin Code 67.21(l)). Therefore, emails exported in the .eml or .msg format with all non-exempt headers, metadata, attachments, etc. are best. All other documents may be provided as text .PDFs.

If you choose to convert documents, for example, to PDF or printed format (even though we have specifically requested .eml or .msg formats), to easily redact them, you must still ensure that you have preserved the full content of the original conversation record, which contains many detailed headers beyond the generally used From/To/Subject/Sent/etc.

If you send PDFs, please use only text/search PDFs, not image/scanned PDFs. You must make exact copies of records under the CPRA - do not exclude color, formatting, images, or any other content that may be lost by printing and scanning records incorrectly.

If you redact portions of the records, please specifically justify each such redaction with a legal citation (statute, ordinance, or case law). If you withhold metadata/headers, even if you don't visually redact them, you are still withholding and must justify it. If you provide PDFs or printed conversations or give us only a few of the headers or exclude attachments/images, and therefore withhold the other headers/attachments without proper 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 in court, before the Supervisor of Records, and/or the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force.

In all cases, 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.

Entity Relationships

The requests and complaints arise out of the complex, but completely non-transparent, relationship between city agency Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco (FAMSF) and private non-profits Corporation of the Fine Arts Museums (COFAM) and Fine Arts Museums Foundation (FAMF). FAMSF is a “local agency” under the CPRA. All three entities share the same address (at least for tax purposes) from the Form 990s I can find. Are these entities are truly independent, or just mechanisms to avoid public records and/or financial reporting laws?

The relationship between the entities is described as follows in their “Report of Independent Auditors”¹:

COFAM is a nonprofit public benefit corporation formed in 1987 that operates most of the activities at the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco. The COFAM Board of Trustees consists of the combined Boards of Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco and FAMF.

FAMF is a nonprofit public benefit corporation formed in 1963 that manages the Museums’ endowment, certain programs, and art acquisition funds, as well as tax-exempt bonds (and related investments) issued for the new de Young building project, which opened in 2005. The FAMF Board of Trustees (“Board”) is self-perpetuating.

The Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco consist of the de Young Museum and the Legion of Honor, and are governed by a self-perpetuating Board. The Museums collect, conserve, display, and interpret fine arts of all periods. The City and County of San Francisco (City) owns the land and buildings in which the Museums operate and most of the collections, and provides partial operating support through an in-kind contribution for their care and maintenance. COFAM and FAMF have rent-free use of the Museums, which must be operated for the benefit of the public.

In 2002, COFAM and FAMF agreed with the City to raise private funds, issue bonds, design and construct the new de Young Museum building and, consistent with the requirement that the City hold title to buildings on City property, donate the completed building to the City. COFAM and FAMF are co-obligors on the bonds. In April 2018, all outstanding bonds were redeemed at par by FAMF.

Public records on private entity systems

Records stored by FAMSF on private FAMF or COFAM systems are public under the principles declared by the Supreme Court in *City of San Jose v Superior Court* (2017) regarding individual employees’ private property holding public records. The fact that two large corporations working on behalf of the City (and existing solely to work on behalf of the City) are keeping records

¹https://www.famsf.org/sites/default/files/famsf_combined_fs_06-18_-_issued_12-14-18_0.pdf

on their private property is no less an effective way to evade public records laws than individual employees doing so, especially given the fact that the Boards of the various organizations are, by contract, law, or bylaw, interlocking. The question is whether FAMSF/City prepared, owned, used or retained those documents – I argue that in various cases City employees (and thus FAMSF) are either preparing or using the records, even if they are not retaining or owning those records. Furthermore, an agent of FAMSF represented at a public SOTF hearing on Sept. 4 that the City agency uses domains, email and document servers, owned and operated by these private entities (see https://sanfrancisco.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view_id=95&clip_id=33934, audio discussion starting at 4hr 15min 01sec.).

The use of COFAM or FAMF servers to shield records from public disclosure would also violate Gov Code 6253.3: “A state or local agency may not allow another party to control the disclosure of information that is otherwise subject to disclosure pursuant to this chapter.” and/or Gov Code 6270(a): “Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no state or local agency shall sell, exchange, furnish, or otherwise provide a public record subject to disclosure pursuant to this chapter to a private entity in a manner that prevents a state or local agency from providing the record directly pursuant to this chapter. ...”

If FAMSF has chosen to commingle its records, funds, employees or otherwise with COFAM or FAMF, that is further evidence that all such records must be public.

Records improperly withheld

I asked for “all legal/contractual relationships” between FAMSF (City) and FAMF/COFAM. I was provided a single one page MOU with no details and a defunct old lease which no longer is in effect. It stretches credulity to believe that there is a one page MOU and that is it. Gov Code 6253.31 states “Notwithstanding any contract term to the contrary, a contract entered into by a state or local agency subject to this chapter, including the University of California, that requires a private entity to review, audit, or report on any aspect of that agency shall be public to the extent the contract is otherwise subject to disclosure under this chapter.” – therefore all such contracts are public.

If that MOU is all there is, then I also allege FAMSF is violating SFAC 67.29-6 which states “When such funds are provided or managed by an entity, and not an individual, that entity must agree in writing to abide by this ordinance.” The MOU fails to require FAMF or COFAM to abide by the entire Sunshine Ordinance. SOTF hearings indicate the City might be interpreting ‘ordinance’ here to mean Section 67.29-6, and not *the Sunshine Ordinance* — that is an absurd rule of statutory interpretation; the word used would be ‘section’ if that were the case.

FAMSF would also be violating SFAC 67.29-7(c): “In any contract, agreement or permit between the City and any outside entity that authorizes that entity to demand any funds or fees from citizens, the City shall ensure that accurate records of each transaction are maintained in a professional and businesslike manner and are available to the public as public records under the provisions of this ordinance.”

I asked for records regarding FAMSF/City employees using IT systems run by FAMF/COFAM. No records were provided. As above, an agent of FAMSF represented at a public SOTF hearing

on Sept. 4 that the City agency uses domains, email and document servers, owned and operated by these private entities (see https://sanfrancisco.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view_id=95&clip_id=33934, audio discussion starting at 4hr 15min 01sec.). These records must exist.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

APPENDIX B

Email threads and responses

RE: Foreign Corrupt Practices Act / 15 U.S.C. §§ 78dd-1 - Communications Audit - Immediate Disclosure Request

To Whom It May Concern:

**** NOTE: Please redact your responses 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). ****

We request under the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance (Ordinance) and the California Public Records Act (CPRA) the following items from your agency.

Please follow the Ordinance precisely as I am auditing your agency's public records regimen; as you are well aware, every violation of the Sunshine Ordinance will be appealed.

Also note it is not relevant whether your office believes the FCPA is relevant to these records or your operations; the Act is being used instead to precisely define the records requested in legal terms.

We remind you of your obligations to provide electronic records in ANY format we request, as long as such format is either the original format you hold them in (CPRA), "available" to you, or "easily generated" (SFAC 67.21(I)). Therefore, e-mails exported in the .eml or .msg format with all non-exempt headers, metadata, attachments, etc. are our requested formats.

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, 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.

Do not print and scan records stored electronically.

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.

You must justify all withholding (redacting is a form of withholding), with specificity (SFAC 67.26, 67.27).

You must provide the names and emails or similar identifiers of foreign government officials - business emails are not protected under Constitutional personal privacy.

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.

This is also a 7-day request under SFAC 67.21(c) for the quantity, nature, and form of each set of requested records.

A. electronic copy of all communications sent or received between and including Jan 1 2017 and Oct 8 2019, by any of the listed persons, where at least one party in the communication is a "foreign official" as defined under 15 U.S.C. § 78dd-1(f)(1)(A) (and as those terms have been interpreted by courts of competent jurisdiction), and in an electronic format as specified above, with all headers, metadata, timestamps, attachments, appendices, exhibits, and inline images, except those explicitly exempted by the Ordinance, including but not limited to messages sent or received on each official government email, Instagram, Facebook, Facebook Messenger, text/SMS/MMS, Google Hangouts/Allo/Duo, Signal, Telegram, WeChat, Twitter, Reddit, QQ, Momo, Wangxin, YouTube, Twitch, Slack, Vk, OK.ru, Livejournal or any other social media, chat, or instant messaging account of the following persons,

1. Chair Emerita
2. President
3. Vice President
4. All other members of the Board
5. CEO/Director
6. Manager of Board Relations
7. the agency's official accounts for the agency as a whole

B. electronic copy of all communications sent or received between and including Jan 1 2017 and Oct 8 2019, by any of the listed persons, where at least one party in the communication is a "foreign political party or official thereof or any candidate for foreign political office" under 15 U.S.C. § 78dd-1(a)(2) (and as those terms have been interpreted by courts of competent jurisdiction), and in an electronic format as specified above, with all headers, metadata, timestamps, attachments, appendices, exhibits, and inline images, except those explicitly exempted by the Ordinance, including but not limited to messages sent or received on each official government email, Instagram, Facebook, Facebook Messenger, text/SMS/MMS, Google Hangouts/Allo/Duo, Signal, Telegram, WeChat, Twitter, Reddit, QQ, Momo, Wangxin, YouTube, Twitch, Slack, Vk, OK.ru, Livejournal or any other social media, chat, or instant messaging account of the following persons,

1. Chair Emerita
2. President
3. Vice President
4. All other members of the Board
5. CEO/Director
6. Manager of Board Relations
7. the agency's official accounts for the agency as a whole

C. electronic copy of all communications sent or received between and including Jan 1 2017 and Oct 8 2019, by any of the listed persons, where at least one party in the communication is a "foreign official" as defined under 15 U.S.C. § 78dd-1(f)(1)(A) (and as those terms have been interpreted by courts of competent jurisdiction), and in an electronic format as specified above, with all headers, metadata, timestamps, attachments, appendices, exhibits, and inline images, except those explicitly exempted by the Ordinance, including but not limited to messages sent or received on each PERSONAL email, Instagram, Facebook, Facebook Messenger, text/SMS/MMS, Google Hangouts/Allo/Duo, Signal, Telegram, WeChat, Twitter, Reddit, QQ, Momo, Wangxin, YouTube, Twitch, Slack, Vk, OK.ru, Livejournal or any other social media, chat, or instant messaging account of the following persons, under a City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017) search.

1. Chair Emerita
2. President
3. Vice President
4. All other members of the Board
5. CEO/Director
6. Manager of Board Relations

D. electronic copy of all communications sent or received between and including Jan 1 2017 and Oct 8 2019, by any of the listed persons, where at least one party in the communication is a "foreign political party or official thereof or any candidate for foreign political office" under 15 U.S.C. § 78dd-1(a)(2) (and as those terms have been interpreted by courts of competent jurisdiction), and in an electronic format as specified above, with all headers, metadata, timestamps, attachments, appendices, exhibits, and inline images, except those explicitly exempted by the Ordinance, including but not limited to messages sent or received on each PERSONAL email, Instagram, Facebook, Facebook Messenger, text/SMS/MMS, Google Hangouts/Allo/Duo, Signal, Telegram, WeChat, Twitter, Reddit, QQ, Momo, Wangxin, YouTube, Twitch, Slack, Vk, OK.ru, Livejournal or any other social media, chat, or instant messaging account of the following persons, under a City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017) search.

1. Chair Emerita
2. President
3. Vice President
4. All other members of the Board
5. CEO/Director
6. Manager of Board Relations

E. all records of all payments sent or received, or contracts/agreements in effect, between and including Jan 1 2017 and Oct 8 2019, where at least one party in the transaction or contract is a "foreign political party or official thereof or any candidate for foreign political office" under 15 U.S.C. § 78dd-1(f)(1)(A) (and as those terms have been interpreted by courts of competent jurisdiction)

F. all records of all payments sent or received, or contracts/agreements in effect, between and including Jan 1 2017 and Oct 8 2019, where at least one party in the transaction or contract is a "foreign political party or official thereof or any candidate for foreign political office" under 15 U.S.C. § 78dd-1(a)(2) (and as those terms have been interpreted by courts of competent jurisdiction)

G. all records of all payments sent or received, or contracts/agreements in effect, between and including Jan 1 2017 and Oct 8 2019, where at least one party in the transaction or contract is a "foreign political party or official thereof or any candidate for foreign political office" under 15 U.S.C. § 78dd-1(f)(1)(A) (and as those terms have been interpreted by courts of competent jurisdiction) and another party is any officer or employee of your agency, under City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017)

H. all records of all payments sent or received, or contracts/agreements in effect, between and including Jan 1 2017 and Oct 8 2019, where at least one party in the transaction or contract is a "foreign political party or official thereof or any candidate for foreign political office" under 15 U.S.C. § 78dd-1(a)(2) (and as those terms have been interpreted by courts of competent jurisdiction) and another party is any officer or employee of your agency, under City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017)

I:

1. all instruments used to inquire of any person as to whether they possess any responsive records above, and all of their responses (both for business and personal accounts)
2. all requests/tickets/etc. used to inquire of your IT persons or the Dept of Tech to retrieve responsive records, and all of their responses

Sincerely,
Anonymous

From: Anonymous Person

10/09/2019

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Foreign Corrupt Practices Act / 15 U.S.C. §§ 78dd-1 - Co...

Email

Apologies - Request E and G should be corrected to replace the quoted phrase with "foreign official" (the citation is already correct). You may consider this an amendment of the request OR you may consider this a subsequent immediate disclosure request with all the same caveats of the original.

From: Fine Arts Museums Of San Francisco

10/10/2019

Subject: Re: California Public Records Act Request: Foreign Corrupt Practices Act / 15 U.S.C. §§ 78dd-1 - Co...

Email

Dear Sir/Ma'am,

Although you labeled your request (Subject: Foreign Corrupt Practices Act / 15 U.S.C. §§ 78dd-1 - Communications Audit (FAMSF) as an Immediate Disclosure Request, it is not "simple, routine, or otherwise readily answerable," as is required by San Francisco Administrative Code Section 67.25(a). For this reason, we are treating your Immediate Disclosure Request (with its amendment to E and G) as a standard public records request, subject to the normally applicable 10-day response time, with a possible extension. Accordingly, we will be in touch with you regarding the request by no later than October 21

Thank you,
On behalf of FAMSF,
Melissa Powers
Manager of Board Relations and Special Projects

Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco
de Young
Legion of Honor

Golden Gate Park | 50 Hagiwara Tea Garden Drive | San Francisco, CA 94118
p 415.750.3690
e mpowers@famsf.org | famsf.org

From: Muckrock Staff

10/25/2019

From: Fine Arts Museums Of San Francisco

10/25/2019

Subject: Please Read: Out of Office RE: California Public Records Act Request: Foreign Corrupt Practices Act / ...

Email

Hello,

Thank your for your e-mail but I am no longer with the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco.

For Board of Trustees matters, please contact Megan Bourne at mbourne@famsf.org. For requests for public information, please e-mail (mailto:mbourne@famsf.org) pr@famsf.org. (mailto:pr@famsf.org)

Thank you.
Melissa Powers

--

Melissa Powers
Manager of Board Relations and Special Projects

Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco
de Young
Legion of Honor

Golden Gate Park | 50 Hagiwara Tea Garden Drive | San Francisco, CA 94118
p 415.750.3690 e mpowers famsf.org (<http://famsf.org>) | famsf.org

From: Anonymous Person

10/25/2019 

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Foreign Corrupt Practices Act / 15 U.S.C. §§ 78dd-1 - Co...

Email

Please respond.

Fine Arts Museums Of San Francisco ,

** Note that all of your responses (including disclosed records) may be automatically and instantly available to the public on the [MuckRock.com](https://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, made on October 8, 2019 re: your department head's calendars. 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. For the quantity of #1, I would like the number of meetings, each of which is an item being requested.

Mr. Heckel, Compliance Officer for the Mayor, made an intriguing assertion at the full SOTF hearing for Case 19047. While the task force ruled against the Mayor for *prior* calendar records, Mr. Heckel appeared to argue that all future meetings of the Mayor are somehow completely secret (the SOTF did not rule on future meetings since they were not requested in 19047). I will be testing that purported claim of exemption. Note that it is implausible that there would be no prospective scheduling information for upcoming events your department head must attend to, even though Prop G/67.29-5 requires no such calendar be kept.

All calendars, whether Prop G/67.29-5 or not, that your agency prepared, owned, used, or retained re: the public's business are public records (see SOTF 19047, see also, Sup. of Records response of Sept. 6, citing the Good Government Guide).

I suspect your office may attempt to use Gov Code 6254(f). The entirety of a future schedule cannot possibly be confidential law enforcement investigatory records under GC 6254(f). This exemption does not even exist for your office, which is not "the office of the Attorney General [or] the Department of Justice, the Office of Emergency Services [or] any state or local police agency" so the first clause re: security procedures does not apply. Furthermore a calendar cannot be "investigatory or security files compiled by any other state or local agency for correctional, law enforcement, or licensing purposes." This would be an absurd stretch of the words of the statute; every meeting is not "for correctional, law enforcement, or licensing purposes." Information regarding the security detail for the department head may potentially be lawfully withheld under 6254(f) - but there is a lot more to a calendar than a security detail, such as normal political and policy meetings. I don't care about the security detail, and you may exclude the security detail info from responsive records. If you believe certain parts of a meeting record are redactable under 6254(f) or otherwise you must only redact each minimal portion and cite each justification.

All records must be provided in rolling fashion. If you use a web portal you must make all records available completely publicly , without any form of login or terms and conditions. Alternatively please email all records directly to me.

Where the phrase "department head" is used, EACH of the following is included: President of FAMSF Board Jason Moment AND Director/CEO Thomas P. Campbell. You must provide responses for each.

Please read carefully the exact wording of my request as it is different than my prior ones. Please follow the Ordinance precisely as I am auditing your agency's public records regimen; as you are well aware, every violation of the Sunshine Ordinance will be appealed.

Please provide:

1a). IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE: an electronic copy of the department head's *prospective/expected* calendar or schedule, with all expected events/items, from Oct 21 to Oct 28, 2019 (inclusive). Calendar items must include (but are not limited to): the exact start and end time of the meeting, the location, the title, all invitees and whether they accepted or not, attachments, inline images, if they exist in the record. We are specifically requesting ALL calendar/scheduling items, individually, for the department head, whether the department head themselves possesses them or their staff, whether they are labeled "Prop G" or not, and whether they are on a computer or in physical form (such as a diary, a physical calendar on a wall, etc.). You are welcome to virtually print/export each item (not the summary view) directly to .PDF form in Outlook and redact them. Do not cutoff information like long text that does not fit on the screen - that would be unjustified withholding. In order to ensure immediacy of disclosure, in this and only this request, .ics format and headers are NOT specifically requested (though you are welcome to provide them if it can be provided immediately). Do NOT physically print and re-scan records

1b). IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE: an electronic copy of the department head's calendar or schedule, with all events/items, from Sep 30 to Oct 7, 2019 (inclusive). Calendar items must include (but are not limited to): the exact start and end time of the meeting, the location, the title, all invitees and whether they accepted or not, attachments, inline images, if they exist in the record. We are specifically requesting ALL calendar/scheduling items, individually, for the department head, whether the department head themselves possesses them or their staff, whether they are labeled "Prop G" or not, and whether they are on a computer or in physical form (such as a diary, a physical calendar on a wall, etc.). You are welcome to virtually print/export each item (not the summary view) directly to .PDF form in Outlook and redact them. Do not cutoff information like long text that does not fit on the screen - that would be unjustified withholding. In order to ensure immediacy of disclosure, in this and only this request, .ics format and headers are NOT specifically requested (though you are welcome to provide them if it can be provided immediately). Do NOT physically print and re-scan records.

2. REGULAR DISCLOSURE: If the department head or any of the department head's staff uses any invitation/guestlist tracking systems on behalf of the department head (such as Outlook's invite mechanism OR regular emails), those items are included within the scope of this request #2, for the date range in #1. In order to ensure rapid disclosure, in this and only this request, particular formats and headers are NOT specifically requested (though you are welcome to provide them if it can be provided rapidly).

3. REGULAR DISCLOSURE: Furthermore, I request that a City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017) search be performed of the department head, their senior-most deputy, their chief of staff (or equivalent, and deputy chiefs), and all personal/secretarial/administrative assistants, such that each such official either provide all records responsive to #1 that are 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 are also requested. In order to ensure rapid disclosure, in this and only this request, particular formats and headers are NOT specifically requested (though you are welcome to provide them if it can be provided rapidly).

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

From: Fine Arts Museums Of San Francisco

10/09/2019

Subject: Re: California Public Records Act Request: FAMSF Calendars and Meetings - Immediate Disclosure R...

Email

Sir/Ma'am,

Regarding your immediate disclosure requests, 1a and 1b, for FAMSF Calendars and Meetings, received on October 8, FAMSF is invoking an extension of up to 14 days (until October 23) because of the need to consult with another department. In addition, for your information, it appears FAMSF received duplicate copy emails of this request.

Thank you, on behalf of FAMSF,
Melissa Powers
Manager of Board Relations and Special Projects

Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco
de Young
Legion of Honor

Golden Gate Park | 50 Hagiwara Tea Garden Drive | San Francisco, CA 94118
p 415.750.3690
e mpowers@famsf.org | famsf.org

From: Anonymous Person

10/09/2019

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: FAMSF Calendars and Meetings - Immediate Disclosure ...

Email

SFAC 67.25 provides for 10 days, which is when I will expect the response.

Thanks,
Anonymous

From: Anonymous Person

10/09/2019

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: FAMSF Calendars and Meetings - Immediate Disclosure ...

Email

** 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 further additional immediate disclosure request for all items #1a,1b,2,3,4 but as applied to the Chair Emerita instead of the President and CEO. All caveats from the original request apply to this request as well, except for the definition of department head.

Thanks,
Anonymous

From: Fine Arts Museums Of San Francisco

10/10/2019

Subject: Re: California Public Records Act Request: FAMSF Calendars and Meetings - Immediate Disclosure R...

Email

Sir/Ma'am

Regarding your immediate disclosure requests, 1a and 1b, for FAMSF Calendars and Meetings for Chair Emerita, received on October 9, FAMSF is invoking an extension of up to 14 days (until October 24) because of the need to consult with another department.

Thank you, on behalf of FAMSF,

Melissa Powers

Manager of Board Relations and Special Projects

Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco

de Young

Legion of Honor

Golden Gate Park | 50 Hagiwara Tea Garden Drive | San Francisco, CA 94118

p 415.750.3690

e mpowers@famsf.org | famsf.org

From: Fine Arts Museums Of San Francisco

10/15/2019

Subject: Re: California Public Records Act Request: FAMSF Calendars and Meetings - Immediate Disclosure R...

Email

Dear Sir/Madam,

Regarding your immediate disclosure requests, 1a and 1b, for FAMSF Calendars and Meetings for Chair Emerita, received on October 9, FAMSF has no responsive records.

Regarding your immediate disclosure requests, 1a and 1b, for FAMSF Calendars and Meetings for President of FAMSF Board, received on October 9, FAMSF has no responsive records.

Regarding your immediate disclosure requests, 1a and 1b, for FAMSF Calendars and Meetings for FAMSF Director received on October 9, FAMSF has 60 responsive calendar entries. Three entries will be withheld because they are personal. Two entries will be partially redacted to protect personal privacy (home addresses, phone numbers).

Responsive documents will be provided to you by October 24.

Thank you, on behalf of FAMSF.

Megan Bourne

From: Anonymous Person

10/15/2019

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: FAMSF Calendars and Meetings - Immediate Disclosure ...

Email

Thank you!

Keep in mind there is also due a 67.21(c) for the non-IDRs (nos 2 and 3, including a City of San Jose search).

To Whom It May Concern:

** 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](https://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. **

Pursuant to the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA, I hereby request the following records as 6 Immediate Disclosure Requests from your agency, from COFAM, and from FAMF:

1. all legal/contractual relationships between your agency (or the City as a whole) and Corporation of the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco (COFAM)
2. all legal/contractual relationships between your agency (or the City as a whole) and Fine Arts Museums Foundation (FAMF)
3. all records of how city employees use IT systems owned or operated by FAMF and/or COFAM
4. all records of how city employees retain records owned, used, or prepared by the city agency, but stored on IT systems owned or operated by FAMF and/or COFAM
5. the last 10 emails from , and the last 10 emails to, Diane B. Wilsey, President, on their official AND personal email (under City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017)) re: the public's business
6. the last 10 emails from , and the last 10 emails to, Belva Davis, Vice President, on their official AND personal email (under City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017)) re: the public's business

We remind you of your obligations to provide electronic records in any format we request them in, as long that format is available to you OR easy to generate (Admin Code 67.21(I)). Therefore, emails exported in the .eml or .msg format with all non-exempt headers, metadata, attachments, etc. are best.

If you choose to convert documents, for example, to PDF or printed format (even though we have specifically requested .eml or .msg formats), to easily redact them, you must still ensure that you have preserved the full content of the original conversation record, which contains many detailed headers beyond the generally used From/To/Subject/Sent/etc.

If you send PDFs, please use only text/search PDFs, not images.

If on the City Attorney's advice or for other reasons, you redact portions of the metadata/headers, please specifically justify each such redaction with a legal citation (statute, ordinance, or case law).

If you provide PDFs or printed conversations or give us only a few of the headers or exclude attachments/images, and therefore withhold the other headers/attachments without proper 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 in court, before the Supervisor of Records, and/or the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force. I have various cases proceeding before the SOTF and Sup. of Records, and intend to vigorously enforce the public's right to record disclosure.

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.

Remember you must inform us whether there are no responsive records, some fully disclosed records, some fully withheld records, or some partially disclosed/partially withheld/redacted records

for each of the individual requests.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

From:

09/09/2019 

Subject: Thank you for your message Re: California Public Records Act Request: Immediate Disclosure Reque...

Email

Thank you for your message.

I am on a leave of absence until further notice.

For acquisitions related matters, please contact Lexi Paulson

at lpaulson@famsf.org(mailto:lpaulson@famsf.org)

For board of trustee related matters, please contact Melissa Powers

at mpowers@famsf.org(mailto:mpowers@famsf.org)

Kind regards,

Skot Jonz

Executive Assistant and Project Assistant

Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco

San Francisco, CA 94118

p 415.750.2635

--

Skot Jonz

Executive Assistant and Project Assistant

Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco

de Young | Legion of Honor

Golden Gate Park | 50 Hagiwara Tea Garden Drive

San Francisco, CA 94118

p 415.750.2635 | sjonz@famsf.org | (mailto:sjonz@famsf.org) famsf.org (<http://famsf.org>)

From: Anonymous Person

09/10/2019 

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Immediate Disclosure Request - FAMSF/COFAM/FAMF R...

Email

To Whom It May Concern:

** 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. **

Pursuant to the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA, I hereby request the following records as 6 Immediate Disclosure Requests from your agency, from COFAM, and from FAMF:

1. all legal/contractual relationships between your agency (or the City as a whole) and Corporation of the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco (COFAM)
2. all legal/contractual relationships between your agency (or the City as a whole) and Fine Arts Museums Foundation (FAMF)
3. all records of how city employees use IT systems owned or operated by FAMF and/or COFAM
4. all records of how city employees retain records owned, used, or prepared by the city agency,

but stored on IT systems owned or operated by FAMF and/or COFAM

5. the last 10 emails from , and the last 10 emails to, Diane B. Wilsey, President, on their official AND personal email (under City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017)) re: the public's business

6. the last 10 emails from , and the last 10 emails to, Belva Davis, Vice President, on their official AND personal email (under City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017)) re: the public's business

We remind you of your obligations to provide electronic records in any format we request them in, as long that format is available to you OR easy to generate (Admin Code 67.21(I)). Therefore, emails exported in the .eml or .msg format with all non-exempt headers, metadata, attachments, etc. are best.

If you choose to convert documents, for example, to PDF or printed format (even though we have specifically requested .eml or .msg formats), to easily redact them, you must still ensure that you have preserved the full content of the original conversation record, which contains many detailed headers beyond the generally used From/To/Subject/Sent/etc.

If you send PDFs, please use only text/search PDFs, not images.

If on the City Attorney's advice or for other reasons, you redact portions of the metadata/headers, please specifically justify each such redaction with a legal citation (statute, ordinance, or case law).

If you provide PDFs or printed conversations or give us only a few of the headers or exclude attachments/images, and therefore withhold the other headers/attachments without proper 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 in court, before the Supervisor of Records, and/or the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force. I have various cases proceeding before the SOTF and Sup. of Records, and intend to vigorously enforce the public's right to record disclosure.

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.

Remember you must inform us whether there are are no responsive records, some fully disclosed records, some fully withheld records, or some partially disclosed/partially withheld/redacted records for each of the individual requests.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

From: Fine Arts Museums Of San Francisco

09/11/2019 

Subject: Re: California Public Records Act Request: Immediate Disclosure Request - FAMSF/COFAM/FAMF R...

[Email](#)

Dear Sir/Madam,

The Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco received your Immediate Disclosure Request, dated September 7, 2019, on September 10, 2019. You have requested the following records:

“Pursuant to the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA, I hereby request the following records as 6 Immediate Disclosure Requests from your agency, from COFAM, and from FAMF:

1. All legal/contractual relationships between your agency (or the City as a whole) and Corporation of the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco (COFAM)
2. All legal/contractual relationships between your agency (or the City as a whole) and Fine Arts Museums Foundation (FAMF)
3. All records of how city employees use IT systems owned or operated by FAMF and/or COFAM
4. All records of how city employees retain records owned, used, or prepared by the city agency, but stored on IT systems owned or operated by FAMF and/or COFAM
5. The last 10 emails from, and the last 10 emails to, Diane B. Wilsey, President, on their official AND personal email (under City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017)) re: the public's business
6. The last 10 emails from, and the last 10 emails to, Belva Davis, Vice President, on their official AND personal email (under City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017)) re: the public's business"

On behalf of the City Department, the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco (FAMSF), please find attached the document responsive to request 1 and 2 (FAMSF Board Resolution of January 2018). The FAMSF does not have records responsive to requests 3 and 4.

As for records request 5 and 6, although you labeled your requests as an Immediate Disclosure Request, it is not "simple, routine, or otherwise readily answerable," as is required by San Francisco Administrative Code Section 67.25(a). For this reason, FAMSF is treating your IDR as a standard public records request, subject to the normally applicable 10 days response time, with a possible extension. Accordingly, FAMSF will be in touch with you regarding these records no later than September 20, 2019. However, FAMSF will endeavor to fulfill your request as soon as possible.

Thank you,

On behalf of FAMSF,
Melissa Powers
Manager of Board Relations and Special Projects

Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco
de Young
Legion of Honor

Golden Gate Park | 50 Hagiwara Tea Garden Drive | San Francisco, CA 94118
p 415.750.3690
e mpowers@famsf.org | famsf.org



FAMSF Board Resolution (1.25.18)

 [Download](#)

From: Anonymous Person

09/11/2019 

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Immediate Disclosure Request - FAMSF/COFAM/FAMF R... [Email](#)

** 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](https://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. **

I want to be certain I understand your response. The entirety of ALL contracts between the City agency and COFAM or FAMF is a 1-page memorandum of understanding with no detail whatsoever? There are literally no other legal agreements?

From: Fine Arts Museums Of San Francisco

09/11/2019

Subject: Re: California Public Records Act Request: Immediate Disclosure Request - FAMSF/COFAM/FAMF R...

Email

Dear Sir/Madam,

Your request was interpreted to capture current, legal agreements.

However, I am attaching a 2002 agreement between CCSF, through the FAMSF Board of Trustees, and FAMF, which is no longer effective.

Thank you,

On behalf of FAMSF,

Melissa Powers

Manager of Board Relations and Special Projects

Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco
de Young
Legion of Honor

Golden Gate Park | 50 Hagiwara Tea Garden Drive | San Francisco, CA 94118

p 415.750.3690

e mpowers@famsf.org | famsf.org



Facilities GroundLease - 2002



Download

From: Anonymous Person

09/12/2019

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Immediate Disclosure Request - FAMSF/COFAM/FAMF R...

Email

** 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](https://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. **

I have seen the various numerous arguments your agency has had with Mr. Smith before the SOTF. I have no idea why the relationship between a city agency and COFAM and FAMF is simultaneously so interlocked/complex but also completely non-transparent, and I will be taking a fresh look at forcing the city to legally turn over all public records associated with this relationship, no matter where they are, whether at the Task Force or in Superior Court.

Keep in mind you must turn over all documents prepared, owned, used, OR retained by your agency. So if the City ever prepared or used the records, you must turn them over whether or not they are owned or retained by your agency (as it appears you seem to believe FAMF/COFAM own or retain them instead of you). City of San Jose vs Superior Court (2017) is very clear that individual employees cannot shield records from disclosure by putting them on private property; there is no way that entire corporations can shield public records from disclosure by putting them on private property.

This is a further IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE REQUEST from FAMSF, from FAMF, and from COFAM:

1. full employee directory with name, title, and email of all FAMSF employees
2. full employee directory with name, title, and email of all FAMF employees
3. full employee directory with name, title, and email of all COFAM employees
4. full officer/board/trustees directory with name, title, and email of all FAMSF officers/board/trustees
5. full officer/board/trustees directory with name, title, and email of all FAMF officers/board/trustees
6. full officer/board/trustees directory with name, title, and email of all COFAM officers/board/trustees

If any FAMSF city employee possesses any of the records about FAMF or COFAM employees/officers you must turn them over.

The relevant question is NOT what the content or topic of the records is - the only issue is whether the City prepared, owned, used, or retained the records. If any City employee has used any of this information you must turn it over.

Thanks,
Anonymous

From: Anonymous Person

09/12/2019 

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Immediate Disclosure Request - FAMSF/COFAM/FAMF R... [Email](#)

Supervisor of Records,

Attached is a new SFAC 67.21(d) petition against FAMSF.

Thanks,
Anonymous

 79999-SupervisorPetition-20190912-b.pdf

 [Download](#)

From: Anonymous Person

09/12/2019 

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Immediate Disclosure Request - FAMSF/COFAM/FAMF R... [Email](#)

Good Morning Supervisor of Records,

You may disregard the petition #79999 sent late last night from this email address (79999-SupervisorPetition-20190912-b.pdf), and replace it with the attached amended one (79999-SupervisorPetition-20190912-rev2.pdf).

Thanks,
Anonymous

 79999-SupervisorPetition-20190912-rev2.pdf

 [Download](#)

From: Anonymous Person

09/12/2019 

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Immediate Disclosure Request - FAMSF/COFAM/FAMF R... [Email](#)

** 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](https://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. **

First, I have attached as a courtesy a Sup. of Records petition filed earlier today against your agency FAMSF. I intend to appeal any of your records withholdings or failure to provide records under the guise that they are COFAM or FAMF records at every available level of remedy, whether Sup. of Records, SOTF, or Superior Court.

Second, this is a yet further set of IMMEDIATE DISCLOSURE REQUESTS for each of the following, from each of FAMSF, COFAM, and FAMF:

- a) all correspondence (including all attachments, exhibits, memos, metadata, headers, emails, physical mail/notes, text, SMS, MMS, or any chat app messages, and in their original electronic format or scan of physical documents) between FAMSF* (the asterisk here and below means this request includes each and every employee, board member, or officer in addition to the entity as a whole, and also requires a City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017) search of private property for records re: the public's business) and Robert M. Smith between Jan. 1, 2018 and Sept. 12 2019 (inclusive)
- b) all correspondence (including all attachments, exhibits, memos, metadata, headers, emails, physical mail/notes, text, SMS, MMS, or any chat app messages, and in their original electronic format or scan of physical documents) between COFAM* and Mr. Smith between Jan. 1, 2018 and Sept. 12 2019 (inclusive)
- c) all correspondence (including all attachments, exhibits, memos, metadata, headers, emails, physical mail/notes, text, SMS, MMS, or any chat app messages, and in their original electronic format or scan of physical documents) between FAMF* and Mr. Smith between Jan. 1, 2018 and Sept. 12 2019 (inclusive)
- d) all correspondence (including all attachments, exhibits, memos, metadata, headers, emails, physical mail/notes, text, SMS, MMS, or any chat app messages, and in their original electronic format or scan of physical documents) between FAMSF* and COFAM* re: {Mr. Smith or his requests/complaints, or the Sunshine Ordinance, or CPRA} between Jan. 1, 2018 and Sept. 12 2019 (inclusive). Use the following case insensitive query: "smith" OR "cpa" OR "sunshine"
- e) all correspondence between FAMSF* and FAMF* re: {Mr. Smith or his requests/complaints, or the Sunshine Ordinance, or CPRA} Jan. 1, 2018 and Sept. 12 2019 (inclusive). Use the following case insensitive query: "smith" OR "cpa" OR "sunshine"
- f) all correspondence (including all attachments, exhibits, memos, metadata, headers, emails, physical mail/notes, text, SMS, MMS, or any chat app messages, and in their original electronic format or scan of physical documents) between FAMSF* and the City Attorney's office* or Sup. of Records' office*, between Jan. 1, 2018 and Sept. 12 2019 (inclusive). I anticipate you may use Attorney-Client privilege as a shield here. However: the City has waived the privilege if you already provided any of these communications to anyone else, whether that anyone is Mr. Smith or private entities COFAM or FAMF. If you waived the privilege by providing the record to member of the public Mr. Smith, that record is now permanently a public record and you must also give it to me (Gov Code 6254.5). If FAMF or COFAM or their employees have the purportedly privileged communication (for example by including them in an email thread or cc-ing or bcc-ing or forwarding the message to them), you also have waived the privilege and must provide me the documents. If the City's argument for privilege is that the City Attorney is also representing FAMF or COFAM, then also produce records of such a contract (your MOU says no such thing) and every associated invoice (which is not protected by privilege). If no such contract exists, and the representation is provided for free by the City to these private entities, a variety of other statutes regarding use of public funds for a private purpose may be in play.
- g) all correspondence (including all attachments, exhibits, memos, metadata, headers, emails, physical mail/notes, text, SMS, MMS, or any chat app messages, and in their original electronic

format or scan of physical documents) between COFAM* and the City Attorney's office* or Sup. of Records' office*, between Jan. 1, 2018 and Sept. 12 2019 (inclusive).

h) all correspondence (including all attachments, exhibits, memos, metadata, headers, emails, physical mail/notes, text, SMS, MMS, or any chat app messages, and in their original electronic format or scan of physical documents) between FAMF* and the City Attorney's office* or Sup. of Records' office*, between Jan. 1, 2018 and Sept. 12 2019 (inclusive).

I would like to remind you that you need to indicate for each request above and in all our messages, whether you did or did not have responsive records (separate from whether or not you withheld them). Remember any record retained, owned, used, or prepared by FAMSF must be included. If a city employee possesses a COFAM or FAMF document, you must disclose it. If COFAM or FAMF are holding records prepared or used by FAMSF, you must disclose it. You also must justify each and every withholding or redaction with particularity. Use footnotes or inline markings for example.

At this point you have #5 and #6 from the Sept. 10 requests, the employee directories from earlier today, and these 8 requests above in the pipeline.

We remind you of your obligations to provide electronic records in any format we request them in, as long that format is available to you OR easy to generate (Admin Code 67.21(I)). Therefore, emails exported in the .eml or .msg format with all non-exempt headers, metadata, attachments, etc. are best.

If you choose to convert documents, for example, to PDF or printed format (even though we have specifically requested .eml or .msg formats), to easily redact them, you must still ensure that you have preserved the full content of the original conversation record, which contains many detailed headers beyond the generally used From/To/Subject/Sent/etc.

If you send PDFs, please use only text/search PDFs, not image/scanned PDFs. You must make exact copies of records under the CPRA - do not exclude color, formatting, images, or any other content that may be lost by printing and scanning records incorrectly.

If on the City Attorney's advice or for other reasons, you redact portions of the records, please specifically justify each such redaction with a legal citation (statute, ordinance, or case law). If you withhold metadata/headers, even if you don't visually redact them, you are still withholding and must justify it. If you provide PDFs or printed conversations or give us only a few of the headers or exclude attachments/images, and therefore withhold the other headers/attachments without proper 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 in court, before the Supervisor of Records, and/or the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force.

In all cases, 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.

Thanks,
Anonymous



79999-SupervisorPetition-20190912-rev2_Ujn4y2l.pdf

 [Download](#)

**** 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](https://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. ****

This is a yet further 3 immediate disclosure requests, from FAMSF, from COFAM, and from FAMF for:

- 1) the SB 272/ Gov Code 6270.5 enterprise systems catalog for FAMSF you are required to create and disclose. Please provide a copy in PDF or spreadsheet format; do not provide a URL.
- 2) the SB 272/ Gov Code 6270.5 enterprise systems catalog for COFAM you are required to create and disclose. Please provide a copy in PDF or spreadsheet format; do not provide a URL.
- 3) the SB 272/ Gov Code 6270.5 enterprise systems catalog for FAMF you are required to create and disclose. Please provide a copy in PDF or spreadsheet format; do not provide a URL.

I would like to remind you that you need to indicate for each request above and in all our messages, whether you did or did not have responsive records (separate from whether or not you withheld them). Remember any record retained, owned, used, or prepared by FAMSF must be included. If a city employee possesses a COFAM or FAMF document, you must disclose it. If COFAM or FAMF are holding records prepared or used by FAMSF, you must disclose it. You also must justify each and every withholding or redaction with particularity. Use footnotes or inline markings for example.

We remind you of your obligations to provide electronic records in any format we request them in, as long that format is available to you OR easy to generate (Admin Code 67.21(I)).

If you send PDFs, please use only text/search PDFs, not image/scanned PDFs. You must make exact copies of records under the CPRA - do not exclude color, formatting, images, or any other content that may be lost by printing and scanning records incorrectly.

If on the City Attorney's advice or for other reasons, you redact portions of the records, please specifically justify each such redaction with a legal citation (statute, ordinance, or case law). If you withhold metadata/headers, even if you don't visually redact them, you are still withholding and must justify it. If you provide PDFs or printed conversations or give us only a few of the headers or exclude attachments/images, and therefore withhold the other headers/attachments without proper 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 in court, before the Supervisor of Records, and/or the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force.

In all cases, 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.

Sincerely,
Anonymous

From: Anonymous Person

09/12/2019 

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Immediate Disclosure Request - FAMSF/COFAM/FAMF R...

Email

**** 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. **

This is a yet further 3 immediate disclosure requests, from FAMSF, from COFAM, and from FAMF for:

- 1) a record of FAMSF "transactions" for the period April 2019 to June 2019 (Q2), within the meaning of SFAC 67.29-7(c): "In any contract, agreement or permit between the City and any outside entity that authorizes that entity to demand any funds or fees from citizens, the City shall ensure that accurate records of each transaction are maintained in a professional and businesslike manner and are available to the public as public records under the provisions of this ordinance."
- 2) a record of COFAM "transactions" for the period April 2019 to June 2019 (Q2), within the meaning of SFAC 67.29-7(c):
- 3) a record of FAMF "transactions" for the period April 2019 to June 2019 (Q2), within the meaning of SFAC 67.29-7(c):

I would like to remind you that you need to indicate for each request above and in all our messages, whether you did or did not have responsive records (separate from whether or not you withheld them). Remember any record retained, owned, used, or prepared by FAMSF must be included. If a city employee possesses a COFAM or FAMF document, you must disclose it. If COFAM or FAMF are holding records prepared or used by FAMSF, you must disclose it. You also must justify each and every withholding or redaction with particularity. Use footnotes or inline markings for example.

We remind you of your obligations to provide electronic records in any format we request them in, as long that format is available to you OR easy to generate (Admin Code 67.21(I)). Our preference is spreadsheets or text PDFs.

If you send PDFs, please use only text/search PDFs, not image/scanned PDFs. You must make exact copies of records under the CPRA - do not exclude color, formatting, images, or any other content that may be lost by printing and scanning records incorrectly.

If on the City Attorney's advice or for other reasons, you redact portions of the records, please specifically justify each such redaction with a legal citation (statute, ordinance, or case law). If you withhold metadata/headers, even if you don't visually redact them, you are still withholding and must justify it. If you provide PDFs or printed conversations or give us only a few of the headers or exclude attachments/images, and therefore withhold the other headers/attachments without proper 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 in court, before the Supervisor of Records, and/or the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force.

In all cases, 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.

Sincerely,
Anonymous

From: Anonymous Person

09/12/2019 

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Immediate Disclosure Request - FAMSF/COFAM/FAMF R...

Email

** 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](https://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. **

Please see the attached immediate disclosure request letter superseding my prior requests, with consistent numbering for your convenien.



79999-FAMSF-20190912-letter.pdf

[Download](#)

From: Fine Arts Museums Of San Francisco

09/13/2019

Subject: Re: California Public Records Act Request: Immediate Disclosure Request - FAMSF/COFAM/FAMF R...

[Email](#)

Sir/Madam,
In response to your letter, please see the attached for itemized answers.
On behalf of FAMSF,
Melissa Powers
Manager of Board Relations and Special Projects

Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco
de Young
Legion of Honor

Golden Gate Park | 50 Hagiwara Tea Garden Drive | San Francisco, CA 94118
p 415.750.3690
e mpowers@famsf.org | famsf.org



COFAM Board Roster(IDR#12)

[Download](#)



FAMF Board Roster (IDR#11))

[Download](#)



FAMSF.Response.79999-FAMSF-20190912 (September 13)

[Download](#)



FAM employeesRoster(IDR#7)

[Download](#)



FAMSF Board Roster (IDR#10)

[Download](#)



COFAM Employee Roster(IDR#9)

[Download](#)

From: Anonymous Person

09/14/2019

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Immediate Disclosure Request - FAMSF/COFAM/FAMF R...

[Email](#)

** 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](https://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. **

A formal complaint will be filed shortly regarding the City's withholding of documents.

Please note that you have until Sept. 17 and 19 to provide your statement re: existence/non-existence, quantity, form of each set of records requested, even if you believe the contents are exempt (see SFAC 67.21(c)).

Also, I am not asking you to answer on behalf of COFAM or FAMF. But if FAMSF prepared, owned, used, or retained any of those communications between COFAM and FAMF and other parties (for example, if any City employee was forwarded any of those, or CC-ed them, or has any copy of them), you must disclose them. Please read the definition of a "public record" in CPRA. You did not actually state that there were no responsive records, merely that you will not respond for other entities, which makes me quite suspicious.

Finally, not all of your communications with the City Attorney are privileged. I believe you have shared some of them with Mr. Smith and/or COFAM or FAMF. If so, you have waived the privilege, and I am owed those documents.

Thanks,
Anonymous

From: Fine Arts Museums Of San Francisco

09/17/2019 

Subject: Public Information Request

Email

Sir/Madam,

In response to your request under 67.21(c)), for items 1-6, for your request of September 10:

- For requests 1-4: 67.21(c) was satisfied with our response on September 11.

- For requests: 5-6: There are no official email accounts for Diane Wilsey and Belva Davis. However, FAMSF has identified 10 responsive emails re: public's business from and to


Mrs. Wilsey's personal account and to Belva Davis. We are still conducting a review to identify 10 from Ms. Davis. We will provide available, responsive documents on Friday, September 20.

Thank you,
Melissa Powers
Manager of Board Relations and Special Projects

Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco
de Young
Legion of Honor

Golden Gate Park | 50 Hagiwara Tea Garden Drive | San Francisco, CA 94118
p 415.750.3690
e mpowers@famsf.org | famsf.org

From: Anonymous Person

09/17/2019 

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Immediate Disclosure Request - FAMSF/COFAM/FAMF R...

Email

Thank you very much.

From: Fine Arts Museums Of San Francisco

09/19/2019 

Subject: Public Information Request

Email

Sir/Madam,

In response to your request under 67.21(c):

Requests 7-12: 67.21(c) was satisfied on September 13.

Request 13: FAMSF has responsive records in the form of emails and attachments, to Mr. Smith and emails from Mr. Smith. Please provide a mailing address so FAMSF can send you a thumbdrive containing responsive material (in the thousands).

Requests 14-15: FAMSF does not have responsive records

Request 16: FAMSF has responsive records in the form of emails.

Requests 17: FAMSF does not have responsive records

Request 18: FAMSF is withholding records based on attorney/client privilege.

Requests 19-20: FAMSF does not have responsive records

Request 21: 67.21(c) was satisfied on September 13.

Requests 22-23: FAMSF does not have responsive records

Request 24: 67.21(c) was satisfied on September 13

Request 25-26: FAMSF does not have responsive records

Thank you,

On behalf of FAMSF,

Melissa Powers

Manager of Board Relations and Special Projects

Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco

de Young

Legion of Honor

Golden Gate Park | 50 Hagiwara Tea Garden Drive | San Francisco, CA 94118
p 415.750.3690
e mpowers@famsf.org | famsf.org

From: Anonymous Person

09/19/2019 

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Immediate Disclosure Request - FAMSF/COFAM/FAMF R...

Email

This is not a conforming response under 67.21c

> Request 18: FAMSF is withholding records based on attorney/client privilege.

From: Fine Arts Museums Of San Francisco

09/20/2019

Subject: Request for Information

Email

Sir/Ma'am,

Please find documents responsive to requests 5 and 6. Redactions were made on the basis of privacy. Authority: Cal. Const. Art. 1 § 1; Cal. Govt. Code § 6254(c); San Francisco Admin. Code § 67.1(g); San Francisco Admin Code Chapter 12M.2.


As far as 67.21(c) for request 18, yes, there are responsive records in the form of emails. As stated, they are being withheld on basis of attorney client privilege.


Thank you.


On behalf of FAMSF,
Melissa Powers
Manager of Board Relations and Special Projects


Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco
de Young
Legion of Honor


Golden Gate Park | 50 Hagiwara Tea Garden Drive | San Francisco, CA 94118
p 415.750.3690
e mpowers@famsf.org | famsf.org


 Request5From 3 Re_ Use of Image of Work_Tissot_Redacted
[Download](#)

 Request5From 4 Re_ FY20 Events _ Annual Luncheon Menu_Redacted
[Download](#)

 Request5From 6 Re_ FY20 Events _ Annual Luncheon Menu_Redacted
[Download](#)

 Request5From 8Re_ Board Meeting Dates.Redacted
[Download](#)

 Request5From 2 Re_ Late Monet Return_Redacted
[Download](#)

 Request5From 1 9.16 Annual Donors' Luncheon and Director's Preview.Redacted
[Download](#)



Request5From 5 Re_ FY20 Events _ Annual Luncheon Menu_Redacted

[Download](#)



Request 6 From 7 Meetings today_Redacted

[Download](#)



Request5From7 Re_ Board Meeting Dates_Redacted

[Download](#)



Request5From10 Re_ summer reading_Redacted

[Download](#)

[There are too many files to display on this communication. See all files](#)

From: Anonymous Person

09/20/2019

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Immediate Disclosure Request - FAMSF/COFAM/FAMF R... [Email](#)

Thank you for the additional documents and for noting redaction justifications with particularity in them.

However, even the most basic metadata is missing from these records. You may follow-along with how the full SOTF rules on electronic metadata on Oct. 2. We will be petitioning that information as well -- please do not destroy it.

Finally, again, please meet the full 67.21(c) requirement - what is the quantity of records for #18? How many emails were there?

Have a good weekend,
Anonymous

From: Fine Arts Museums Of San Francisco

09/23/2019

Subject: Request for Information [Email](#)

Dear Sir/Ma'am,

Regarding your Request #13, pursuant to California Government Code Section 6253(c), FAMSF is invoking an extension of up to 14 days (until October 7) because of the voluminous nature of the request.

Regarding your Request #16, pursuant to California Government Code Section 6253(c), FAMSF is invoking an extension of up to 14 days (until October 7) because of the need to consult with another department.

In addition, it has come to my attention, regarding your Request #1 for all contracts between FAMSF (or the City as a whole) and COFAM, that there is one additional responsive document. However, that document is being withheld due to privacy concerns. Cal. Const. Art. 1 § 1; Cal. Govt. Code § 6254(c); San Francisco Admin. Code § 67.1(g); San Francisco Admin Code Chapter 12M.2.

Thank you,

On behalf of FAMSF,
Melissa Powers
Manager of Board Relations and Special Projects

Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco
de Young
Legion of Honor

Golden Gate Park | 50 Hagiwara Tea Garden Drive | San Francisco, CA 94118
p 415.750.3690
e mpowers@famsf.org | famsf.org

From:

09/23/2019 

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Immediate Disclosure Request - FAMSF/COFAM/FAMF R...

[Email](#)

To Whom It May Concern:

We write to provide an update on the status of our consideration of your petitions. Since September 6, you have submitted five separate petitions to the Supervisor of Records and numerous other email communications concerning prior petitions. We have already responded to four other petitions you submitted in recent months.

Due to the volume of petitions and the complexity of the issues raised, we are invoking 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 the issues raised are novel and 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 for previously providing your stated preference in terms of prioritization.

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



~WRD001

 [Download](#)

From: Anonymous Person

09/23/2019 

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Immediate Disclosure Request - FAMSF/COFAM/FAMF R...

[Email](#)

Supervisor of Records,

Attached is a further petition re: FAMSF (I sent you a FAMSF petition " #79999– Rev. 2" on Sept. 12, and it remains pending).

It is much smaller in scope than the others -- for exactly one contract between the city and COFAM, being withheld in entirety for privacy reasons.

Sincerely,
Anonymous



79999-SupervisorPetition-2-20190923.pdf

[Download](#)

From: Fine Arts Museums Of San Francisco

09/30/2019

Subject: Follow Up

[Email](#)

Dear Sir/Madam,

On September 23, you were informed that a document responsive to Request #1 (all contracts between FAMSF (or the City as a whole) and COFAM) was being withheld due to privacy concerns. Cal. Const. Art. 1 § 1; Cal. Govt. Code § 6254(c); San Francisco Admin. Code § 67.1(g); San Francisco Admin Code Chapter 12M.2. The basis for withholding has been updated to also include attorney-client privilege. Cal. Govt. Code §§ 6254(k), 6276.04; Cal. Evid. Code §§ 950 et seq.

And do you have a mailing address for FAMSF to send a thumbdrive, containing records responsive to Request #13?

Thank you,
On behalf of FAMSF,

Melissa Powers
Manager of Board Relations and Special Projects

Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco
de Young
Legion of Honor

Golden Gate Park | 50 Hagiwara Tea Garden Drive | San Francisco, CA 94118
p 415.750.3690
e mpowers@famsf.org | famsf.org

From: Anonymous Person

10/01/2019

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Immediate Disclosure Request - FAMSF/COFAM/FAMF R... [Email](#)

** 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. **

1) These justifications make no sense. A contract is between 2 or more parties. Attorney-client privilege does not exist when a party includes another party, who is not their attorney, on a communication. There is no legitimate way an entire contract between the City and COFAM, a private corporation that is not a law firm, can be shielded by personal privacy or attorney-client privilege. You must disclose every part of the contract that is not purportedly privileged or involving personal privacy, and redact the rest. Remember Sunshine Ordinance requires disclosure of even the smallest amount of non-exempt portion of a record.


2) Please merely email the records. I do not wish to provide a mailing address. You can split it into multiple emails if you need to. Alternatively you could use a file share service (Google Drive, Dropbox, etc.) . Also, if you publish the records to your public website, you may provide me just a URL.

Thanks,

Anonymous

From:

10/02/2019 

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Immediate Disclosure Request - FAMSF/COFAM/FAMF R... 

Please see attached response to your petition.
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



~WRD000

 [Download](#)




Ltr. to Muckrock 10.2.2019

 [Download](#)

From: Anonymous Person

10/07/2019 


Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Immediate Disclosure Request - FAMSF/COFAM/FAMF R... 

Thank you for your response Mr. Russi.

Please note a similar request to the City Attorney's office turned over a document captioned "Agreement Governing Reimbursement 2002-2003" between FAMSF and COFAM. To my knowledge FAMSF has not turned over such record. Therefore it is a record, withheld by FAMSF, that is a public record, and I would like a determination as such, and an order to FAMSF to immediately disclose it.

From: Anonymous Person

10/07/2019 

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Immediate Disclosure Request - FAMSF/COFAM/FAMF R... 


To be clear, the below was *already* part of our prior petitions against FAMSF re: their agreements. However if for some reason you aren't considering it that way, then this is a subsequent 67.21(d) petition.

"Please note a similar request to the City Attorney's office turned over a document captioned "Agreement Governing Reimbursement 2002-2003" between FAMSF and COFAM. To my knowledge FAMSF has not turned over such record. Therefore it is a record, withheld by FAMSF, that is a public record, and I would like a determination as such, and an order to FAMSF to immediately disclose it."

Remember that 67.21(d) imposes not ONLY a 10 day requirement, but ALSO an "as soon as possible" requirement - given that your office should have already investigated this request, it should not take you 10 days.

Thanks,
Anonymous

From: Fine Arts Museums Of San Francisco

10/07/2019 

Subject: Sunshine Ordinance Request - Ref #79999

Email 

Sir/Madam,

Links to folders, in response to Request 13 and 16 are below. Redactions not reflected on the noted indexes are on the basis of personal privacy. Cal. Const. Art. 1 § 1; Cal. Govt. Code § 6254(c); San Francisco Admin. Code § 67.1(g); San Francisco Admin Code Chapter 12M.2, and San Francisco Charter, Section 5.100, when referring to donor anonymity. Two records have been withheld, both on basis of privacy, including for one, the authority based on San Francisco Charter, Section 5.100

<https://drive.google.com/open?id=15B28EetRgLX1I9W-V8GMm7dDFaTc3W7Y>
<https://drive.google.com/open?id=1j-Q2gN5vZFSt0DuEJIBeBuN1bI5jluzd>
<https://drive.google.com/open?id=1jDZogkWWBdbLwQHCCTrw0f4Rn4TsFiJR>

These links will be shut off on October 14th, at close of business.

Thank you,
On behalf of FAMSF,

Melissa Powers
Manager of Board Relations and Special Projects

Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco
de Young
Legion of Honor

Golden Gate Park | 50 Hagiwara Tea Garden Drive | San Francisco, CA 94118
p 415.750.3690
e mpowers@famsf.org | famsf.org



18049-20191016T194537Z-001.zip

 [Download](#)



PRR.Oct7-20191016T194725Z-001.zip

 [Download](#)



18083-20191016T194615Z-001.zip

 [Download](#)

From:

10/08/2019 

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Immediate Disclosure Request - FAMSF/COFAM/FAMF R... [Email](#)

FAMSF has stated it does not have a copy of this document. Therefore, there is no issue for the Supervisor of Records to determine, and the petition is closed.

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



~WRD000

 [Download](#)

From: Anonymous Person

10/08/2019 

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Immediate Disclosure Request - FAMSF/COFAM/FAMF R... [Email](#)

**** 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. ****

In preparation for publishing my story on the audit of San Francisco public records compliance, I will also be sampling your records of past controversies.

This is a further immediate disclosure request for every single email or physically written communication prepared, owned, used, or retained by your agency mentioning any of these persons, or to/from any of these persons, from Jan. 2016 to present, on the business AND personal: email, text, MMS, WhatsApp, Signal, Telegram, Instagram, Facebook, WeChat, Twitter, and all other online chat accounts of the Chair Emerita, the President, the CEO, and the Manager of Board Relations. You must perform a City of San Jose v Superior Court search for each of the 4 people mentioned above as well.

1. Bernard Osher ,
2. Jack McDonald ,
3. Louise Renne ,
4. Joe Cotchett ,
5. Bill Huggins ,
6. Therese Chen ,

This is also a 67.21(c) request for quantity, nature, form statements for each of these 6 requests for each of 4 custodians (24 statements), in 7 days without extension.

We remind you of your obligations to provide electronic records in any format we request them in, as long that format is available to you OR easy to generate (Admin Code 67.21(l)). Therefore, emails exported in the .eml or .msg format with all non-exempt headers, metadata, attachments, etc. are best.

If you choose to convert documents, for example, to PDF or printed format (even though we have specifically requested .eml or .msg formats), to easily redact them, you must still ensure that you have preserved the full content of the original conversation record, which contains many detailed headers beyond the generally used From/To/Subject/Sent/etc.

If you send PDFs, please use only text/search PDFs, not images.
Do not physically print and scan records (see SOTF 19047).

If on the City Attorney's advice or for other reasons, you redact portions of the metadata/headers, please specifically justify each such redaction with a legal citation (statute, ordinance, or case law).

If you provide PDFs or printed conversations or give us only a few of the headers or exclude attachments/images, and therefore withhold the other headers/attachments without proper 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 in court, before the Supervisor of Records, and/or the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force. I have various cases proceeding before the SOTF and Sup. of Records, and intend to vigorously enforce the public's right to record disclosure.

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.

Remember you must inform us whether there are no responsive records, some fully disclosed records, some fully withheld records, or some partially disclosed/partially withheld/redacted records for each of the individual requests.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

From: Fine Arts Museums Of San Francisco

10/09/2019 

Subject: Re: California Public Records Act Request: Immediate Disclosure Request - FAMSF/COFAM/FAMF R...

[Email](#)

Sir/Ma'am,

This email is to inform you that while your request is dated October 8, it was not delivered to and received by FAMSF until October 9. FAMSF will respond by close of business October 10.

Thank you,

On behalf of FAMSF,

Melissa Powers

Manager of Board Relations and Special Projects

Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco

de Young

Legion of Honor

Golden Gate Park | 50 Hagiwara Tea Garden Drive | San Francisco, CA 94118
p 415.750.3690
e mpowers@famsf.org | famsf.org

From: Fine Arts Museums Of San Francisco

10/10/2019

Subject: Re: California Public Records Act Request: Immediate Disclosure Request - FAMSF/COFAM/FAMF R...

Email

Sir/Ma'am,

In response to your request for follow up information, which we received on October 9, although you labeled your request as an Immediate Disclosure Request, it is not "simple, routine, or otherwise readily answerable," as is required by San Francisco Administrative Code Section 67.25(a). 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. Accordingly, we will be in touch with you regarding the request by no later than October 21.

Thank you,

On behalf of FAMSF,

Melissa Powers

Manager of Board Relations and Special Projects

Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco
de Young
Legion of Honor

Golden Gate Park | 50 Hagiwara Tea Garden Drive | San Francisco, CA 94118
p 415.750.3690
e mpowers@famsf.org | famsf.org

From: Anonymous Person

10/18/2019

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Immediate Disclosure Request - FAMSF/COFAM/FAMF R...

Email

RE: Reopening a 67.21(d) petition

Sup. of Records,

You previously stated "FAMSF has stated it does not have a copy of this document." However contracts like ""Agreement Governing Reimbursement 2002-2003"" must be preserved for 20 years per FAMSF retention policy (<https://index.sfgov.org/taxonomy/term/50>).

Please have them re-search. If they don't have it, they may be violating their retention policy and/or SF AC 67.29-7.

--Anonymous

From: Fine Arts Museums Of San Francisco

10/18/2019

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Immediate Disclosure Request - FAMSF/COFAM/FAMF R...

Email

Hello – I can follow up again with FAMSF. Nonetheless, the Supervisor of Records does not have jurisdiction over complaints concerning compliance with record retention policies or Section 67.29-7 of the Administrative Code. 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



~WRD000

 [Download](#)

From: Anonymous Person

10/18/2019 

Subject: RE: California Public Records Act Request: Immediate Disclosure Request - FAMSF/COFAM/FAMF R... [Email](#)

Yes I understand - I would have to take the retention issue up with SOTF.

Thanks!

FAMSF RESPONSE 9/13/19

79999-25916958@requests.muckrock.com (Anonymous requestor).

Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco; Corporation of the Fine Arts Museums; Fine Arts Museums Foundation
Custodian of Records and/or Corporate Secretary 50 Hagiwara Tea Garden Drive San Francisco CA 94118
mpowers@famsf.org sent via email

Our ref.

Date #79999

2019-09-12

RE: SF Sunshine Ordinance request - ref #79999- Immediate Disclosure Request

To the FAMSF, COFAM, and FAMF:

NOTE: 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.

For your convenience, I am memorializing all requests made by me between Sept. 10 and 12 in this letter. This letter supersedes those prior emails – please use the numbers below to refer to the requests.

Pursuant to the Sunshine Ordinance and CPRA, I hereby request the following records as 26 distinct Immediate Disclosure Requests from FAMSF, from COFAM, and from FAMF. They are each a separate request. Deadlines, rolling production, determination of immediacy of response, and any assertion of the so-called “rule of reason” to delay responses must apply to the volume of responses required by each request separately. If you fail to do so, I will need to send each request individually and then receive that treatment.

Previously sent, Dated Sept. 10:

1. All legal/contractual relationships between your agency (or the City as a whole) and Corporation of the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco (COFAM)

Responded September 11.

2. all legal/contractual relationships between your agency (or the City as a whole) and Fine Arts Museums Foundation (FAMF)

Responded September 11.

3. all records of how city employees use IT systems owned or operated by FAMF and/or COFAM

Responded September 11.

4. all records of how city employees retain records owned, used, or prepared by the city agency, but stored on IT systems owned or operated by FAMF and/or COFAM

Responded September 11.

5. The last 10 emails from , and the last 10 emails to, Diane B. Wilsey, President, on their official AND personal email (under City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017)) re: the public's business

Responded September 11; Will respond by Sep 20

6. The last 10 emails from , and the last 10 emails to, Belva Davis, Vice President, on their official AND personal email (under City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017)) re: the public's business .

Responded September 11; Will respond by Sep 20

Previously sent, Dated Sept. 12:

7. Full employee directory with name, title, and email of all FAMSF employees

Roster attached.

8. Full employee directory with name, title, and email of all FAMF employees

No such record exists as there are no FAMF employees.

9. Full employee directory with name, title, and email of all COFAM employees

Roster attached.

10. Full officer/board/trustees directory with name, title, and email of all FAMSF officers/board/trustees

Roster attached. A roster of FAMSF trustees is provided, officers indicated and business emails listed where available.

11. Full officer/board/trustees directory with name, title, and email of all FAMF officers/board/trustees

Roster attached. A roster of FAMF trustees is provided, officers indicated.

12. Full officer/board/trustees directory with name, title, and email of all COFAM officers/board/trustees

Roster attached. A roster of COFAM trustees is provided, officers indicated and business emails listed where available.

13. All correspondence (including all attachments, exhibits, memos, metadata, headers, emails, physical mail/notes, text, SMS, MMS, or any chat app messages, and in their original electronic format or scan of physical documents) between FAMSF* (the asterisk here and below means this request includes each and every employee, board member, or officer in addition to the entity as a whole, and also requires a City of San Jose v Superior Court (2017) search of private property for records re: the public's business) and Robert M. Smith between Jan. 1, 2018 and Sept. 12 2019 (inclusive)

It is not "simple, routine, or otherwise readily answerable," as is required by San Francisco Administrative Code Section 67.25(a). For this reason, FAMSF is treating your IDR as a standard public records request, subject to normally applicable 10 days response time, with a possible extension. Accordingly, FAMSF will be in touch with you regarding this no later than September 23, 2019. In addition, due to the volume, several records were sent to Mr. Smith on a thumbdrive. Please provide an address for the same delivery method.

14. All correspondence (including all attachments, exhibits, memos, metadata, headers, emails, physical mail/notes, text, SMS, MMS, or any chat app messages, and in their original electronic format or scan of physical documents) between COFAM* and Mr. Smith between Jan. 1, 2018 and Sept. 12 2019 (inclusive)

Not responding on behalf COFAM.

15. All correspondence (including all attachments, exhibits, memos, metadata, headers, emails, physical mail/notes, text, SMS, MMS, or any chat app messages, and in their original electronic format or scan of physical documents) between FAMF* and Mr. Smith between Jan. 1, 2018 and Sept. 12 2019 (inclusive)

Not responding on behalf of FAMF

16. All correspondence (including all attachments, exhibits, memos, metadata, headers, emails, physical mail/notes, text, SMS, MMS, or any chat app messages, and in their original electronic format or scan of physical documents) between FAMSF* and COFAM* re: Mr. Smith or his requests/complaints, or the Sunshine Ordinance, or CPRA between Jan. 1, 2018 and Sept. 12 2019 (inclusive). Use the following case

insensitive query: "smith" OR "cpa" OR "sunshine"

This is not "simple, routine, or otherwise readily answerable," as is required by San Francisco Administrative Code Section 67.25(a). For this reason, FAMSF is treating your IDR as a standard public records request, subject to normally applicable 10 days response time, with a possible extension. Accordingly, FAMSF will be in touch with you regarding this no later than September 23, 2019.

17. All correspondence (including all attachments, exhibits, memos, metadata, headers, emails, physical mail/notes, text, SMS, MMS, or any chat app messages, and in their original electronic format or scan of physical documents) between FAMSF* and FAMF* re: Mr. Smith or his requests/complaints, or the Sunshine Ordinance, or CPRA Jan. 1, 2018 and Sept. 12 2019 (inclusive). Use the following case insensitive query: "smith" OR "cpa" OR "sunshine"

No responsive records

18. All correspondence (including all attachments, exhibits, memos, metadata, headers, emails, physical mail/notes, text, SMS, MMS, or any chat app messages, and in their original electronic format or scan of physical documents) between FAMSF* and the City Attorney's office* or Sup. of Records' office*, between Jan. 1, 2018 and Sept. 12 2019 (inclusive). I anticipate you may use Attorney-Client privilege as a shield here. However: the City has waived the privilege if you already provided any of these communications to anyone else, whether that anyone is Mr. Smith or private entities COFAM or FAMF. If you waived the privilege by providing the record to member of the public Mr. Smith, that record is now permanently a public record and you must also give it to me (Gov Code 6254.5). If FAMF or COFAM or their employees have the purportedly privileged communication (for example by including them in an email thread or cc-ing or bcc-ing or forwarding the message to them), you also have waived the privilege and must provide me the documents. If the City's argument for privilege is that the City Attorney is also representing FAMF or COFAM, then also produce records of such a contract (your MOU says no such thing) and every associated invoice (which is not protected by privilege). If no such contract exists, and the representation is provided for free by the City to these private entities, a variety of other statutes regarding use of public funds for a private purpose may be in play.

Any records between FAMSF and City Attorney's office are protected by Attorney Client Privilege. There are no responsive documents between FAMSF and Sup. Of Records.

19. All correspondence (including all attachments, exhibits, memos, metadata, headers, emails, physical mail/notes, text, SMS, MMS, or any chat app messages, and in their original electronic format or scan of physical documents) between COFAM* and the City Attorney's office* or Sup. of Records' office*, between Jan. 1, 2018 and Sept. 12 2019 (inclusive).

FAMSF directs you to the City Attorney's Office for this question.

20. All correspondence (including all attachments, exhibits, memos, metadata, headers, emails, physical mail/notes, text, SMS, MMS, or any chat app messages, and in their original electronic format or scan of physical documents) between FAMF* and the City Attorney's office* or Sup. of Records' office*, between Jan. 1, 2018 and Sept. 12 2019 (inclusive).

FAMSF directs you to the City Attorney's Office for this question.

21. The SB 272/ Gov Code 6270.5 enterprise systems catalog for FAMSF you are required to create and disclose. Please provide a copy in PDF or spreadsheet format; do not provide a URL.

No responsive documents.

22. The SB 272/ Gov Code 6270.5 enterprise systems catalog for COFAM you are required to create and disclose. Please provide a copy in PDF or spreadsheet format; do not provide a URL.

Not responding on behalf of COFAM

23. The SB 272/ Gov Code 6270.5 enterprise systems catalog for FAMF you are required to create and disclose. Please provide a copy in PDF or spreadsheet format; do not provide a URL.

Not responding on behalf of FAMF.

24. A record of FAMSF "transactions" for the period April 2019 to June 2019 (Q2), within the meaning of SFAC 67.29-7(c): "In any contract, agreement or permit between the City and any outside entity that authorizes that entity to demand any funds or fees from citizens, the City shall ensure that accurate records of each transaction are maintained in a professional and businesslike manner and are available to the public as public records under the provisions of this ordinance."

No responsive records.

25. A record of COFAM "transactions" for the period April 2019 to June 2019 (Q2), within the meaning of SFAC 67.29-7(c)

Not responding on behalf of COFAM.

26. A record of FAMF "transactions" for the period April 2019 to June 2019 (Q2), within the meaning of SFAC 67.29-7(c)

Not responding on behalf of FAMF.