

Date: June 24, 2008

Item No. 2

File No. \_\_\_\_\_

## SUNSHINE ORDINANCE TASK FORCE

### AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST\*

- Draft Minutes: Task Force for May 27, 2008**
- \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_

Completed by: Frank Darby

Date: June 19, 2008

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

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

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



**SUNSHINE ORDINANCE TASK FORCE  
DRAFT MINUTES**

Tuesday, May 27, 2008  
4:00 p.m., City Hall, Room 408

**Task Force Members**

Seat 1	Erica Craven (Vice Chair)	Seat 8	Kristin Chu
Seat 2	Richard Knee	Seat 9	Hanley Chan
Seat 3	Sue Cauthen	Seat 10	Nick Goldman
Seat 4	Allyson Washburn	Seat 11	Marjorie Ann Williams
Seat 5	Ketaki Gokhale		
Seat 6	Doug Comstock (Chair)	Ex-officio	Angela Calvillo
Seat 7	David Pilpel	Ex-officio	Harrison Sheppard

**Call to Order** The meeting was called to order at: 4:00 P.M.  
**Roll Call** Present: Craven, Knee, Cauthen, Washburn, Gokhale, Comstock, Pilpel, Chu, Chan (in at 4:20; out at 7:25), Goldman, Williams (out at 9:08), Sheppard (out at 8:50)

**Agenda Changes:** Item #9 was heard after item #5; item #18 was heard after item #6; item #9a was heard after item #18, and item #2 was heard after item #9a.

**Deputy City Attorney:** Rosa Sanchez  
**Administrator:** Frank Darby  
Chris Rustom

*Members Craven, Knee, Cauthen, Washburn, Gokhale, Chu, Chan and Goldman were administrated the Oath of Office prior to the start of the meeting by Deputy Director Nilka Julio from the Office of the Clerk of the Board.*

Member Pilpel expressed concern as to whether the Task Force could meet since there were no know members who were physically handicapped as required under §67.30 of the Ordinance. Member Sheppard asked if decisions made by the Task Force could be invalidated since the membership is not in compliance with the Ordinance. DCA Sanchez said that the actions of the Task Force would not be invalidated. That the Task Force has two seats that are currently vacant which can be filled by someone who meets the Ordinance requirements. Administrator Darby, in response to Chair Comstock, stated that he was not aware of any current member or application who have identified themselves as having a "physical handicap." Mr. Darby, also informed members that during

the May 15, 2008, BOS Rules Committee meeting the committee continued the discussion to recommend filling seats 6 and 7 until their June 5, 2008, meeting, due to the requirement under §67.30 that at least one of the Task Force members be physically handicapped.

Member Williams said that a disability can be seen or unseen and also expressed her concern about meeting without a qualified member.

Member Cauthen said that the rule is loose and that a person does not have to identify the nature of the disability.

Administrator Darby, in response to Member Pilpel, stated that a survey of members has not been done and will not be done until further direction on the appropriate method is received from the City Attorney's Office.

#### Agenda Changes:

Member Pilpel asked if item 9 could be heard earlier in the meeting. Without objection.

Kimo Crossman asked if representatives for item 6-1 would be attending the meeting.

Administrator Darby, in response to Chair Comstock indicated that Jack Chin would not be able to attend and that Rohan Lane said that he would try to attend.

### 1. Election of Officers: Chair and Vice-Chair

#### A. Nominations for Chair: Chu

Public Speakers: None

Ayes: Craven, Knee, Cauthen, Gokhale, Washburn, Comstock, Pilpel, Chu, Goldman, Williams

Absent: Chan

#### B. Vice Chair Nominations: Craven and Knee

Public Speakers: None

Vice Chair: Member Craven

Ayes: Knee, Cauthen, Gokhale, Washburn, Comstock, Pilpel, Chu, Goldman,

Vice Chair: Member Knee

Ayes: Craven, Williams

Member Craven was elected as the vice-chair.

Chair Chu asked Member Comstock to chair the rest of the meeting.

New Members Washburn and Gokhale introduce themselves and were welcomed by the Task Force.

### 2. Special recognition to Bruce Wolfe for his community service as a contributing

member of the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force.

Public Speakers: None

Acting Chair Comstock said the he will miss serving with Mr. Wolfe, and presented Mr. Wolfe with a Certificate of Recognition signed by the President of the Board of Supervisors Aaron Peskin.

Mr. Wolfe said that he feels fortunate to have served. He urged the Task Force to continue to evolve. He said that he will use his time to push the amendments to passage.

Member Chan said that it was an honor serving with Mr. Wolfe. Member Williams said that she will miss Mr. Wolfe's expertise, knowledge and his compassion for people.

3. Discussion of City Attorney's interpretation of, implementation of, and advice and counsel to clients on compliance with Sunshine Ordinance sections 67.21 (i) and 67.24 (b) (1) (iii). Discussion of City Attorney's policy on whether such advice should be provided in written and/or oral communications.

Member Pilpel asked for clarity on the item. Member Craven said the this matter is in regards to the City Attorney's Office (CAO) providing oral advice in lieu of written advice.

DCA Sanchez, said that she is not aware of the policy referred to by Member Craven, but that she will look into it. She distributed and elaborated on a section of the Good Government Guide and a copy of the February 26, 2007, letter to the Task Force from Paul Zarefsky.

Public Comment: Allen Grossman said that the CAO's client is the departments, which is contrary to §67.21 (i). He said the Paul Zarefsky wrote "ghost letters" for the Administrator in response to prior complaints. Kimo Crossman said that the CAO violates §67.21 (i) by not documenting their advice. He said that the Public Information Officer should appear before the Task Force.

Motion to continue (Craven / Goldman). Without objection. The Task Force asked that Paul Zarefsky attend the next Task Force meeting to discuss this matter.

4. Continued approval of minutes of March 25, 2008, meeting.

Speakers: None

Motion to approve the amended minutes of March 25, 2008 (Pilpel / Goldman). Without objection.

5. Approval of minutes of April 22, 2008, meeting.

Speakers: None

Motion to continue to the June 24, 2008, meeting (Knee/ Cauthen). Without objection.

6.

Discussion and possible action re: Public testimony time and questions from members of boards and commissions to those who comment (§67.7 and Brown Act 54954.2). Possible development of a policy or memo to all City policy bodies outlining best practices and assuring the rights of members of boards and commissions as well as the public.

Member Comstock said that this matter is about a Board member of the Ethics Commission who was not allowed to ask questions of a member of the public during general public comment.

Member Knee expressed concern that questing public speakers could be used to humiliate and intimidate.

Member Craven said that members need to be careful about discussing non agendized items; that members can ask questions to obtain clarity.

Member Pilpel said that bodies have broad discretion and should be allowed to exercise the policy and appropriately ask questions of the public.

Member Chan said that he feels that it is unfair that Police Commissioners can speak freely, but the public is unable to get answers to questions from commissioners.

Public Comment: Kim Crossman said that the Chair of the Commission would not allow another member to ask questions of the public for clarity. He said that people should be able to ask a simple question if it does not lead to a discussion; that §67.22 (c) already has provision for obtaining oral information. Patrick Monette-Shaw said that the Task Force should ensure consistency of public comment by recommending that public comment be held at the end of all meetings, rather than the beginning.

Allen Grossman said that an interruption that he experienced while speaking during public comment was an attempt to denigrate his remarks. He said that the 3-minute rule is not written in stone so the rule should be adjusted to allow speakers to complete their remarks.

Member Williams said that she is concerned with how the general public is treated. She said that the member's tone need to be respectful and not denigrate.

Member Craven said that she does not believe that developing a policy or writing a letter is an appropriate course of action.

Member Sheppard said that having public comment at the end of lengthy meetings would pose a burden on the public.

Action Chair Comstock asked if members want to take any action?

No action taken.

6-1

Media Services and SFGTV to describe their plans to implement the Digital Recording measure.

Member Craven asked Mr. Darby if the digital recording of today's hearing could be posted online. Mr. Darby said that he was certain and that he would need to consult with SFGTV. Member Craven asked Mr. Darby to research the matter with SFGTV regarding their procedures and protocol and report back to the Task Force.

Member Pilpel asked that DTIS and Media Service provide a written status report and asked that the item be continued.

Speakers: Kimo Crossman said that he is distressed that there is a delay in posting the digital audio; that the digital audio has to be posted regardless of the funding. He said that he will file a complaint if it's not done, and that the Task Force should make the Administrator follow its rules. Patrick Monette-Shaw said that the City can't rapidly provide \$72K for implementation and urged the Task Force to attend the Board meetings to push for funding.

Member Craven asked that Media Services/SFGTV 1) provide a written plan for implementation and attend the next meeting, and 2) that the Administrator explore current posting.

7. Report from the Complaint Committee meeting of May 13, 2008.

Member Cauthen made the report.

Speakers: None

a. Proposed Amendments: Mission and Work Plan.

Motion to accept amended Mission and Work Plan (Cauthen / Goldman).  
Without objection.

8. 07092 Hearing to consider the appeal filed by Patrick Monette-Shaw of the February 26, 2008, Order of Determination (OD) issued by the Task Force against the Board of Supervisors and Human Resources Department.

Speakers: Patrick Monette-Shaw said that the OD does not cite the correct violation, which should be §67.8 (a)(5). He also said that the use of the word "technical" to describe the violation is not appropriate, and asked that it be removed from the working. Mr. Monette-Shaw also read from his March 23, 2008 letter to the Task Force.

Member Craven said that §67.10 (e)(1) of the ordinance was cited but it should have been §67.8 (a)(5) for violation of the notice requirement. She said that she still believes that the term "technical" is appropriate and suggested that the OD be amended to cite the correct Ordinance section.

Member Pilpel said that he doesn't believe that there is an error in the original OD, and said that there is no need to reconsider the matter.

Chair Chu said that she does not agree with changing the OD without reconsidering the matter, however, there isn't enough evidence presented to warrant reconsideration.

Motion to reconsider (Knee / Craven)

Mr. Monette-Shaw said that he does not want the matter reconsidered or a new hearing, but he only wants to cite the correct violation and to omit the term "technical."

Public Comment: Kimo Crossman said that the matter should be reheard and that there is not legal justification for describing the violation as "technical."

Member Sheppard said that the term "technical violation" means a violation that has no substantial injustice or harm. He said that it is an appropriate term.

Acting Chair Comstock asked Mr. Monette-Shaw who the victim is. Mr. Monette-Shaw said that the public is the victim.

Motion to reconsider (Knee / Craven)

Ayes: Craven, Knee, Gokhale, Washburn, Williams

Noes: Cauthen, Comstock, Pilpel, Chu, Chan, Goldman

The motion failed for lack of member majority (6) vote.

Acting Chair Comstock said that he cited the wrong Ordinance section when he made the original motion and instructed the Administrator to reissue a new OD and cite §67.8 (a)(5) and to leave in the word "technical."

9. 08020 Determination of jurisdiction of complaint filed by Peter Witt against the Taxi Commission for alleged interrupting of public speaker, depriving public speaker equal speaking time, removal of public speaker from the meeting, deleting public testimony from the minutes, failure to allow time to set up, and discussing an non agendized matter.

Member Pilpel disclosed that he has prior involvement with the Taxi Commission but can be fair and impartial.

Speakers: None

Motion accepting jurisdiction. (Goldman/ Cauthen). Without objection.

- a. Public Hearing, complaint filed by Peter Witt against the Taxi Commission (TC) for alleged interrupting of public speaker, depriving public speaker equal speaking time, removal of public speaker from the meeting, deleting public testimony from the minutes, failure to allow time to set up, and discussing an

non agendized matter.

Speakers: Peter Witt, Complainant, said that he was prevented from providing public comment on outreach on an agendized item, that he was not allowed set up time and was cut off during public comment. He also said that written remarks submitted were not added to the minutes. He showed several video clips as proof of his complaint. Jordanna Thigpen, for Respondent, said that she transcribed the meetings referred by Mr. Witt in an attempt to resolve the matter. She said that the commissioner Paul Gillespie was declined to attend the meeting, because there is no violation of the Brown Act. She said that she has made an effort to provide full disclosure

Mr. Witt, in response to Member Pilpel, said that he was denied full speaking time.

Ms. Thigpen, said that what was shown on the video was probably a violation; that she believes that Mr. Witt was attempting to talk about outreach and not his survey.

Member Pilpel said that he believe that the events that took place at the October 24, 2006, meeting was a violation.

Member Cauthen said that TC meetings are a challenge, and believes that there was a violation of Mr. Witt's speaking time.

Mr. Witt, in rebuttal, said that his 150 word remarks should be added to the minutes, and that at their August 12, 2003, meeting he was not allowed to use the projection and his time was cut.

Member Washburn asked Mr. Witt if he had given the survey to the commissioners. Mr. Witt said yes.

Ms. Thigpen, in rebuttal, said that she is looking for clarification of the Task Force regarding how much time to allow for set up, and how to help the public stay on topic on an agenda item.

Motion finding a violation of §§67.15 and 67.16 of the Sunshine Ordinance for interrupting public speaker, depriving public speaker of equal speaking time, and failure to include a brief summary of testimony in the minutes. The Task Force would like the see the Taxi Commission allow the public the opportunity to give their public comment on an agendized item without interruption; so long as/until the point which it becomes clear that the public comment has no relation to the agenda item under discussion. The Task Force further encourage the chair to use his/her broad discretion to allow public comment to continue and to error on the side of allowing public comment to proceed to the full lot of time. (Craven / Knee)

Member Cauthen offered a friendly amendment regarding setup time to include a statement that the Chair is to arrange with media services for a prior setup if they become aware of the request prior to the meeting.



Member Craven proposed the following amendment in lieu of Member Cauthen's suggestion: Recommend that the Taxi Commission adopt proceedings whereby they publicize that if public speakers would like to make audio-video presentations that they contact the commission secretary in advance to discuss their needs and that the staff member assist the public speaker with providing audio-video testimony where feasible.

Acting Chair Comstock said that it is impossible for the chair to know what the need is and should not be his/her responsibility.

Member Pilpel said that members of the public should be allowed to speak without interruption, and on topic. He said that providing an audio-video presentation should require a little more reasonable burden on the public to accomplish.

Public Speakers: Kimo Crossman suggested that §67.21 (e) be added to the violation and said that 1 minute is not enough time for public comment. Allen Grossman said that the public should be allowed greater latitude with providing public comment.

On the motion. (Craven / Knee).

Ayes: Craven, Knee, Cauthen, Gokhale, Washburn, Comstock, Pilpel, Chu, Chan, Goldman, Williams

10. 08021 Determination of jurisdiction of complaint filed by Kimo Crossman against the City Attorney's Office for alleged failure to provide oral information in response to a request and inappropriate referral.

Speakers: None

Motion accepting jurisdiction. (Goldman / Cauthen). Without objection.

- a. Public Hearing, complaint filed by Kimo Crossman against the City Attorney's Office for alleged failure to provide oral information in response to a request and inappropriate referral.

Speakers: Kimo Crossman, Complainant, said that he did not get a follow up call or assistance requested from the CAO. He said the fact that the CAO did not send a representative to the hearing is an indication of guilt. He urged the Task Force to find a violation of §67.22 (c) and for failure to appear.

Member Cauthen said that this matter was heard before and recall not finding a violation.

Member Craven said that Mr. Crossman does not have a right to speak with a specific person; that she does not feel that there is a violation.

Member Pilpel said the 15 minutes in the Ordinance is for research and not to respond to questions; that he does not find a violation.

Public Speakers: Allen Grossman said under 67.2 (b) (iii) that CAO advice is public information and should be disclosed; that it's a violation to not disclose oral advice.

Bruce Wolfe: Asked that the Chair be called last on the vote in the event there is a tie.

Motion finding no violation (Pilpel / Cauthen).

Ayes: Craven, Cauthen, Gokhale, Washburn, Comstock, Pilpel, Chu, Chan, Goldman

Noes: Knee, Williams

11. 08022 Determination of jurisdiction of complaint filed by Kimo Crossman against the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors for alleged improper redaction of home address, home telephone number and e-mail address from an original Sunshine application.

Speakers: None

Motion accepting jurisdiction. (Goldman / Cauthen) Without objection.

- a. Public Hearing, complaint filed by Kimo Crossman against the Kimo Crossman against the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors (COB) for alleged improper redaction of home address, home telephone number and e-mail address from an original Sunshine application.

Member Washburn recused herself. Without objection.

Speakers: Kimo Crossman, Complainant, said that the Task Force has made prior rulings that there is no expectation of privacy for e-mails. He also said that information that he obtained on Member Washburn came from Whitepages.com. He said that COB is performing invalid redactions and urged a finding of a violation. Frank Darby, for Respondent, said that personal information was properly redacted from the applications, however no content was redacted. He said that every individual including Task Force members retains their right to privacy when they contact government. He read from the COB's recently approved Redaction Policy.

Member Pilpel asked if the policy also involves not posting on the internet and non-disclosure to members of the Task Force, and whether the redactions include "C" pages. Mr. Darby answered, yes.

Member Pilpel, asked Mr. Crossman if he was aware of Gov. code §6254.21 which requires obtaining written permission to disclose the personal information of elected and/or appointed positions. Mr. Crossman said that he was not aware of that provision.

Member Craven said that this matter is very significant and requires legal analysis. She said that 6254.21 does not deal with redactions but rather posting on the internet. She asked DCA Sanchez to provide a legal analysis to help the Task Force in making a decision.

Member Cauthen asked that the matter be continued.

Member Sheppard said that he has great sympathy for the policy.

Member Craven said that she is not aware of any report of an invasion of privacy. She asked Mr. Darby for a written plan explaining how they intend to implement the policy.

Member Pilpel asked for written procedures as to how the department will redact legislative files of the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Crossman, in rebuttal, said that every address in the Assessors Office would need to be redacted. He said that the CAO has never reported a complaint about invasion of privacy.

Public Speakers: Allen Grossman said that there is no balancing of interest of public right to privacy as per §67.24 (i). He said that in his meeting with the Clerk of the Board that she was concerned about liability.

Bruce Wolfe said that the policy should be submitted by the policy maker and that the question is whether the policy violates the law. He said that according to the policy a member of the Task Force can not obtain the contact information of another Task Force member.

Motion to continue (Craven / Pilpal ).

Ayes: Craven, Knee, Cauthen, Gokhale, Comstock, Pilpel, Chu, Goldman, Williams

Recused: Washburn

Absent: Chan

12. Report: Compliance and Amendments Committee: meeting of May 14, 2008.

Member Knee made the report. He said that a special meeting is scheduled for June 4, 2008, to discuss revisions to the Ordinance.

13. 08013 The Compliance and Amendments Committee has referred to the Task Force, for further consideration, their recommendation that the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force Administrator be found in willful failure to comply with the Sunshine Ordinance, and failure to keep withholding to a minimum and to provide the requested unredacted personal e-mail addresses in compliance with the Order of Determination (OD) issued by the full Task Force on March 25, 2008; that referral, based on that finding, to the Board of Supervisors for enforcement be considered.

Member Craven indicated that this matter was continued pending the redaction policy from the Clerk's Office (COB).

Speakers: Kimo Crossman, Complainant, urged the Task Force to refer the matter to the Board of Supervisors and the Ethics Commission. Allen Grossman, in support of the complainant said that in his meeting with the COB

she was concerned with liability, but that he was not aware of a lawsuit for disclosing an e-mail address. Frank Darby, Respondent, said that the Department will not provide the personal e-mail addresses to third parties as per its redaction policy.

Member Pilpel asked Mr. Darby if the redaction policy was based on advice of the City Attorney's Office. Mr. Darby said yes.

Member Craven said that the new policy reverses decades of practices by the COB with regards to the correspondence file and has implications for the public and reporters and watchdogs of city government. She suggest that the matter be referred to the BOS for enforcement because it's more of a political issue and is not clearly spelled out under the Ordinance. However, she believes that the Task Forces interpretation of the Ordinance is correct.

Kimo Crossman, in rebuttal, asked that the COB Angela Calvillo's name be added to the referral. He said that it's said that the Task Force's own administrator won't follow the Task Force's policies and direction. He asked that the matter also be referred to the Ethics Commission.

Motion to refer to the Board of Supervisors with a finding of willful violation.  
(Comstock / Knee)

Acting-Chair Comstock said that he got involved with Sunshine when he received redacted letters, from the Department of Elections, of individuals who complained about not being able to vote because the polls were not open on time.

Member Cauthen said that she agrees with Member Comstock and said that reasonable expectation of privacy does not apply.

Member Pilpel said that he does not agree with the motion. He said he does not believe that it is a willful violation; that the department received advice of counsel which is not necessary wrong but different from the Task Force.

Public Comment: Bruce Wolfe said that even if the CAO is providing advise the department is still making the decision and the action is still willful.

Ayes: Craven, Knee, Cauthen, Gokhale, Washburn, Chu, Goldman, Williams, Comstock

Noes: Pilpel

Excused: Chan

14. Discussion re: Amendments to SOTF Bylaws (discussion and possible action)

Member Pilpel asked if Mr. Darby gave 10 day notice pursuant to Article VIII of the By Laws. Mr. Darby said that a separate special notice was not given other than the notice in the last two Task Force meetings. Member Pilpel said that he doesn't feel that proper notice was given and suggested that the matter be continued.

DCA Rosa Sanchez said that she agrees with member Pilpel, that the matter be rescheduled for the next meeting after proper notice has been given.

Public Comment: Bruce Wolfe said that the matter was previously voted on and approved, and is being followed in today's meeting. He said that it's not necessary to notice the matter again.

Kimo Crossman said that there is no harm to the public to move forward, or dispute on the matter.

Motion to continue. (Pilpel / Cauthen). Without objection.

15. Discussion re: Letter to the Ethics Commission (EC) regarding Task Force referrals.

Public Comment: Allen Grossman read a written response. He said that 1) referral letters should be sent to the EC and not Mr. St. Croix, 2) the Task Force has the same status as the Ethics Commission, 3) the EC be required to create separate rules for referral and show legal requirements, and 4) there should be no secrecy or confidentiality of referrals.

Kimo Crossman said that the Task Force should stop sending letters and start having joint meetings with the Ethics Commission, and urged send Mr. Grossman's letter rather than the current letter.

Member Pilpel said that the Task Force can request a meeting or send a letter to/with the EC, but that they are under no obligation to meet with or respond to them. He said that there is no harm sending the letter, and that it is worth sending as proposed.

Member Williams said that its time to mover forward and to get action from the EC. She said that the Task Force is loosing good members who don't feel that the Task Force is accomplishing enough.

Member Craven suggested that the Chair review the letter written by Mr. Grossman and add any necessary suggestion, then send the letter to the Ethics Commission.

~~Acting-Chair Comstock said that he will prepare the letter for Chair Chu.~~

16. Possible amendments to Sections 67.13 to 67.18 of the Sunshine Ordinance and subsequent sections as time permits. (discussion and possible action item) (attachment)

- (a.)Sec 67.13 Barriers to Attendance Prohibited.
- (b.)Sec 67.14 Tape Recording, Filming and Still Photography.
- (c.)Sec 67.15 Public Testimony.
- (d.)Sec 67.16 Minutes
- (e.)Sec 67.17 Public Comment by Members of Policy Bodies.
- (f.) Sec 67.18 Supervisor of Public Forums

Public Comment (PC) on 67.13: Kimo Crossman suggested adding sub-section "f" that would require video recording of meetings.

Bruce Wolfe, defined the difference between streaming and downloading a file. He said that streaming is continuous playing, while downloading is start and stop playing. He urged using the word streaming.

PC on 67.14: Kimo Crossman suggested changing the word indefinite on page 36, line 20 to permanent, and the year 2013 on page 37, line 17 to 2010.

PC on 67.15: Kimo Crossman said that he likes the changes but is concerned that they have never been tried in "real life." He suggested trying the changes to see if they work.

PC on 67.16: Kimo Crossman said that Supervisor Mirkarimi's provisions require recording of departmental meetings and not just policy bodies. The said the section should have a requirement for detail minutes.

Section 67.13, 67.14, and 67.15 were discussed and the Administrator recorded recommended amendments, which were made without objection. The Task Force will continue discussions on §67.16 at their next meeting.

17. Administrator's Report.

The Administrator made the report.

Mr. Darby, also informed members he did not receive a response from the Ethics Commission regarding the status of referrals.

Public Comment: Kimo Crossman said that the Task Force should not use an administrator who does not follow their rules. He urged the Task Force to ask the Clerk of the Board for a new Administrator who will follow their rules.

Member Pilpel and Craven thanked the administrator for providing a status report on referrals to the Ethics Commission.

18. Public comment for items not listed on the agenda. Public comment shall be held at 5:00 p.m., or as soon thereafter as possible.

Public Comment: Kimo Crossman urged the Task Force to have today's digitally recorded meeting posted on the internet within 72 hours. He said that he will file a complaint if it's not posted. He informed the new members that Member Sheppard is not a voting member.

Allen Grossman congratulated Member Chu on her election to Chair. He said that the term complainant should be replaced with petitioner. He read a letter containing a statement that he alleged Member Pilpel made during the Board of Supervisors Rules Committee meeting, which he said is not favorable to the Task Force.

19. Announcements, questions, and future agenda items from the Task Force.

Public Comment: None

**Adjournment**

**The meeting was adjourned at 10:08 p.m.**

This meeting has been audio recorded and is on file in the Office of the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force.

