


Ethics in the City:

Promise, Practice or Pretense

June 2014



City and County of San Francisco
Civil Grand Jury 2013-2014

City Hall, Room 488
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl, San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone 415-554-6630

MEMBERS OF THE 2013-2014
CIVIL GRAND JURY
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Elena Schmid, Foreperson
Robert van Ravenswaay, Foreperson Pro Tem
Thomas Duda, Recording Secretary
Maryta Piazza, Corresponding Secretary

Larry Bush
Hans Carter
Daniel Chesir
Barbara Cahrssen
Mike Ege
John Finnick
Kai Forsley
Charles Head
David Hoiem
Joseph Kelly
Mazel Looney
Claudia O'Callaghan
Ernestine Patterson
Michael Skahill

THE CIVIL GRAND JURY

The Civil Grand Jury is a government oversight panel of volunteers who serve for one year. It makes findings and recommendations resulting from its investigations.

Reports of the Civil Grand Jury do not identify individuals by name. Disclosure of information about individuals interviewed by the jury is prohibited.
California Penal Code, Section 929

STATE LAW REQUIREMENT California Penal Code, section 933.05

Each published report includes a list of those public entities that are required to respond to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court within 60 to 90 days, as specified.

A copy must be sent to the Board of Supervisors. All responses are made available to the public.

For each finding the response must:

- 1) agree with the finding, or
- 2) disagree with it, wholly or partially, and explain why.

As to each recommendation the responding party must report that:

- 1) the recommendation has been implemented, with a summary explanation; or
- 2) the recommendation has not been implemented but will be within a set timeframe as provided; or
- 3) the recommendation requires further analysis. The officer or agency head must define what additional study is needed. The Grand Jury expects a progress report within six months; or
- 4) the recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable, with an explanation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ISSUE..... 1

SUMMARY 1

Overview1

Changed Landscape.....1

Diffused Responsibility.....2

BACKGROUND 3

The Institutional Framework3

The Ethics Commission.....3

Sunshine Ordinance Task Force4

DISCUSSION 4

Transparency—In General.....4

 Campaign Related Disclosures 5

 Public Entity Disclosures..... 5

 Public Official Disclosures..... 5

Campaign Reporting.....6

 Campaign-related Committees 6

 Campaign Consultants..... 6

 Voter Handbook Disclosures 6

 Lobbyists..... 7

 Disclosure of Signed Contracts..... 7

Public Entity Disclosures.....7

 Public Meetings..... 7

 Public Records 7

 Sources of Outside Funding (Sunshine Ordinance)..... 7

 Statements of Incompatible Activity..... 8

Public Officials' Disclosures8

 Form 700 – Statement of Economic Interests..... 8

 Gift Disclosure 8

 Gift of Travel Disclosures..... 8

 Public Calendars 9

 Behested Payments..... 9

 Lobbyists on Behalf of City 9

 Waivers Of Post-Public Employment Restrictions 9

 Certification Of Training 10

Enforcement10

 Enforcement for Most Cases Moved to The FPPC 11

 Administrative Penalties 12

 Forfeitures 12

 Citizen’s Right Of Action..... 13

 Whistleblower Program 13

Recommended Systemic and Structural Changes14

 Transparency..... 14

Campaign Related Disclosures15

 Lobbyist registrations and disclosures 16

Public Entity Disclosures.....17

Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense

Open public meetings	17
Release of public records	17
Sources of Outside Funding (Sunshine Ordinance).....	18
Statements of Incompatible Activities	18
Public Official Disclosures.....	19
Form 700 - Statements of Economic Interests.....	19
Gift of Travel disclosures	20
Public calendars of public officials (Sunshine Ordinance).....	20
Waivers of post-public employment restrictions by the Ethics Commission	21
Sunshine Ordinance Task Force and the Ethics Commission	21
Ethics Commission Structure and Relation to Staff	22
Commission Performance And Staffing	24
A New Focus For Commission Activities	24
Coda: Proposition J Case Study	27
RESPONSE MATRIX.....	31
METHODOLOGY	42
BIBLIOGRAPHY (SELECTED)	42
GLOSSARY	43
APPENDIX ONE	44
The Legal Framework	44
Transparency For Government	44
Transparency In Campaigns	45
Ethics Laws	46
Anti-Corruption Laws	47
Process To Amend The Laws	47
Finding The Laws	48
APPENDIX TWO	50
Behested Payments - Example.....	50
APPENDIX THREE.....	55
Gifts of Travel Example	55
APPENDIX FOUR.....	72
Proposition J Voters Guide Materials	72

ISSUE

The Jury members were concerned about reports of apparent improper actions by City officials and departments with little or no evident enforcement responses.

The Jury looked at the institutions involved with preventing and punishing improper actions and at the laws they administer. Ethics Commission operations provided a starting point, as a 2010-2011 Civil Grand Jury report recommended a more detailed investigation. We rapidly learned that "transparency" is a key component of ensuring governmental integrity, so we broadened our focus to consider how to protect and enhance government transparency.

During our eight-month investigation, a wide spectrum of local, state, campaign, political and public sources told us the Ethics Commission is not an effective enforcement agency, while generally endorsing its efforts to promote transparency.

SUMMARY

The Jury finds that San Francisco officials at all levels have impeded actions intended to establish a culture of ethical behavior, and that the focus needed to ensure accountability and anti-corruption standards needs greater leadership from the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, the City Attorney, the District Attorney, and City department heads and commissions.

Overview

- The Jury recommends transferring all major enforcement cases to the California Fair Political Practices Commission on a two-year pilot contract to ensure stronger and fairer enforcement action. The state agency would be able to act in cases alleging violations of unique San Francisco ethics laws as well as state laws similar to the role it has accepted with several other jurisdictions.
- The Jury recommends the Ethics Commission emphasize increased transparency by significantly upgrading its systems for disclosing the full range of money spent, given, or benefitting City officials and their projects. It has successfully developed improvements to its disclosure reports making them more user-friendly but currently fails to provide easy access to reports on millions more spent on behalf of or at the request of City officials, including spending to influence administrative and legislative decisions.
- The Jury recommends changes in the operation of the Ethics Commission to make the five-member commission a stronger force in developing policy and ensuring effective implementation. The Jury recommends the Ethics Commissions activate its committee structure. Additionally, we recommend splitting the duties of the Executive Director from the duties of Commission Secretary.

Changed Landscape

In the two decades since voters created the San Francisco Ethics Commission, the political landscape has changed substantially. The Commission itself has been tasked with new responsibilities ranging from partial public financing of campaigns to registering and disclosing

Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense

the activities of campaign consultants. At the same time, federal court decisions have affected the ability of local governments to regulate the reporting and influence of money in political activities. The California State Legislature has enacted new standards that also affect local campaign finance laws.

Currently, elections are more significantly affected than before by the creation of independent expenditure committees, the lifting of contribution limits, and the ability to hide the source of funds paying for campaign messages. New approaches to campaigning have come into play that do not correspond with existing law directly, and often have exploited exceptions in the laws in ways that create major blind spots in transparency.

Today elected officials can create their own political committees to spend on other candidates and on measures they favor while accepting unlimited contributions from those seeking benefits such as entitlements from these same officials.

These new changes are a challenge to ethical standards long accepted in San Francisco and which, more troubling, fall outside of any regulation, oversight or user-friendly disclosures. In the last 35 years, San Francisco citizens had at least 16 local ballot measures dealing with campaign finance, ethics, conflict of interest and transparency, demonstrating a long interest in trying to control corruption.

Diffused Responsibility

The Jury found that although the Ethics Commission appears to be the primary enforcement authority, it has substantially less power than other City and state officials to actually punish wrongdoers. Its investigative powers, by requiring confidentiality of its investigations, muzzle it from publicly criticizing questionable activities.

BACKGROUND

The Institutional Framework

The Ethics Commission and San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance Task Force are the front lines in overseeing and implementing City laws on transparency, ethics and violations.¹

A web of City and state laws establish rules on campaign finance and lobbying, and require that public officials and employees act in accordance with the public trust. The Ethics Commission generally administers these laws locally, while enforcement responsibilities are spread out.

Other state and City laws require open government through open meetings and public records. Both the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance Task Force and the Ethics Commission enforce these laws locally.

The Ethics Commission

The voters created the San Francisco Ethics Commission in 1993 as a five-member commission, approving a proposal placed on the ballot by the Board of Supervisors. The Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, the Assessor, the City Attorney and the District Attorney each make a single appointment to the Commission. The City Attorney's appointee must have background in governmental ethics law. The Mayor's appointee must have background in public information and public meetings. The Assessor's appointee must have background in campaign finance. The appointees of the Board of Supervisors and the District Attorney must be broadly representative of the general public.

The Commissioners each serve a single six-year term without pay for their service but do receive access to the City health coverage. The Commission meets monthly at City Hall, with occasional special meetings.

Ethics Commission duties include general policy-making responsibilities for the Commission itself, along with significant administrative responsibilities for its staff, including acting as the filing agent for campaign filings for candidates, ballot measures and committees, lobbyists, campaign consultants and Disclosure of Economic Statements (Form 700), as well as administering the public funding of candidates for Mayor and supervisor, educating City officials about conflict of interest and campaign treasurers about filing requirements, conducting audits, and investigating and resolving violations (some of which are eventually decided by the Commission).

The legal framework has changed significantly since the Ethics Commission was created. For the Commission, the term of office and the appointing authorities have changed. Administering publicly funded candidates and regulating campaign consultants are added responsibilities. The laws they administer have in large part been taken from the Charter and various locations in the San Francisco code and consolidated into the Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code; key state laws have also undergone significant changes.

The Ethics Commission has a staff of nineteen to handle the administrative responsibilities of the Commission. The operating budget for the Commission has grown from \$157,000 in 1994 to

¹ The legal framework is discussed in Appendix One.

over \$2,000,000 in 2013.

The San Francisco Ethics Commission earns high marks among California jurisdictions for its electronic filing and self-reported disclosures by campaigns, candidates, lobbyists and consultants in each category. In addition to disclosures required under state law, San Francisco has enacted additional disclosure requirements intended to provide greater transparency.

The Ethics Commission can also propose changes in the laws it administers and can place measures on the ballot.

Sunshine Ordinance Task Force

The Sunshine Ordinance Task Force reports to and advises the Board of Supervisors, and provides information to other City departments, on appropriate ways to implement the Sunshine Ordinance and to implement its goals. It also proposes amendments, receives the annual report of Supervisor of Public Records, and refers matters to enforcement.²

The Sunshine Ordinance Task Force consists of eleven voting members appointed by the Board of Supervisors, with qualifications stated in the ordinance.³ The Mayor and the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, or their designees, serve as non-voting members of the task force. The Clerk of the Board of Supervisors provides modest administrative support, as does the City Attorney.

The Board of Supervisors is responsible for appointments but has, at times, failed to make timely appointments to the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, stopping its work due to quorum problems.

The Sunshine Ordinance has only had one significant change since initial enactment, which converted the ordinance passed by the Board of Supervisors into an ordinance passed by the voters. General language on open meetings and public records was added to the Charter in 1996.⁴

Because there is no full-time staff, all powers are vested in the Task Force, specifically including policy-making powers.

DISCUSSION

Transparency—In General

Transparency in government includes open meetings and public records. These matters generally come under state laws and the Sunshine Ordinance.

Transparency also includes public information about the decision-makers: their backgrounds, their commitments, and their supporters. In the case of elected officials, detailed campaign finance information is filed. Additionally, many policy decisions in San Francisco are made through ballot measures. Committees advocating for or against individual ballot measures file

² The Sunshine Ordinance is Chapter 67 of the Administrative Code; § 67.30(c) of the Administrative Code outlines responsibilities of the Task Force.

³ See § 67.30(a) of the Administrative Code.

⁴ See Charter § 16.112

finance information on their campaigns. In San Francisco, these filings are made with the Ethics Commission.

A third area of transparency is open data sets from government. This area is just starting to emerge, and San Francisco has a Chief Data Officer and Department Data Coordinators to implement its Open Data policies.⁵ Data sets are currently posted at DataSF.⁶ The Ethics Commission has embraced this effort, and has posted many data sets with DataSF, which are broadly used.

As data sets become more widely available, and the software tools to analyze them continue to simplify, independent review of government actions and of information filed with government will lead to new thinking about the meaning of this information. The Jury notes this development and encourages its growth.⁷

Currently, required public disclosures include the following:

Campaign Related Disclosures

- Candidate campaign committees (state and local law)
- Reporting of spending by other types of campaign-related committees, including independent committees supporting candidates, ballot proposition committees, and general purpose committees (state and local law)
- Campaign consultant registrations and disclosures (local law)
- Voter Handbook Disclosures (state and local law)
- Lobbyist registrations and disclosures (local law similar to state law)
- Disclosure of contracts approved and signed (local law)

Public Entity Disclosures

- Open public meetings that follow a stipulated format (Sunshine Ordinance and state law)
- Release of public records upon request (Sunshine Ordinance and state law)
- Sources of Outside Funding (Sunshine Ordinance)
- Statements of Incompatible Activities (local law) prepared by departments and commissions.

Public Official Disclosures

- Statements of Economic Interests (Form 700)— required by state and local law —
- Gift disclosures by public officials and designated employees (state and local law)
- Gift of Travel disclosures by public officials and designated employees (state and local law)
- Public calendars of public officials (Sunshine Ordinance) (except members of the Board of Supervisors)
- Reporting of behested payments (state and local law)

⁵ In 2009, Mayor Gavin Newsom issued an Executive Directive promoting Open Data. In 2010, the Board of Supervisors expanded on the Directive with the passage of the City's Open Data Policy (Ordinance 293-10), codified in San Francisco's Administrative Code § 22D.

⁶ <https://data.sfgov.org/>

⁷ Groups such as Code For America might help to generate open source applications to analyze these data sets.

Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense

- Lobbyist On Behalf Of City disclosures (Sunshine Ordinance)
- Waivers of post-public employment restrictions by the Ethics Commission
- Annual certification of training in ethics and public disclosure (state and local law)

Campaign Reporting

The political campaign cycle barely pauses between elections. As term limits have taken effect, elected officials often aim for other offices but are not yet declared candidates subject to filing requirements. Groups interested in affecting City government action work continuously, adjusting their approach to the political season—sometimes campaign contributions, sometimes gifts and event tickets and travel, sometimes behested payments, and so on. The lines between campaigns, public relations, lobbying, and potential conflicts of interest have become blurred.

San Francisco's laws mirror state laws in most significant respects. The City law expresses concerns about "the appearance that elected officials may be unduly influenced by contributors who support their campaigns or oppose their opponents' campaigns."⁸ Other stated purposes of the campaign finance law include assisting voters to make informed decisions and helping to restore public trust through mandated disclosures.

Campaign-related Committees

Elected officials, and those who want to be elected officials, operate their campaigns through candidate campaign committees. Candidate committees must disclose campaign contributions, campaign mailers and advertisements, expenditures and other campaign activities, as well as limitations and bans on certain contributions — no contributions over \$500 (local law); no contributions from City contractors (local law).

Other types of committees are regulated differently by state and local laws, and file their information locally with the Ethics Commission. These include independent committees supporting candidates; ballot proposition committees; and general-purpose committees. Some of these committees can promote a candidate's activities when playing different roles, such as advocating a ballot proposition.

Campaign Consultants

Campaign consultant registration is required by Proposition G, an ordinance passed by the voters in 1997. It requires campaign consultants to register with the Ethics Commission, to provide information on each client, on political contributions made by or delivered by the campaign consultant or where the consultant acted as the intermediary, and on any gifts given or promised by the consultant to a local office holder.

Voter Handbook Disclosures

The Voter Handbook notes the source of funds for each paid argument. The official wording and explanations undergo a public comment process.

⁸ See Purpose and Intent of the Campaign Finance law - § 1.100 of the Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code.

Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense

Lobbyists

Lobbyists are required to register and to report their contacts, their clients and their payments both promised and made. This registration and disclosure requirement is intended "to reveal information about lobbyists' efforts to influence decision-making".⁹

Disclosure of Signed Contracts

Each city elective officer who approves a contract that has a value of \$50,000 or more in a fiscal year files a disclosure form with the Ethics Commission within five business days of approval.¹⁰ This requirement applies if the contract is approved by the City elective officer, any board on which the City elective officer serves, or the board of any state agency on which an appointee of the City elective officer serves. The section that requires the filing of this information also bars City elective officers from taking contributions from a contractor beginning from the time negotiations commence until six months after the contract is signed.

Completed contract approval forms are posted on the Ethics Commission web site.¹¹

Public Entity Disclosures

Public Meetings

San Francisco mandates that City government operate openly and with transparency in decision making. This includes open meetings noticed in advance, open access to documents to be presented at meetings, and public comment before action by City decision-makers.

Public Records

To the extent that reports are filed and become publicly available, the public benefits from the transparency provided. The public benefit can be increased dramatically by increasing accessibility to reports. If reports are audited for accuracy and completeness, the public can have greater confidence in the information provided.

Many of the reports have filing schedules. It is a fairly simple matter to determine whether someone has filed a report on time. The difficulty comes in determining whether the content of the report is accurate and complete and in determining whether everybody who should file a report has done so.

In all cases, there are deadlines for making information publicly available and, in the case of government documents, the deadline is a standard of 24-hour release of documents unless an exception is cited.

Sources of Outside Funding (Sunshine Ordinance)

There are many "Friends Of" groups associated with departments. Departments are required to post on their websites the names of anyone who donates \$100 or more to assist their operations,

⁹ See Findings on Lobby Law - § 2.100 of the Campaign and Governmental Conduct (Derivation: Former Administrative Code § 16.520; added by Ord. 19-99, App. 2/19/99)

¹⁰ Required by C&GCC § 1.126; the form is SFEC-126

¹¹ <http://www.sfethics.org/ethics/2009/05/contracts.html>

Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense

along with a statement of any financial interest involving the City the donor might have. If the donation comes from an organization, their members must be disclosed.¹²

Statements of Incompatible Activity

C&GCC (Campaign & Governmental Conduct Code)§ 3.216 prohibits officers or employees from engaging in activities incompatible with their position, such as being an officer of a group being funded by the Department. Each department develops its own Statement of Incompatible Activities filed with, and approved by, the Ethics Commission. No Statement of Incompatible Activities becomes operative until the meet and confer requirements of State law and the collective bargaining agreements are satisfied.

Each Department provides its Statement of Incompatible Activities to its officers and employees each year.

Approved departmental Statements of Incompatible Activities are posted online on the Ethics Commission web site.¹³

Public Officials' Disclosures

Form 700 – Statement of Economic Interests

State law requires San Francisco office holders and key employees to disclose their financial interests annually. This year marks the first year of electronic filing. Filings also are required after entering office, either appointed or elected, and after leaving office.

Only elected officials and key officeholders file these reports at the Ethics Commission, who places them on their web site. Other officials who are required to file disclosures because of their role in awarding contracts, permits and other actions that provide financial benefits file their reports with an official at the Department level.

Gift Disclosure

The current overall gift limit in state law is currently \$440/year from a source reportable on Form 700, and will soon be reduced to \$200 per year.¹⁴ Gifts, other than gifts of travel, are reported on Form 700.¹⁵

Gift of Travel Disclosures

San Francisco keeps to the state standard for gifts of travel, although it could enact greater disclosure. Currently, only persons or entities that contributed \$500 or more are disclosed. The amount over \$500 is not specified. It also includes only those contributions for travel outside of California.

City contractors and developers seeking City Hall approvals may make a gift to pay for the travel

¹² See § 67.29-6 of the Sunshine Ordinance

¹³ <http://www.sfethics.org/ethics/2009/05/statements-of-incompatible-activities.html>

¹⁴ See § 3.214 of the Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code

¹⁵ see <http://www.sfethics.org/ethics/2013/01/summary-of-gift-rules-march-2013.html>

of City officials without disclosing how much they have given.

Appendix 3 has examples of actual filings with both the pre-trip and post-trip filing.

Public Calendars

When the voters amended the Sunshine Ordinance, they required City officials to maintain a daily calendar that lists meetings, both in the office and outside City Hall when conducting City business. The calendar requirement includes the names of those who attended, and the date of the meeting. If the meeting is not publicly recorded, the calendar entry shall include a general statement of issues discussed.¹⁶

Behested Payments

California law allows elected officials to request contributions for nonprofit agencies or governmental purposes with no restrictions on the amount or source of the contribution. The officeholder is responsible for filing a disclosure of the “behest payment” with the FPCC or its designee, in this case the Ethics Commission.

Reports are posted on the Ethics Commission website.¹⁷

Lobbyists on Behalf of City

Lobbyists on Behalf of the City are a different category of lobbyists. They are retained by the City or its agencies to lobby other units of government, such as the state or federal government. The Sunshine Ordinance, not the Lobbyist Ordinance, requires their reports. The reports are posted on the Ethics Commission website.¹⁸

Waivers Of Post-Public Employment Restrictions

Prior to 2003, there was a two-year ban on representing a private interest before one's agency after public service, along with similar limitations on former Supervisors.

Now there is a one-year ban in most circumstances and a permanent ban on "switching sides". As part of 2003 Proposition E, this restriction moved from the Charter to ordinance and was modified, taking some variations from state law. City officers and employees are also barred from being employed by a contractor if that former employee was involved in the contract award. In a change, the Ethics Commission was empowered to grant waivers if they made certain findings—that the waiver would not "create the potential for undue influence or unfair advantage" or that "imposing the restriction would cause extreme hardship for the City officer or employee."¹⁹

A listing of post-employment waiver requests is posted on the Ethics Commission web site.²⁰

¹⁶ See full text of § 67.29.5 of the Administrative Code

¹⁷ <http://www.sfethics.org/ethics/2012/05/payments-made-at-the-behest-of-an-elected-officer.html>

¹⁸ <http://www.sfethics.org/ethics/Lobbyists-on-Behalf-of-the-City/>

¹⁹ See § 3.234 of the San Francisco Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code.

²⁰ <http://www.sfethics.org/ethics/2011/03/post-employment-restriction-waivers.html>

Certification Of Training

The Ethics Commission is responsible for annual training seminars for top-level officials including elected officers and commissioners. This training reinforces the importance of compliance and informs officials of any changes in the laws relating to conflicts of interest, lobbying, governmental ethics, open meetings, and public records.²¹

San Francisco City workers and appointees sign statements that they received training on sunshine and ethical requirements. Campaign treasurers and lobbyists sign that they received training on the requirements of the campaigning and lobbying ordinances. This mirrors training required at the state level.

Enforcement

The linchpins of San Francisco's ethics enforcement policies rests on public disclosure of the flow of money to City decision-makers (either through gifts, contributions, or holding investments) restricting some sources in an effort to curb pay-to-play politics where financial benefits to officials result in financial benefits to the donor or contributor, and enforcement when violations occur.

When it comes to official ethical misconduct (public corruption), federal, state, and local investigators and prosecutors can and do step in. Matters like bribery, self-dealing, misuse of public funds, and other conflicts of interest are typical subjects for prosecution.²²

Ethical areas on the edge of the criminal sphere - misdemeanor level - often do not have clean lines drawn between proper and improper conduct. Gray areas in laws make prosecutions difficult because the elements of a crime must be clear so the defendant "knew" he or she was violating the law. In recent years here in San Francisco, cases have been dismissed because the laws under which the defendant was charged were found to be vaguely written, failing to clearly define the prohibited conduct.

There are four potential levels of enforcement of the campaign finance, lobbying, ethics and conflict of interest laws in San Francisco:

- Criminal sanctions can only be enforced by the District Attorney. If a person “knowingly or willfully” violates any conflict of interest or governmental ethics laws, s/he is guilty of a misdemeanor and if convicted, is subject to a fine and/or imprisonment. False filings are deemed perjury, which is a felony. The District Attorney must bring any such action.
- The City Attorney can seek civil court sanctions. If a person “intentionally or negligently” violates any conflict of interest or governmental ethics laws, s/he is liable in a civil action and is subject to a fine. The City Attorney must bring any such action.

²¹ City Charter appendix C C3.699-11 Duties (14(b))

²² Voter fraud comes under the purview of the California Secretary of State and the Department of Elections in San Francisco.

Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense

- Administrative sanctions are brought by the Ethics Commission. If a person violates any conflict of interest or governmental ethics laws, s/he is liable in an administrative proceeding before the Ethics Commission. There may be fines and/or letters of warning.
- Discipline for public employees is through their departments, or removal of elected and other high-ranking officials by action of the Mayor, the Ethics Commission and the Board of Supervisors.

Of the key laws, San Francisco's Campaign & Governmental Conduct Code (C&GCC) has all types of possible enforcement action. In addition, the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force is authorized to make a finding that the ordinance was violated but the enforcement of their finding is referred to Ethics and the District Attorney.

The Ethics Commission also has responsibility for considering the removal of specified public officials from office if the Mayor suspends them.²³

Enforcement for Most Cases Moved to The FPPC

Many cases currently can be prosecuted both by the FPPC and by the Ethics Commission because City laws are based on state law.

With Form 700 filings, the Ethics Commission is the local filing agent but can only assess \$10 per day of late filing fees, so it has handed off those cases to the FPPC for enforcement. In 2013, nearly a dozen City officials stipulated that they violated this law in settlements with the FPPC.

Finding 1a: The Ethics Commission lacks resources to handle major enforcement cases. These include, for example, cases alleging misconduct, conflict of interest, violating campaign finance and lobbying laws, and violating post-employment restrictions.

Finding 1b: The Ethics Commission has only two investigators.

Finding 1c: The confidentiality required of Ethics Commission investigations runs counter to the Commission's other duties to make information more public and to increase the transparency of government.

Finding 1d: The District Attorney, City Attorney and the Fair Political Practices Commission have more substantial investigative staffs.

Finding 1e: The Fair Political Practices Commission has been very active in bringing enforcement actions, and handles enforcement for some local units of California government.

²³ Only the Mayor has the authority to act in cases of misconduct or violation of city laws by city commissioners appointed by the mayor and, at this point, the Mayor has stated that he does not have a policy on disciplining offenders but decides on a "...case by case basis." see testimony at: http://sanfrancisco.granicus.com/TranscriptViewer.php?view_id=142&clip_id=15510

Finding 1f: Enforcement is best handled outside of the environment of political partisanship and preferences.

Recommendation 1: The Jury recommends a contract with the Fair Political Practices Commission for at least a two-year pilot basis to enforce both state and related San Francisco law violations.

Administrative Penalties

The Commission staff is tasked with monitoring most of the election cycle filings disclosures and auditing individual candidates and committees. This area has grown in complexity since the inception of the Commission.

As outlined in the 2010-2011 Grand Jury Report on the Ethics Commission, the system for imposing fines and penalties upon individuals and Committees appeared arbitrary and deficient. There were enormous differences in fines assessed in similar cases and often huge differences between the fines initially proposed and those assessed at final settlement.

Arbitrary enforcement creates the impression that the penalty is tied to the status of the alleged violator rather than to the violation itself. In some cases, low-level penalties have been levied against high-ranking City appointees while citizen activists have faced enforcement penalties significantly higher for lesser offenses.

In July 2013, the Commission adopted policies to establish fixed penalties for certain campaign finance violations.²⁴

Forfeitures

Forfeitures are potential penalties for certain campaign finance violations - the wrongful money received is to be paid directly over to the City through the Ethics Commission unless reduced or waived by the Commission. Circumstances that would result in forfeitures include:

- §1.114(e)—Taking money into campaign account if contributor crosses \$100 threshold without disclosures.
- §1.114(f)—Exceeding campaign contribution limits
- §1.126(d)—receiving contributions from City contractors, their officers or board members (applies only to sitting officeholders receiving contributions).
- §1.126 (a) and (b)—Receiving funds that originate from an improper donor, such as a corporation or an individual "maxed out", but are "laundered" through others.

The Jury notes the new policies for fixed penalties call for forfeiture in the case of §1.114 violations.

Finding 2: In some instances, improper campaign contributions were returned to the contributor rather than forfeited to the City as required by City law. The Jury found no record of the Commission acting to waive or reduce the forfeiture.

²⁴ <http://www.sfethics.org/ethics/2013/07/ethics-commission-policies-re-fixed-penalties-for-violations-of-certain-cfro-sections.html>

Recommendation 2: The Board of Supervisors should request an independent audit by the City Attorney to determine whether prohibited contributions were forfeited to the City as required by law.

Citizen's Right Of Action

San Francisco law recognizes a Citizen's Right of Action to require that the law be enforced in over a dozen different circumstances, ranging from environmental protections to housing code violations. Proposition J in 2000 could be enforced by citizen suit but was repealed three years later as part of voter approved "ethics reform."²⁵

At the state level, the Political Reform Act provides a Private Right of Action both for injunctions and for civil penalties. Injunctions can be sought directly and actions for civil penalties can be brought after government lawyers have declined the case.²⁶ The Public Records Act allows any person to bring action for release of records.²⁷

The Sunshine Ordinance allows any person to bring a civil action to enforce it, especially for release of records.²⁸

Residents can bring a civil action on behalf of the people of San Francisco to enjoin violations of or compel compliance with a conflict of interest or governmental ethics law, provided the City Attorney has declined to bring an action.

Finding 3: A broader Citizen's Right of Action to enforce ethics laws will provide assurance to the public that the laws will be enforced.

Recommendation 3: The Jury recommends that the Ethics Commission and the Board of Supervisors act to enhance the Citizen's Right of Action to enforce all of the City's ethics laws, with an award of attorney fees and a share of any penalties going to the City for a successful filer, as was provided by Proposition J.

Whistleblower Program

The Jury finds that an important aspect of accountability and anti-corruption standards is a strong whistleblower program with protections against retaliation. The Jury finds that San Francisco currently lacks such a strong program, including protection against retaliation and public disclosure of actions taken based on whistleblower information. The current protections fail to cover contractors working on City-funded projects.

The Jury recommends that the whistleblower program, its current provisions and its implementation be an issue for a future Civil Grand Jury.²⁹

²⁵ See discussion as part of the Proposition J review on p. 30 supra.

²⁶ See §91003 regarding injunctions. §§91004-91007 on civil actions, which cannot be brought for as much as 120 days while government lawyers consider whether or not to take the case. 90% of any monies recovered would go to the state; 10% to the citizen, plus attorney fees.

²⁷ Government Code §6258

²⁸ §§67.21(f), 67.35(a) and 67.35(d) of the Sunshine Ordinance

²⁹ We note this has been previously examined by Civil Grand Juries, most recently in 2010-2011 with their report: "Whistling In The Dark: The San Francisco Whistleblower Program"

Recommended Systemic and Structural Changes

Transparency

This Jury looks to the Ethics Commission as the entity who carries the primary responsibility for ensuring the public has thorough access to information. As noted previously, the Ethics Commission has primary responsibility to receive and publish the mandated public disclosures by campaigns, public entities, and public officials under the C&GCC. It also has enforcement responsibility under the Sunshine Ordinance.

Ethics Commission Staff deserves credit for moving the vast majority of the campaign forms from paper to paperless which allows the information to be published quickly on the Commission website. This applies to candidate filings as well as to many ballot measure and independent committee filings.

The Jury recommends improving public access to open records on the Ethics Commission's Web site.

Finding 4: Some information currently reported and posted is not put into the standard searchable electronic format. The Jury specifically finds that contract approval forms, Form 700 forms, behested payments forms, and Lobbyists On Behalf Of The City forms can be converted to a searchable format before they are posted.

Recommendation 4: That contract approval forms be converted to a format which allows searches by the name of the official, by the name of the contractor, the value of contracts and the date the contract was signed. Behested payments information should be filed electronically in a format that allows for searches and data aggregation. Form 700s should be formatted to allow data to be searched on income sources, outside employment, gift sources and travel.

Finding 5: Required filings are treated independently and cannot easily be cross searched electronically using common data reference fields like name and organization to access and aggregate information types, such as dollar amounts, that cross between filings.³⁰

Recommendation 5: The Ethics Commission work to develop a common format database for data posted to DataSF, initially aiming to combine campaign, lobbying and Form 700 data.

³⁰ Voters seeking to follow these money trails will have little help from the current system of electronic filing. Under the current system, each report is filed under the name of one committee and each committee report is then filed separately by the date of the filing. There is no system that ties all the reports into a single database that can be easily searched or that can easily provide a total of all contributions to a single individual. It is possible to enter the name of a donor or vendor, but the system then lists each document involving that individual or entity separately.

Campaign Related Disclosures

With respect to elected officials, there is a broad range of disclosures required for campaign contributions (state and local law), campaign spending (state and local law) and, a variety of campaign related actions, as well as limitations and bans on certain contributions; no contributions over \$500 (local law); no contributions from City contractors (local law).

These disclosures, rules and restrictions primarily apply to committees formed by a candidate for their own election for local office (not state party offices, etc.). In 2011 and 2012, committees emerged that upend existing practices.

Finding 6a: City officials, both those in elective office and political appointees, may create separate committees to raise funds and campaign for political party office such as the Party Central Committees, as well as separate committees to raise funds and campaign for ballot measures or to contribute to other candidate. There are no limits on contributions to these committees.

Finding 6b: If candidates seek election to local political party committees during the same election cycle while also seeking election to an official City position, including supervisor, candidate committee rules do not apply. Thus while being limited to a \$500 cap in a City contest (or even an outright prohibition on contributions), donors may contribute additional funds through the back door of a political party contest.³¹

Candidates also face no restrictions on how they spend funds on a political party race and may legally choose to spend the entire amount only in the district where they are contesting for a City office, thus reaching deeper and more frequently to the voters who will decide on the City contest.

Finding 6c: The rise of major donors, and the potential for further influence following the recent U.S. Supreme Court decisions³² may well influence elections far beyond what political party affiliation has historically done.

Finding 6d: Corporations may not contribute directly to a candidate for City office but may instead contribute to a business association that contributes to a candidate, or to a nonprofit that spends on behalf of a candidate, or to another committee controlled by the candidate or officeholder, or through an independent expenditure committee.³³

Finding 6e: Corporate money is being funneled into local campaigns through a web of nonprofit organizations. The Jury cannot determine whether the main effect is to hide the true source of contributions or if this shields illegal contributions from disclosure. The Ethics Commission has not discussed a disclosure strategy to make this information

³¹ In looking through filings with the FPPC, the Jury found that in 2012 more than \$444,000 was contributed to Democratic County Central Committee candidates.

³² see *McCutcheon v Federal Election Commission* 572 U. S. ____ (2014), *Citizens United v Federal Election Commission* 558 US 310 (2010). , *Federal Election Commission v Wisconsin Right to Life* 551 US 449 (2007)

³³ In the 2010 campaign for supervisor, these independent expenditure committees raised and spent \$1.3 million outpacing the spending by the candidates themselves.

public.

Recommendation 6a: The Commission should proactively look at ways to track back 501(c) (3) &(4) money to real donors before the start of campaigns where this kind of money will be important; its true source should be identified.

Recommendation 6b: The Commission should propose ordinance amendments to require disclaimers in mailings, ads, door hangers and other voter outreach materials funded by committees whose individual donors are not identified to the satisfaction of a reasonable person which states, “this is paid for by (insert organization name) funded by anonymous donors in this campaign cycle”.

Finding 7: The Ethics Commission provides written information only in English although San Francisco has strong political participation from communities and officials whose first language is not English and who require guides and educational materials relevant to their needs.

Recommendation 7: The Ethics Commission should make guides and educational materials available in the major languages as is done in other City Departments.

Lobbyist registrations and disclosures

In 2013, registered lobbyists reported to the Ethics Commission that their clients paid them over \$5.8 million.³⁴

City law does not prohibit contributions from lobbyists to the officials they lobby, unlike state law. In 2013, about \$135,000 was contributed to candidates from registered lobbyists.³⁵

The lobbyist law itself excludes from “contacts” 17 categories that do not have to be publicly disclosed.³⁶ This limits the number of people required to register as lobbyists, rightfully excluding many people with limited contacts, but also excluding some people actively involved in influencing decision-making and reducing both the number of contacts reported and the amounts of money spent influencing decision-making.

In 2010, the Board accepted amendments drafted by the Ethics Commission that had the effect of eliminating some lobbyists from disclosing their spending and contacts—so-called “expenditure lobbyists.” Among those who are no longer required to make disclosures is the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce.

Finding 8: The current definition of “lobbyist” and “contacts” does not provide the public with sufficient information to understand how City Hall decisions are influenced despite the intent of the law.

³⁴ See <https://netfile.com/Sunlight/sf/Lobbyist/PaymentsPromisedSearch>

³⁵ see: <https://netfile.com/Sunlight/sf/Lobbyist/PoliticalContributionsSearch>

³⁶ The exclusions are listed at § 2.105(d)(1) of the Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code and include providing information at the request of an elected official, communicating regarding an existing contract including questions on performance, or negotiating the terms of the contract after being selected to enter into the contract.

Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense

Recommendation 8: The lobbyist ordinance should be reviewed and amended to provide clearer public disclosure of contacts with City officials regarding the interests of clients, and who should be required to register and make disclosures.

Finding 9: The effort to influence City Hall decisions is not limited to contacts with City officials but also includes outreach to community, political and nonprofit organizations as well as to the general public through television ads, mailers, robocalls, polling, and other strategies. In 2010 the Ethics Commission proposal was approved by the Board to eliminate reporting on these expenditures

Recommendation 9: The requirement for disclosure of all expenditures aimed at influencing City Hall decisions should be reinstated in the law with full public disclosure.

Finding 10: People holding themselves out as "strategic advisors" provide advice on ways to influence City decision-making.

Recommendation 10: Work of "strategic advisors" that provide guidance on winning approvals from City officials and/or the public should be reviewed by the Ethics Commission for possible inclusion in the lobbyist registration and/or campaign consultant law.

Public Entity Disclosures

Open public meetings

When considering the number of public meetings held by San Francisco Boards, Commissions and other public bodies each year, the numbers of complaints are few. This Jury finds that meeting public meeting requirements have become routine and have become part of the San Francisco government culture.

Release of public records

When considering the number of public records requests received and fulfilled each year, the number of complaints are few. This Jury finds that releasing public records has become routine and has become part of the San Francisco government culture.

The recent move to providing electronic copies of documents to requestors is positive, yielding efficiencies to both the requestor and to the disclosing agency.

Technological change has reshaped the world of public meetings and public records. Public meetings are frequently televised and are available for streaming on-line. The members of public bodies are often communicating during the meetings on their computers and telephones. The papers, discussions and public meetings that once documented a decision's "paper trail" now include e-mail, text messages, phone calls and electronic file transfers. Drafts of legislation will often zip around the Internet to be edited by lobbyists and other interests without transparency. Although the Sunshine Ordinance calls for it, the Jury learned that the City has no policy on retaining or disclosing text messages or emails and has no plan to address the increasing intermixture of business and personal communications through multiple e-mail accounts and multiple telephones.

Finding 11: The role of e-mail and text messages in governmental decision-making has not been fully discussed and explored. Rules on preservation of e-mails in public records are very hazy and some departmental officials told the Jury they routinely delete e-mail. Guidance from the City Attorney on preservation of e-mail is non-specific.³⁷ There is no guidance regarding text messages. There is no policy that applies to private e-mails and text messages that further public decision-making.

Recommendation 11: The Ethics Commission in conjunction with the City Attorney should develop a policy to ensure preservation of e-mails and text messages consistent with preservation of other public records. The policy, along with policies on preservation of public records, should be made available for public comment. Once it is completed and published it should be made available on City Attorney and Ethics Commission web pages that lists each Department, its policy, and how to obtain documents.

Sources of Outside Funding (Sunshine Ordinance)

Many San Francisco's departmental operations benefit from special grants or gifts. It might be a behest contribution requested by a City officeholder, or it might come from an organization formed to support the department's work. Departments are required to post on their websites the names of anyone who donates \$100 or more to assist their operations, along with a statement of any financial interest involving the City the donor might have. If the donation comes from an organization, its members must be disclosed.³⁸

Finding 12: Many departments have failed to post their sources of outside funding, as required by the Sunshine Ordinance.

Recommendation 12: The Jury recommends that the Ethics Commission and the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force review departmental web sites for compliance and notify non-compliant departments to immediately post their sources of outside funding, or face a show-cause before the Ethics Commission on why the information has not been posted.

Statements of Incompatible Activities

Only Department heads can discipline a Department level official for violating ethical standards, and under current practice, the public is not informed of any sanctions for unethical conduct. Other penalties, such as fines, can be imposed by other enforcement agencies and are made public.

³⁷ Good Government Guide: An Overview of the Laws Governing the Conduct of Public Officials 2010-2011 Edition (downloaded from: <http://www.sfcityattorney.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=686>) On one hand, it says e-mails are public records, under the public records act (see pp.80); on the other hand, it narrowly defines records that must be retained — "For example, as a general rule, employees may immediately dispose of phone message slips, notes of meetings, research notes prepared for the personal use of the employee creating them, and the large majority of e-mail communications." p. 103 But the Sunshine Ordinance specifically requires the Mayor and Department Heads to maintain and preserve e-mails in a professional and businesslike manner. §67.29-7(a) Also note: The City Attorney has not updated the Good Government Guide, a primer used by city departments and officials, since 2011. The Guide therefore does not contain guidance on current requirements.

³⁸ See § 67.29-6. Sources Of Outside Funding. (Sunshine Ordinance)

Finding 13: When violations of the standards in a departmental Statements of Incompatible Activities are enforced departmentally as a disciplinary matter, the Ethics Commission is not notified and the discipline is not disclosed to the public.

Recommendation 13: All violations of departmental Statements of Incompatible Activities should be disclosed to the Ethics Commission and posted on the Commission's web site.³⁹

Public Official Disclosures

Form 700 - Statements of Economic Interests

Annual filing of Form 700 is required by state and local law. This year marks the first year of electronic filing. Filings also are required after entering office, either appointed or elected, and upon leaving office. This year, staff started reminding late filers of missed deadlines by mail and by phone, increasing compliance markedly.

The state Fair Political Practices Commission ultimately imposes much more substantial penalties on non-filers than are available for the Ethics Commission direct enforcement, so much of the enforcement is handled at the state level.

Finding 14: The Ethics Commission has increased compliance by notifying any employee who fails to file Form 700 within 30 days after the deadline that he or she must file or face potential penalties.

Recommendation 14a: The Ethics Commission should continue to routinely notify all non-filers of their obligation within 30 days of the state filing deadline.

Recommendation 14b: The Ethics Commission should recommend dismissal for any officer or employee who fails to file 90 days after the deadline.

Recommendation 14c: The Ethics Commission should recommend dismissal for any officer or employee who files a Statement of Economic Interest (Form 700) that is inaccurate and relevant to the position they hold.

Recommendation 14d: Now that all Form 700 filers file electronically, the Ethics Commission should require that all Form 700s be filed with them as well as with the Department filing officer.

Finding 15: The disclosures in Form 700 filings also may reveal violations of San Francisco laws that are enforced locally. This includes compensated advocacy before other commissions and arrangements that violate the locally adopted and enacted Statements of Incompatible Activities for each department.

Recommendation 15: The Ethics Commission should audit and act on violations disclosed through Form 700 filings of local prohibitions such as compensated advocacy

³⁹ The Sunshine Ordinance specifically authorizes making public disclosure of employee misconduct – see Sec. 67.24(c)(7).

and incompatible activities, and enforce these violations with strong action.

Gift of Travel disclosures

Finding 16: City officials travel expenses can be covered by gifts made by individuals, lobbyists, business associations, corporations or any other source, including those with financial interests in matters to be decided by the official. The public disclosure is limited to a list of donors or donor organizations contributing \$500 or more, but without specifying the total amount of the gift. Additionally, a significant amount of travel expenses are paid through organizations that do not disclose the names of the original donors.

Recommendation 16: The Ethics Commission should require full disclosure of contributions or payments for official travel of City officials, including the actual amount contributed and the names of the original donors. The official should also disclose what official business was conducted, including meetings, who participated in the meetings, topics, speeches given, ceremonies attended and other information.

Public calendars of public officials (Sunshine Ordinance)

The Jury surveyed calendars from the Mayor, the District Attorney, the City Attorney, key department heads and other elected officials for a month during our service. While the Sunshine Ordinance does not require Supervisors to keep a calendar, nearly all of them provided copies.

Finding 17a: There is useful information in the calendars of City Officials that should be readily available to the public.

Finding 17b: The Jury found calendar entries that did not meet the law's requirements, particularly in listing the meeting's subject matter and attendee names. As a result, it is not possible to crosscheck lobbyists' reports on their meetings with City officials with the calendar reports from the City officials.

Finding 17c: The training currently provided on the Sunshine Ordinance contains no materials on the keeping of official calendars as required by the Ordinance.

Recommendation 17a: The Ethics Commission staff should collect the official calendars prepared under the Sunshine Ordinance monthly, convert them to electronic form and post them online.

Recommendation 17b: The City Attorney and the Ethics Commission ensure that those officials subject to the calendar requirement, and their administrative staff, be trained on the law's requirements.

Finding 18: The Board of Supervisors is not subject to this calendar requirement. Many members did provide their calendars upon request, and the information in their calendars will be helpful for public understanding of their work.

Recommendation 18: The Board of Supervisors should adopt a rule subjecting themselves to the public calendar requirement of the Sunshine Ordinance.

Waivers of post-public employment restrictions by the Ethics Commission

In reviewing meeting minutes where post-public employment restriction waivers have been approved, the Jury did not find specific determinations of how the applicant's waiver would meet the conditions of the ordinance.

Finding 19: The public record will be better served if post-public employment restriction waivers are granted by Commission resolutions that indicate the specific grounds for granting the waiver. In at least one instance, the Ethics Commission inappropriately interpreted the "extreme hardship" standard to grant a post-public employment restriction waiver.

Recommendation 19: The Commission should grant or deny post-public employment restriction waiver applications by resolutions that indicate specifically how the decision meets the conditions of the ordinance.

Sunshine Ordinance Task Force and the Ethics Commission

The Ethics Commission and the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force have had a complicated relationship over the years rooted in the enforcement (and enforceability) of the Sunshine Ordinance. Decisions of the task force are not enforced by the Ethics Commission without further investigation.

The ultimate finding the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force can make is to find someone has committed "official misconduct."⁴⁰ This is an end point in their process since they lack authority to enforce their findings.

"Official misconduct" is defined in Charter provisions dealing with the Ethics Commission and its role in the removal of certain elected officials from office.⁴¹ Because of these consequences for the accused, due process protections should be observed.

Finding 20: Both the Ethics Commission and the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force act in good faith. They are authorized to come to similar ends—transparency in government. However, there are legal and procedural differences between their process and their legal requirements. Therefore, the results of their work are not in harmony with each other.

⁴⁰ 67.34. WILLFUL FAILURE SHALL BE OFFICIAL MISCONDUCT.

The willful failure of any elected official, department head, or other managerial city employee to discharge any duties imposed by the Sunshine Ordinance, the Brown Act or the Public Records Act shall be deemed official misconduct. Complaints involving allegations of willful violations of this ordinance, the Brown Act or the Public Records Act by elected officials or department heads of the City and County of San Francisco shall be handled by the Ethics Commission.

⁴¹ §(e) OFFICIAL MISCONDUCT. Official misconduct means any wrongful behavior by a public officer in relation to the duties of his or her office, willful in its character, including any failure, refusal or neglect of an officer to perform any duty enjoined on him or her by law, or conduct that falls below the standard of decency, good faith and right action impliedly required of all public officers and including any violation of a specific conflict of interest or governmental ethics law. When any City law provides that a violation of the law constitutes or is deemed official misconduct, the conduct is covered by this definition and may subject the person to discipline and/or removal from office.

Recommendation 20a: The Mayor's Office should establish a blue-ribbon committee of experts and stakeholders in open government, sunshine, and transparency, including former Sunshine Task Force members. The Committee of Experts should review and update the Sunshine Ordinance as necessary and should report to both entities and the Board of Supervisors recommendations that would result in coordination and respect for the functions of each entity.

Recommendation 20b: For now, arrangements should be made jointly by the Ethics Commission and the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force to have complaints heard by an independent hearing officer who would develop a consistent legally sufficient record of the case for the decision of each body. This would allow the meetings of the Task Force and the Commission to focus on broader policy issues.

Ethics Commission Structure and Relation to Staff

An appointed Commission has general policy-making powers.⁴² A department head has responsibility for administering the department.⁴³

The Ethics Commission itself is established by §15.100 of the Charter which details the appointment process and establishes their ability to call witnesses. Charter §15.101 authorizes them to hire an Executive Director who “shall be the chief executive of the department and shall have all the powers provided for department heads.” Article XV of the Charter goes on to delineate the rulemaking power of the Commission and to define its role in the process removing public officers from their positions.

Other duties of the "Ethics Commission" are enumerated in Appendix C of the Charter, especially in §C3.699-11, where administrative duties are mixed in with policy duties without any effort by the drafters to distinguish between the two. Because of this, there is no clear definition of the Commission as a policy body distinct from the Executive Director and staff that are charged administrative functions. Paragraph 6 seems to be the broadest statement of policy-making power for the Ethics Commission.⁴⁴

In any instance where the Commission may be called to adjudicate a matter investigated by the staff, it takes no part in the investigation and is not even told about the investigation until the matter comes before them. This highlights the differing roles of the Commission and the staff.

The Commission should have its own sense of duties and responsibilities that are separate and distinct from those of staff. Staff, especially the Executive Director, will be crucial to the Commission's work, but rather than being completely dependent for the information flow coming through the Executive Director, the Jury is recommending a practice that is evident throughout

⁴² See Charter §4.102(1)

⁴³ See Administrative Code §2A.30

⁴⁴ 6. To make recommendations to the mayor and the board of supervisors concerning (a) campaign finance reform, (b) adoption of and revisions to City ordinances laws related to conflict of interest and lobbying laws and governmental ethics and (c) the submission to the voters of charter amendments relating to campaign finance, conflicts of interest and governmental ethics. The commission shall report to the board of supervisors and mayor annually concerning the effectiveness of such laws. The commission shall transmit its first set of recommendations to the board of supervisors and mayor no later than July 1, 1995"

Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense

the Commission structure in San Francisco. Most commissions appoint an Executive Secretary to manage their affairs and operations separate from the departmental staff.⁴⁵

The Jury has found that the vast majority of the information provided to the Ethics Commissioners for meetings comes from staff, which can create an appearance of impropriety if a decision seems rushed or is made with insufficient information.

A Commission Secretary would be responsible for the support functions for the Ethics Commissioners. This could include such duties as providing support to the Ethics Commissioners, serving as the recording secretary for their meetings/hearings, managing the administrative needs of the Ethics Commissioners including preparing, disseminating, and appropriately posting the Commissions' advanced calendars, hearings calendars, meeting packets, minutes, meeting/hearing results and actions, list and recording official acts of the Commissioners. It also would provide a direct information channel to the Commissioners separate from the Executive Director.

In most cases, Commission Secretaries provide a central point of contact for the Commission. The Secretary can support the public's engagement with the Commission by maintaining open and transparent communication with the public, ensuring the availability of material and information to the public, answering questions, responding sensitively to diverse and multicultural communities engaging in the Commissions' process; and ensuring appropriate decorum and public involvement at Commission hearings.

Finding 21a: The policy-making powers of the Ethics Commission are vested in the Commission itself, not in the Executive Director (absent express delegation by the Commission).

Finding 21b: The current structure where staff provides much of each Commission meeting's content creates the impression that the Commission is not an independent policy-making body.

Recommendation 21: The Board of Supervisors should provide the Commissioners an Executive Secretary separate from the existing Commission's employee base who will, among other duties, prepare the Commission's agendas, maintain minutes, lists of complaints, serve as a liaison for public input and interested persons meetings and assist a Commission member to be the parliamentarian.

Finding 22: While the Commission's Bylaws authorize committees, no committees have been established or meet. One result is that all matters requiring deliberation by the Commission are heard only once a month, in a process that can extend for many months and sometimes for years. If the Commission acts through its committee structure, issues can be explored and brought to the full Commission in a more developed state, thus providing a better basis for the Commission's actions.

Recommendation 22: The Commissioners should use their committee structure to focus

⁴⁵ Specifically authorized by § 4.102(9) of the Charter.

Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense

on Ethics Commission issues. In the weeks between monthly meetings, each commissioner could take the lead on issues of concern to the Ethics Commission, such as developing policies on emerging campaign finance issues, transparency matters, complaint processing and training. This structure would allow for more interaction with the public and the regulated community.

The Charter specifies the City Attorney shall be the legal advisor of the Ethics Commission.⁴⁶ At times, the City Attorney has stepped aside from certain matters due to potential conflicts of interest. Routinely, the City Attorney advises the Commission on matters where other departments, also represented by the City Attorney, hold differing positions. This creates an appearance of impropriety.

Given the twenty year history of the City Attorney working with the Ethics Commission, it is appropriate for both parties to take a long dispassionate look at how these arrangement works and consider the possibility of having the Ethics Commission engage outside counsel. The Charter provides a case-by-case process for a department to seek outside counsel.⁴⁷ Perhaps this process can be adapted to fit this situation if the City Attorney and the Ethics Commission reach an agreement on representation.

Finding 23: While the Charter mandates the City Attorney represent the Ethics Commission, conflicts have arisen repeatedly and the Ethics Commission has had to obtain outside counsel. We find these instances of conflict are likely to continue and that the Commission is best represented by a consistent set of lawyers who are not City employees.

Recommendation 23: That the Ethics Commission apply to the City Attorney for permission to engage outside counsel for advice and recommendations.

Commission Performance And Staffing

The Jury is making recommendations that fundamentally reshape what the Ethics Commission does and how it goes about its tasks. Therefore, depending on which of our recommendations are accepted for implementation, the Ethics Commission budget, staffing, and performance needs to be reviewed to determine appropriate levels of staffing and budget resources. That review is beyond the scope of this report.

Interactions with ethics professionals from other jurisdictions can inform the Ethics Commission and its staff about emerging best practices for ethics professionals in government but no one has attended the Council on Governmental Ethics Laws meetings in recent years. The Jury hopes that representatives of the Commission can attend Council on Governmental Ethics Laws meetings again and report back to the Commission on what they learn.

A New Focus For Commission Activities

City Charter Appendix C3.699-11(6) states: "The commission shall report to the board of supervisors and Mayor annually concerning the effectiveness of such laws," referring to

⁴⁶ Charter §15.102

⁴⁷ See Charter §6.102

campaign finance, conflicts of interest and governmental ethics laws. A City Attorney advice letter concluded that the Charter language did not specify whether meeting this requirement should be done in writing, orally or in another format, but it did not conclude that the requirement did not exist. This is a separate requirement from the Charter requirement that all City departments file an annual report.

Finding 24a: The Jury was unable to locate and the Ethics Commission was unable to provide copies of any reports or notes of oral presentations to the Mayor or to the Board of Supervisors as required in the Charter to report annually on the effectiveness of San Francisco's ethics laws.

Finding 24b: The Jury was unable to locate any reports that reviewed changes in laws aimed at transparency and ethical conduct adopted in other jurisdictions that might be relevant to San Francisco. The only references were to changes based on court decisions that lessened public disclosure and protections against the influence of money in politics, even when those decisions were not based on San Francisco cases.

It is important that laws adapt to changing circumstances. The requirement for the Ethics Commission to report annually to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors on the effectiveness of the laws is necessary to address a constantly changing political environment and provides an opportunity to consider different ways to achieve the goals of the laws.

Finding 24c: The proper standard to judge the effectiveness of laws is to consider their ability to achieve the purposes set forth in each law when it was enacted.

The effectiveness of the lobby law would be how well it reveals information about lobbyists efforts to influence decision-making regarding local legislative and administrative matters. The effectiveness of the campaign finance laws should be judged on a variety of criteria including whether a full range of useful information is reported; whether limitations on contributions effectively limit contributions, whether such reporting assists voters in making informed decisions; whether the files can be efficiently reviewed and compared; and whether there is public trust in governmental and electoral institutions.

The effectiveness of a conflict of interest laws can be judged in part on public confidence in the integrity of government decision-making. The number and type of violations noted would be an indicator as would be the types of information revealed in the filings related to conflicts of interest—Form 700, gifts, employment restriction waiver requests.

Recommendation 24: The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors should request an annual written report from the Ethics Commission that meets the standards set out in the Charter for annual reviews of the effectiveness of the City's laws. This report should be posted on the Ethics Commission web site.

Throughout this report, we have catalogued information that is filed and publicly disclosed. There is a wide range of information that appears useful to the public. However, without at least some audit and review, the public cannot be confident of its accuracy, and the filers have little incentive to ensure the correctness of their filings.

Finding 25a: Periodic reviews of filed information are essential to ensure its validity.

Finding 25b: The Ethics Commission has undertaken little to no monitoring and auditing of the content of Lobbyists, Campaign Consultants, Conflict of Interest and Governmental Ethics filings beyond fines for late filing of statements; nor have they actively monitored whether former City employees abide by the restrictions on dealing with their former departments.

Recommendation 25: The Ethics Commission should begin to focus staff resources on monitoring and auditing other items within the Ethics Commission jurisdiction unrelated to campaigns such as the following ordinances: Conflict of Interest, Governmental Ethics, The Lobbyist Ordinance, Campaign Consultant Ordinance, and the Sunshine Ordinance.

Information reported elsewhere can provide another layer of understanding to local reports. For example, the FPPC received filings for years on races for political party Central Committee slots that are now being filed locally, but the prior filings are relevant to understanding local politics as well. The FPPC receives campaign filings from incumbent San Francisco officeholders seeking state office, which shows their current campaign fundraising while making decisions that may be important to their contributors.

Other items might include reports on enforcement actions involving San Francisco officials and entities actively involved in San Francisco lobbying and campaigns or doing business with San Francisco; federal actions that debar or institute limited denial of participation in federal contracts resulting from federal investigations.

Finding 26: The Ethics Commission, though its staff, can catalog information reported elsewhere that is relevant for supplemental understanding of information currently reported locally. Links to this information would be a logical addition to the Ethics Commission web site.

Recommendation 26: The Ethics Commission should determine information reported elsewhere that is relevant for supplemental understanding of information currently reported locally, and provide links to it on the Ethics Commission web site, if it cannot be imported and posted.

The Jury found instances of Ethics Commission proposals to reduce protections against pay-to-play politics, reduce requirements for full disclosure of spending to influence City decisions, and relaxed standards regarding post-employment which did not explain how the proposal would further the purposes of the underlying law.⁴⁸

Finding 27: The Charter requires that proposals to amend campaign finance and ethics laws explain how the change will assist in furthering the purpose of the law. The Ethics Commission proposals have not included any statements showing that its proposals will

⁴⁸ For example, see the proposal from 2010 on contractor contributions discussed at the Oct 18, 2010 Ethics Commission meeting, and the memo with draft legislation at http://www.sfethics.org/files/memo_to_EC_re_proposed_changes_10.6.10_packet.pdf

further the purposes of the law.

Recommendation 27: When a bill is proposed or passed to amend campaign finance and ethics laws, it should specify how it "further the purposes of this Chapter".⁴⁹

And finally, the Jury believes the appearance of impropriety may be even more corrosive to public trust in government than actual criminal wrongdoing. Why? Because actual wrongdoing can get prosecuted, while it seems that nothing is ever done about things that "just look bad."

The conflict of interest law stresses the importance of appearances. "Government decisions should be, and should appear to be, made on a fair and impartial basis."⁵⁰ This theme shows up repeatedly in the law, as well as in related case law.

Finding 28a: The Commission has not taken an active role in questioning the propriety of actions that skirt the edges of legality. This inquiry can feed into reports on the effectiveness of laws, and also remind public officials that they can be called to account for the appearance of impropriety.

Finding 28b: The general public needs an opportunity to talk to the Ethics Commission about their expectations and beliefs on ethical behavior of public officials. This initial discussion may help to highlight matters that appear to be improper.

Recommendation 28: That the Commission hold hearings, whether through their committees or in the full Commission, to ask the public to report matters that appear improper, then call the responsible officials before the Commission to account for and defend their actions.

Coda: Proposition J Case Study

How The Proposition J Law Changed to Lessen Ethical Protections

If you blinked, you missed this one. Passed in a landslide in 2000, it was quietly repealed three years later.

Proposition J was called "Taxpayer Protection."⁵¹ It regulated behavior of public officials, barring them from receiving a "personal or campaign advantage" (e.g. contributions, gifts, employment) from anyone who gained a "public benefit" by action of the public official. This prohibition continued for two years after the official left office. It barred campaign contributions, gifts, and potential employment in many instances.

No one stood against this proposition—there was no argument against it in the Voter's Guide and

⁴⁹ e.g. The state is required to do the same thing when amending the Political Reform Act. It makes a conclusory pro forma finding by inserting a section: "The Legislature finds and declares that this bill furthers the purposes of the Political Reform Act of 1974 within the meaning of subdivision (a) of Section 81012 of the Government Code." We would hope to see some actual findings.

⁵⁰ C&GCC §3.200(e)

⁵¹ Proposition J added Article XX to Chapter 16 of the Administrative Code. See Appendix Four for full text and ballot materials – Proposition J Handbook

no paid arguments against it.

“Public benefit” was broadly defined, including contracts, land sales, leases, franchises, land use variances, and tax abatements or other tax variances not generally applicable. “Public official” was limited to “any elected or appointed official acting in an official capacity,” not civil servants, only elected and appointed officials.

The Proposition J Findings and Declarations spoke of tainted decision making and corruptive influences of donations in much stronger language than is used in other San Francisco laws.⁵²

Proposition J also provided a Citizen’s Right of Action against public officials who violated its terms if the City Attorney and the District Attorney declined to pursue a case. After payment of attorney fees, 90% of any monies recovered would go to San Francisco.

Proposition J paralleled other San Francisco laws, in some ways broader, in some ways narrower, and used different terminology. City law bans contractor campaign contributions from the time contract negotiations begin until six months after the contract is awarded is in effect. City law limits the ability of public officials and employees to take certain jobs after their government service—narrower than Proposition J for public officials covered by it, broader for other employees.

The Steps By Which Proposition J was Amended Out of Existence

Step 1: In 2000, via a citizen petition initiative, Proposition J was placed on the ballot. Voters overwhelmingly (83%) approved an ordinance that banned public officials from receiving contributions of any kind from persons who obtained benefits through a decision by that official.

⁵² **Section 16.991. Findings and Declarations**

(a) The people of the City and County of San Francisco (“City and County”) find that the use or disposition of public assets is often tainted by conflicts of interest among local public officials entrusted with their management and control. Such assets, including publicly owned real property, land use decisions conferring substantial private benefits, conferral of a franchise without competition, public purchases, taxation, and financing, should be arranged strictly on the merits for the benefit of the public, and irrespective of the separate personal or financial interests of involved public officials.

(b) The people find that public decisions to sell or lease property, to confer cable, trash hauling and other franchises, to award public construction or service contracts, or to utilize or dispose of other public assets, and to grant special land use or taxation exceptions have often been made with the expectation of, and subsequent receipt of, private benefits from those so assisted to involved public ‘decision makers’. The people further find that the sources of such corruptive influence include gifts and honoraria, future employment offers, and anticipated campaign contributions for public officials who are either elected or who later seek elective office. The trading of special favors or advantage in the management or disposal of public assets and in the making of major public purchases compromises the political process, undermines confidence in democratic institutions, deprives meritorious prospective private buyers, lessees, and sellers of fair opportunity, and deprives the public of its rightful enjoyment and effective use of public assets.

(c) Accordingly, the people declare that there is a compelling state interest in reducing the corruptive influence of emoluments, gifts, and prospective campaign contributions on the decisions of public officials in the management of public assets and franchises, and in the disposition of public funds. The people, who compensate public officials, expect and declare that as a condition of such public office, no gifts, promised employment, or campaign contributions shall be received from any substantial beneficiary of such a public decision for a reasonable period, as provided herein.

Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense

Step 2: Although not designated in Proposition J, the Ethics Commission administered this proposition. In 2003, the Ethics Commission proposed repealing Proposition J at their April 2003 meeting as part of their effort to recodify conflict of interest laws out of the Charter, amending some of them and making non-voter amendments possible in the future—the effort that became Proposition E on the 2003 ballot.⁵³

Step 3: In 2003, voters approved Proposition E that recodified the ethics laws; however, it also had the undisclosed effect of deleting Proposition J language.

The City Attorney had codified Proposition J as Article 3, Chapter 7 of the C&GCC (§3.700 et seq) and it was repealed in a section of Proposition E of 2003—the ethics recodification entitled "Deletion of Ordinances regulating conflicts of interest and transfer of Charter sections regulating conflicts of interest into the Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code."

Proposition E started as a two part proposal from the Ethics Commission. One part had amendments to the Charter moving items into ordinance; the second part was a series of amendments to the conflict of interest ordinance. These two parts were merged into one proposal, and the Board of Supervisors made some changes during the process. The original Ethics Commission conflict of interest changes showed the Proposition J language being struck out; the redraft at the Board just repealed it by reference.

The deletion of Proposition J was noted in the Legislative Digest at the Board of Supervisors, saying "Other conflict of interest provisions included in this measure and an amendment to the Campaign Finance Reform Ordinance will accomplish some of the same goals by limiting gifts, future employment, and campaign contributions, but are more narrowly tailored to accomplishing these goals."

No mention of this was made in the Voter's Guide for the 2003 election, and we find no discussion of it during the campaign.

Thus, the concept of regulating public officials' relations with those who receive "public benefits" from them (Proposition J's intent) was totally eliminated from San Francisco law.

Finding 29: The Findings and Declarations of Proposition J clearly articulate many public concerns with role of money in politics and should be re-adopted, perhaps adapted to be part of the general conflict of interest law - Chapter 2 of Article III of the C&GCC.

Recommendation 29: That the Ethics Commission hold a hearing on "Proposition J Revisited" to consider how some of its concepts apply today and whether the "public

⁵³ From the Ethics Commission meeting minutes 4/14/2003:

(Staff) explained that Proposition J, which places limits on gifts, future employment and campaign contributions, and which is currently part of the C&GCC, is now redundant because the goals of Proposition J are either (a) already addressed in the proposed conflict of interest amendments, or (b) scheduled to be addressed by proposed amendments to be considered in Item VIII at tonight's meeting.

Motion 03-04-14-7 (Melbostad/Garcia): Moved, seconded, and unanimously passed (4-0): that the Commission adopt the proposed staff recommendation to delete Proposition J from the Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code.

benefit" definition includes elements that should be incorporated into sections of the C&GCC⁵⁴, and specifically consider offering amendments to C&GCC which re-incorporate its Findings and Declarations into current San Francisco law, and to consider placing these amendments on the ballot.

⁵⁴ The Jury's examination of lobbying contacts for 2013 found that only a small fraction of lobbying involves city contracts while nine out of ten lobbyist contacts involve development projects which would be within the "public benefit" definition, and which fall outside the ban on contractor contributions

RESPONSE MATRIX

Findings	Recommendations	Response Required
<p><u>Finding 1a</u>: The Ethics Commission lacks resources to handle major enforcement cases. These include, for example, cases alleging misconduct, conflict of interest, violating campaign finance and lobbying laws, and violating post-employment restrictions.</p> <p><u>Finding 1b</u>: The Ethics Commission has only two investigators.</p> <p><u>Finding 1c</u>: The confidentiality required of Ethics Commission investigations runs counter to the Commission's other duties to make information more public and to increase the transparency of government.</p> <p><u>Finding 1d</u>: The District Attorney, City Attorney and the Fair Political Practices Commission have more substantial investigative staffs.</p> <p><u>Finding 1e</u>: The Fair Political Practices Commission has been very active in bringing enforcement actions, and handles enforcement for some local units of California government.</p> <p><u>Finding 1f</u>: Enforcement is best handled outside of the environment of political partisanship and preferences.</p>	<p><u>Recommendation 1</u>: The Jury recommends a contract with the Fair Political Practices Commission for at least a two-year pilot basis to enforce both state and related San Francisco law violations.</p>	<p>Ethics Commission</p> <p>Board of Supervisors</p> <p>City Attorney</p> <p>District Attorney</p>

Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense

<p><u>Finding 2:</u> In some instances, improper campaign contributions were returned to the contributor rather than forfeited to the City as required by City law. The Jury found no record of the Commission acting to waive or reduce the forfeiture.</p>	<p><u>Recommendation 2:</u> The Board of Supervisors should request an independent audit by the City Attorney to determine whether prohibited contributions were forfeited to the City as required by law.</p>	<p>Board Of Supervisors City Attorney</p>
<p><u>Finding 3:</u> A broader citizen’s right of action to enforce ethics laws will provide assurance to the public that the laws will be enforced.</p>	<p><u>Recommendation 3:</u> The Jury recommends that the Ethics Commission and the Board of Supervisors act to enhance the Citizen’s Right of Action to enforce all of the City’s ethics laws, with an award of attorney fees and a share of any penalties going to the City for a successful filer, as was provided by Proposition J.</p>	<p>Ethics Commission City Attorney Board Of Supervisors</p>
<p><u>Finding 4:</u> Some information currently reported and posted is not put into the standard searchable electronic format. The Jury specifically finds that contract approval forms, Form 700 forms, behested payments forms, and Lobbyists On Behalf Of The City forms can be converted to a searchable format before they are posted.</p>	<p><u>Recommendation 4:</u> That contract approval forms be converted to a format which allows searches by the name of the official, by the name of the contractor, the value of contracts and the date the contract was signed. Behested payments information should be filed electronically in a format that allows for searches and data aggregation. Form 700s should be formatted to allow data to be searched on income sources, outside employment, gift sources and travel.</p>	<p>Ethics Commission Ethics Commission Executive Director Chief Data Officer</p>
<p><u>Finding 5:</u> Required filings are treated independently and cannot easily be cross searched electronically using common data reference fields like name and organization to access and aggregate information types, such as dollar amounts, that cross between filings.</p>	<p><u>Recommendation 5:</u> The Ethics Commission work to develop a common format database for data posted to DataSF, initially aiming to combine campaign, lobbying and Form 700 data.</p>	<p>Ethics Commission Ethics Commission Executive Director Chief Data Officer</p>

Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense

<p><u>Finding 6a:</u> City officials, both those in elective office and political appointees, also may create separate committees to raise funds and campaign for political party office such as the Party Central Committees. There are no limits on contributions to these committees.</p> <p><u>Finding 6b:</u> If candidates seek election to local political party committees during the same election cycle while also seeking election to an official City position, including supervisor, candidate committee rules do not apply. Thus while being limited to a \$500 cap in a City contest (or even an outright prohibition on contributions), donors may contribute additional funds through the back door of a political party contest.</p> <p><u>Finding 6c:</u> The rise of major donors, and the potential for further influence following the recent U.S. Supreme Court decision, may well influence elections far beyond what political party affiliation has historically done.</p> <p><u>Finding 6d:</u> Corporations may not contribute directly to a candidate for City office but may instead contribute to a business association that contributes to a candidate, or to a nonprofit that spends on behalf of a candidate, or to another committee controlled by the candidate or officeholder, or through an independent expenditure committee.</p> <p><u>Finding 6e:</u> Corporate money is being funneled into local campaigns through a web of nonprofit organizations. The Jury cannot determine whether</p>	<p><u>Recommendation 6a:</u> The Ethics Commission should proactively look at ways to track back 501(c) (3) &(4) money to real donors before the start of campaigns where this kind of money will be important; its true source should be identified.</p> <p><u>Recommendation 6b:</u> The Ethics Commission should propose ordinance amendments to require disclaimers in mailings, ads, door hangers and other voter outreach materials funded by committees whose individual donors are not identified to the satisfaction of a reasonable person which state “this is paid for by (insert organization name) funded by anonymous donors in this campaign cycle,”</p>	<p>Ethics Commission</p>
---	--	--------------------------

Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense

<p>the main effect is to hide the true source of contributions or if this shields illegal contributions from disclosure. The Ethics Commission has not discussed a disclosure strategy to make this information public.</p>		
<p><u>Finding 7:</u> The Ethics Commission provides written information only in English although San Francisco has strong political participation from communities and officials whose first language is not English and who require guides and educational materials relevant to their needs.</p>	<p><u>Recommendation 7:</u> The Ethics Commission should make guides and educational materials available in the major languages as is done in other City Departments.</p>	<p>Ethics Commission Executive Director</p>
<p><u>Finding 8:</u> The current definition of “lobbyist” and “contacts” does not provide the public with sufficient information to understand who and how City Hall decisions are influenced despite the intent of the law.</p>	<p><u>Recommendation 8:</u> The lobbyist ordinance should be reviewed and amended to provide clearer public disclosure of contacts with City officials regarding the interests of clients, and who should be required to register and make disclosures.</p>	<p>Ethics Commission Board Of Supervisors</p>
<p><u>Finding 9:</u> The effort to influence City Hall decisions is not limited to contacts with City officials but also includes outreach to community, political and nonprofit organizations as well as to the general public through television ads, mailers, robocalls, polling and other strategies. In 2010 the Ethics Commission proposal was approved by the Board to eliminate reporting on these expenditures</p>	<p><u>Recommendation 9:</u> The requirement for disclosure of all expenditures aimed at influencing City Hall decisions should be reinstated in the law with full public disclosure.</p>	<p>Ethics Commission Board Of Supervisors</p>
<p><u>Finding 10:</u> People holding themselves out as "strategic advisors" provide advice on ways to influence City decision-making.</p>	<p><u>Recommendation 10:</u> Work of "strategic advisors" that provide guidance on winning approvals from City officials and/or the public should be reviewed by the Ethics Commission for possible inclusion in the</p>	<p>Ethics Commission</p>

Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense

	lobbyist registration and/or campaign consultant law.	
<p><u>Finding 11:</u> The role of e-mail and text messages in governmental decision-making has not been fully discussed and explored. Rules on preservation of e-mails in public records are very hazy and some departmental officials told the Jury they routinely delete e-mail. Guidance from the City Attorney on preservation of e-mail is non-specific. There is no guidance regarding text messages. There is no policy that applies to private e-mails and text messages that further public decision-making.</p>	<p><u>Recommendation 11:</u> The Ethics Commission in conjunction with the City Attorney should develop a policy to ensure preservation of e-mails and text messages consistent with preservation of other public records. The policy, along with policies on preservation of public records, should be made available for public comment. Once it is completed and published it should be made available on City Attorney and Ethics Commission web pages that lists each Department, its policy, and how to obtain documents.</p>	<p>City Attorney Ethics Commission Sunshine Ordinance Task Force Board Of Supervisors</p>
<p><u>Finding 12:</u> Many departments have failed to post their sources of outside funding as required by the Sunshine Ordinance.</p>	<p><u>Recommendation 12:</u> The Jury recommends that the Ethics Commission and the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force review departmental web sites for compliance and notify non-compliant departments to immediately post their sources of outside funding, or face a show-cause before the Ethics Commission on why the information has not been posted.</p>	<p>Ethics Commission Executive Director Sunshine Ordinance Task Force</p>
<p><u>Finding 13:</u> When violations of the standards in a departmental Statements of Incompatible Activities are enforced departmentally as a disciplinary matter, the Ethics Commission is not notified and the discipline is not disclosed to the public.</p>	<p><u>Recommendation 13:</u> All violations of departmental Statements of Incompatible Activities should be disclosed to the Ethics Commission and posted on the Commission’s web site.</p>	<p>Ethics Commission Executive Director Ethics Commission</p>
<p><u>Finding 14:</u> The Ethics Commission has increased compliance by notifying any employee who fails to file Form 700 within 30 days after the deadline that he or she must file or face potential penalties.</p>	<p><u>Recommendation 14a:</u> The Ethics Commission should continue to routinely notify all non-filers of their obligation within 30 days of the state filing deadline.</p> <p><u>Recommendation 14b:</u> The Ethics Commission should recommend dismissal for any officer or employee who</p>	<p>Ethics Commission Executive Director Ethics Commission</p>

Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense

	<p>fails to file by the 90 day deadline for referral to the Fair Political Practices Commission</p> <p><u>Recommendation 14c:</u> The Ethics Commission should recommend dismissal for any officer or employee who files a Statement of Economic Interest that is inaccurate and relevant to the position they hold.</p> <p><u>Recommendation 14d:</u> Now that all Form 700 filers file electronically, the Ethics Commission should propose that they be filed with them as well as with the Department filing officer.</p>	
<p><u>Finding 15:</u> The disclosures in Form 700 filings also may reveal violations of San Francisco laws that are enforced locally. This includes compensated advocacy before other commissions and arrangements that violate the locally adopted and enacted Statements of Incompatible Activities for each department.</p>	<p><u>Recommendation 15:</u> The Ethics Commission should audit and act on violations disclosed through Form 700 filings of local prohibitions such as compensated advocacy and incompatible activities, and enforce these violations with strong action.</p>	<p>Ethics Commission Ethics Commission Executive Director</p>
<p><u>Finding 16:</u> City officials travel expenses can be covered by gifts made by individuals, lobbyists, business associations, corporations or any other source, including those with financial interests in matters to be decided by the official. The public disclosure is limited to a list of donors or donor organizations contributing \$500 or more, but without specifying the total amount of the gift. Additionally, a significant amount of travel expenses are paid through organizations that do not disclose the names of the original donors.</p>	<p><u>Recommendation 16:</u> The Ethics Commission should require full disclosure of contributions or payments for official travel of City officials, including the actual amount contributed and the names of the original donors. The official should also disclose what official business was conducted, including meetings, who participated in the meetings, topics, speeches given, ceremonies attended and other information.</p>	<p>Ethics Commission Board of Supervisors</p>

Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense

<p><u>Finding 17a:</u> There is useful information in the calendars of City Officials that should be readily available to the public.</p> <p><u>Finding 17b:</u> The Jury found calendar entries that did not meet the law's requirements, particularly in listing the meeting's subject matter and attendee names. As a result, it is not possible to crosscheck lobbyists' reports on their meetings with City officials with the calendar reports from the City officials.</p> <p><u>Finding 17c:</u> The training currently provided on the Sunshine Ordinance contains no materials on the keeping of official calendars as required by the Ordinance.</p>	<p><u>Recommendation 17a:</u> The Ethics Commission staff should collect the official calendars prepared under the Sunshine Ordinance monthly, convert them to electronic form and post them online.</p> <p><u>Recommendation 17b:</u> The City Attorney and the Ethics Commission ensure that those officials subject to the calendar requirement, and their administrative staff, be trained on the law's requirements.</p>	<p>Ethics Commission Executive Director Ethics Commission Sunshine Ordinance Task Force City Attorney</p>
<p><u>Finding 18:</u> The Board of Supervisors is not subject to this calendar requirement. Many members did provide their calendars upon request, and the information in their calendars will be helpful for public understanding of their work.</p>	<p>The Board of Supervisors should adopt a rule subjecting themselves to the public calendar requirement of the Sunshine Ordinance.</p>	<p>Board Of Supervisors</p>
<p><u>Finding 19:</u> The public record will be better served if post-public employment restriction waivers are granted by Commission resolutions that indicate the specific grounds for granting the waiver. In at least one instance, the Ethics Commission inappropriately interpreted the "extreme hardship" standard to grant a post-public employment restriction waiver.</p>	<p><u>Recommendation 19:</u> The Commission should grant or deny post-public employment restriction waiver applications by resolutions that indicate specifically how the decision meets the conditions of the ordinance.</p>	<p>Ethics Commission</p>

Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense

<p><u>Finding 20:</u> Both the Ethics Commission and the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force act in good faith. They are authorized to come to similar ends – transparency in government. However, there are legal and procedural differences between their process and their legal requirements. Therefore, the results of their work are not in harmony with each other.</p>	<p><u>Recommendation 20a:</u> The Mayor's Office should establish a blue-ribbon committee of experts and stakeholders in open government, sunshine and transparency, including former Sunshine Task Force members. The Committee of Experts should review and update the Sunshine Ordinance as necessary and should report to both entities and the Board of Supervisors recommendations that would result in coordination and respect for the functions of each entity.</p> <p><u>Recommendation 20b:</u> For now, arrangements should be made jointly by the Ethics Commission and the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force to have complaints heard by an independent hearing officer who would develop a consistent legally sufficient record of the case for the decision of each body. This would allow the meetings of the Task Force and the Commission to focus on broader policy issues.</p>	<p>Sunshine Ordinance Task Force</p> <p>Mayor</p> <p>Board Of Supervisors</p> <p>Ethics Commission</p>
<p><u>Finding 21a:</u> The policy-making powers of the Ethics Commission are vested in the Commission itself, not in the Executive Director (absent express delegation by the Commission).</p> <p><u>Finding 21b:</u> The current structure where staff provides much of each Commission meeting's content creates the impression that the Commission is not an independent policy-making body.</p>	<p><u>Recommendation 21:</u> The Board of Supervisors should provide the Commissioners an Executive Secretary separate from the existing Commission's employee base who will, among other duties, prepare the Commission's agendas, maintain minutes, lists of complaints, serve as a liaison for public input and interested persons meetings and assist a Commission member to be the parliamentarian.</p>	<p>Board Of Supervisors</p> <p>Ethics Commission</p> <p>Ethics Commission Executive Director</p>

Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense

<p><u>Finding 22:</u> While the Commission's Bylaws authorize committees, no committees have been established or meet. One result is that all matters requiring deliberation by the Commission are heard only once a month, in a process that can extend for many months and sometimes for years. If the Commission acts through its committee structure, issues can be explored and brought to the full commission in a more developed state, thus providing a better basis for the Commission's actions.</p>	<p><u>Recommendation 22:</u> The Commissioners should use their committee structure to focus on Ethics Commission issues. In the weeks between monthly meetings, each commissioner could take the lead on issues of concern to the Ethics Commission, such as developing policies on emerging campaign finance issues, transparency matters, complaint processing and training. This structure would allow for more interaction with the public and the regulated community.</p>	<p>Ethics Commission</p>
<p><u>Finding 23:</u> While the Charter mandates the City Attorney represent the Ethics Commission, conflicts have arisen repeatedly, and the Ethics Commission has had to obtain outside counsel. We find these instances of conflict are likely to continue, and that the Commission is best represented by a consistent set of lawyers who are not City employees.</p>	<p><u>Recommendation 23:</u> That the Ethics Commission apply to the City Attorney for permission to engage outside counsel for advice and recommendations</p>	<p>Ethics Commission Ethics Commission Executive Director City Attorney</p>
<p><u>Finding 24a:</u> The Jury was unable to locate and the Ethics Commission was unable to provide copies of any reports or notes of oral presentations to the Mayor or to the Board of Supervisors as required in the Charter to report annually on the effectiveness of San Francisco's ethics laws.</p> <p><u>Finding 24b:</u> The Jury was unable to locate any reports that reviewed changes in laws aimed at transparency and ethical conduct adopted in other jurisdictions that might be relevant to San Francisco. The only references were to changes based on court</p>	<p><u>Recommendation 24:</u> The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors should request an annual written report from the Ethics Commission that meets the standards set out in the Charter for annual reviews of the effectiveness of the City's laws. This report should be posted on the Ethics Commission web site.</p>	<p>Board Of Supervisors Mayor Ethics Commission</p>

Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense

<p>decisions that resulted in less public disclosure and less protection against the influence of money in politics even when those decisions were not based on San Francisco cases.</p> <p><u>Finding 24c</u>: The proper standard to judge the effectiveness of laws is to consider their ability to achieve the purposes set forth when they were enacted.</p>		
<p><u>Finding 25a</u>: Periodic reviews of filed information are essential to ensure its validity.</p> <p><u>Finding 25b</u>: The Ethics Commission has undertaken little to no monitoring and auditing of the content of Lobbyists, Campaign Consultants, Conflict of Interest and Governmental Ethics filings beyond fines for late filing of statements; nor have they actively monitored whether former City employees abide by the restrictions on dealing with their former departments.</p>	<p><u>Recommendation 25</u>: The Ethics Commission should begin to focus Staff resources on monitoring and auditing other items within the Ethics Commission jurisdiction unrelated to campaigns such as the following ordinances: Conflict of Interest, Governmental Ethics, The Lobbyist Ordinance, Campaign Consultant Ordinance and the Sunshine Ordinance.</p>	<p>Ethics Commission</p> <p>Ethics Commission Executive Director</p> <p>Board Of Supervisors</p>
<p><u>Finding 26</u>: The Ethics Commission, though its staff, can catalog information reported elsewhere that is relevant for supplemental understanding of information currently reported locally. Links to this information would be a logical addition to the Ethics Commission web site.</p>	<p><u>Recommendation 26</u>: The Ethics Commission should determine information reported elsewhere that is relevant for supplemental understanding of information currently reported locally, and provide links to it on the Ethics Commission web site, if it cannot be imported and posted.</p>	<p>Ethics Commission</p> <p>Ethics Commission Executive Director</p> <p>Chief Data Officer</p>

Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense

<p><u>Finding 27:</u> The Charter requires that proposals to amend campaign finance and ethics laws explain <u>how</u> the change will assist in furthering the purpose of the law. The Ethics Commission proposals have not included any statements showing that its proposals will further the purposes of the law.</p>	<p><u>Recommendation 27:</u> When a bill is proposed or passed to amend campaign finance and ethics laws, it should specify <u>how</u> it "furtheres the purposes of this Chapter".</p>	<p>Ethics Commission Ethics Commission Executive Director Board of Supervisors City Attorney</p>
<p><u>Finding 28a:</u> The Commission has not taken an active role in questioning the propriety of actions that skirt the edges of legality. This inquiry can feed into reports on the effectiveness of laws, and also remind public officials that they can be called to account for the appearance of impropriety.</p> <p><u>Finding 28b:</u> The general public needs an opportunity to talk to the Ethics Commission about their expectations and beliefs on ethical behavior of public officials. This initial discussion may help to highlight matters that appear to be improper.</p>	<p><u>Recommendation 28:</u> That the Commission hold hearings, whether through their committees or in the full Commission, to ask the public to report matters that appear improper, then call the responsible officials before the Commission to account for and defend their actions.</p>	<p>Ethics Commission</p>
<p><u>Finding 29:</u> The Findings and Declarations of Proposition J (2000) clearly articulate many public concerns with role of money in politics and should be re-adopted, perhaps adapted to be part of the general conflict of interest law - Chapter 2 of Article III of the C&GCC.</p>	<p><u>Recommendation 29:</u> That the Ethics Commission hold a hearing on "Proposition J Revisited" to consider how some of its concepts apply today and whether the "public benefit" definition includes elements that should be incorporated into sections of the C&GCC, and specifically consider offering amendments to C&GCC which re-incorporate its Findings and Declarations into current San Francisco law, and to consider placing these amendments on the ballot.</p>	<p>Ethics Commission Board of Supervisors</p>

METHODOLOGY

The San Francisco Civil Grand Jury investigated the Ethics Commission, Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, and other government transparency practices of the City. We conducted over twenty interviews of people knowledgeable about the public bodies involved or about efforts and practices to promote government transparency.

Our investigation led us to review hundreds of documents from various sources. These sources included commission meetings (streaming video as well as minutes), ordinances and propositions, The San Francisco Ethics Commission and the data.sf.org websites, the FPPC website, newspaper reports, and online journalism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY (SELECTED)

Appendix One discusses the key laws and where to find them.

Budget Analyst Report – San Francisco Board of Supervisors [June 06, 2012 - Comparison of City and County of San Francisco and City of Los Angeles Ethics Laws – Phase 2](#)

Fair Political Practices Commission Publications <http://www.fppc.ca.gov/index.php?id=226>

SF Ethics Commission Annual Reports

2013: <http://www.sfethics.org/ethics/2013/11/san-francisco-ethics-commission-annual-report-july-1-2012-june-30-2013.html>

2012: <http://www.sfethics.org/ethics/2013/01/san-francisco-ethics-commission-annual-report-july-1-2011-june-30-2012.html>

2011: <http://www.sfethics.org/ethics/2011/09/san-francisco-ethics-commission-annual-report-july-1-2010-june-30-2011.html>

Earlier reports: <http://www.sfethics.org/ethics/2009/05/annual-reports.html>

Los Angeles Ethics Commission publications:

<http://ethics.lacity.org/publications.cfm>

2010-2011 SF Civil Grand Jury Report on Ethics:

[San Francisco Ethics Commission: The Sleeping Watchdog](#)

SF Ethics response to 2010-2011 Civil Grand Jury report on Ethics:

<http://www.sfethics.org/ethics/2011/09/ethics-commission-response-to-the-2010-2011-civil-grand-jury-report.html>

2004-2005 SF Civil Grand Jury report on ethics:

[San Francisco Ethics Commission Budgeting and Staffing Issues](#)

2012-2013 Orange County Civil Grand Jury report: “A Call For Ethical Standards: Corruption In Orange County”

GLOSSARY

C&GCC - San Francisco Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code, a separate code in San Francisco Ordinances created in 2000 from existing laws related to campaign finance, lobbyists, conflict of interest, government ethics, and whistleblower protection.

Behest Payments -- payments made at the behest of elected officials are presumed not to be campaign contributions if: the payments are made principally for legislative, governmental, or charitable purposes, and the payments are made principally for purposes unrelated to the official's candidacy for elected office.

City - The City and County of San Francisco

Form 700 Statements of Economic Interests (SEIs or Form 700s) - These state mandated forms include information about the sources of an official's income, investments, business positions, real property holdings and gifts. Merely reporting an economic interest is not a conflict in itself; a conflict arises when an official governmental decision, made by the official, impacts their economic interests. Form 700s are an important means for the official that files them, the media, and the public to help gauge where potential conflicts of interest may exist.

FPPC - California Fair Political Practices Commission (FPPC) was created by the Political Reform Act of 1974.

Political Reform Act of 1974 – the core California law on campaign finance, financial reporting and many conflicts of interest, a ballot initiative passed by California voters in 1974 as Proposition 9.

Ralph M. Brown Act – the California law on open meetings, originally passed in 1953 and codified at . Government Code §§ 54950 et seq

APPENDIX ONE

The Legal Framework

The grand jury looked at the laws administered directly or indirectly by the Ethics Commission and the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force.

A web of local, state, and federal laws require that public officials and employees act in accordance with the public trust. These laws rest on common law, constitutional and Charter principles and provisions that set norms of behavior for public officials. Self-dealing is wrong. Divided loyalties demand recusal.

San Francisco voters have adopted a variety of Charter amendments and ordinances over the years, which aim, in different ways, at promoting transparency in government and elections along with preventing corruption.

The Ethics Commission legal framework has changed significantly since its creation. For the Commission, the term of office and the appointing authorities have changed. Administering publicly funded candidates is an added responsibility. The local laws they administer have in large part been taken from the Charter and various locations in the San Francisco code and consolidated into the Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code and amended.

The Sunshine Ordinance Task Force has only one significant change since initial enactment—converting an ordinance passed by the Board of Supervisors into an ordinance passed by the voters.

Transparency For Government

Expansive government sunshine language was added to the California Constitution in 2004, mandating that existing laws be construed to further the public right of access; and to allow public scrutiny of public records.⁵⁵ The existing state law framework on transparency is the Ralph M. Brown Act⁵⁶ enacted in 1953, and the California Public Records Act⁵⁷ enacted in 1968.

The Brown Act and the Public Records Act set the floors for San Francisco government transparency. Both permit local jurisdictions to enact ordinances whose transparency requirements are greater than those established in the state laws.

The San Francisco Sunshine ordinance was passed by the Board of Supervisors and went into effect on January 1, 1994.⁵⁸ The ordinance follows the California Brown Act and the California Public Records Act. Its purposes are broadly stated:

⁵⁵ Proposition 59 - passed Legislature unanimously, and was approved by 83.4% of the 2004 voters. Now codified as Article I, § 3(b) of California Constitution.

⁵⁶ Government Code §§ 54950 et seq

⁵⁷ Government Code § 6250 through § 6276.48. This law is modeled on the Federal Freedom of Information Act.

⁵⁸ The San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance — Added by Ord. 265-93, App. 8/18/93; amended by Proposition G, approved November 2, 1999, codified Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code. Kevin Shelley took the lead in moving the ordinance through the Board of Supervisors. It passed 11-0 in 1993, was signed by then-Mayor Frank Jordan and became effective on 1/1/94.

Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense

- a. Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public.
- b. Commissions, boards, councils and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. The ordinance will assure that their deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review.

Over the next few years, sunshine activists noted difficulties with the implementation of the Sunshine Ordinance and developed revisions mandating greater public access to City records. By petition, their amendments, touching on every section of the ordinance, went on the ballot and were adopted by the voters in November 1999.⁵⁹

Transparency In Campaigns

The core state law is the Political Reform Act of 1974, a ballot measure approved by the voters in June 1974.⁶⁰ The Political Reform Act also established the Fair Political Practices Commission (FPPC). These established a reporting framework at the state level while authorizing local officials to act as local filing agents for the FPPC.

From its inception, the Ethics Commission was designated as the local filing agent for the FPPC, so it receives all local campaign filings and enforces local requirements that go beyond FPPC requirements. For example, in 1997, voters approved a proposal requiring campaign consultants to register with the Ethics Commission, reporting on their clients, services provided and payments received.

Campaign disclosures and regulations have been more closely judged in recent years under the First Amendment to the United States Constitution.⁶¹ Several significant cases decided by the United States Supreme Court have struck down campaign finance limits as infringing free speech, while affirming the importance and availability of mandated disclosures of campaign finances.⁶²

The Problem Of Contractor Contributions

San Francisco's law prohibits contributions to the candidate or candidate-election committee that has a role in approving the contract from those who are seeking contract approvals. This is intended to maintain an arms-length relationship between officials and donors seeking contract approvals.

San Francisco voters approved a measure making it illegal for City officials and the political committees they control to solicit or accept any campaign contributions from someone who has a contract that the official will decide and making it the responsibility of an elected official to

⁵⁹ Proposition G (1999) passed by a 58-42 margin despite public opposition by then-Mayor Willie Brown, seven supervisors, the Democratic and Republican county central committees, the Chamber of Commerce, SPUR and the Chronicle.

⁶⁰ Generally codified in the Government Code §§ 81000 et seq

⁶¹ "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances."

⁶² See *McCutcheon v Federal Election Commission* 572 U. S. ____ (2014), *Citizens United v Federal Election Commission* 558 US 310 (2010) , *Federal Election Commission v Wisconsin Right to Life* 551 US 449 (2007)

Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense

convey contributions from City contractors to the City, although the Ethics Commission may waive or reduce the forfeiture.⁶³ San Francisco also prohibits contributions that are reimbursed by another person or entity that skirts the contribution limits.

San Francisco's Campaign Finance Reform Ordinance prohibits contributions from City contractors and from officers or Board members of City contractors.⁶⁴

Ethics Laws

"Public office is a public trust and all officers and employees of the City and County shall exercise their public duties in a manner consistent with this trust."⁶⁵

Ethics laws start from the general concept of public service as a public trust, with the power of public office to be exercised fairly and impartially. They further caution officers and employees to avoid the appearance of impropriety.

The Charter further says: the breach of "the standard of decency, good faith and right action" is grounds for removal of a public officer.⁶⁶

The City conflict of interest laws⁶⁷ articulate basic principles:

Governmental processes must promote fairness and equity for all residents; for the people to maintain public trust in governmental institutions, conflicts of interest and outside activities of public officers and employees must be regulated. Public officers and employees cannot buy their appointment or accept anything of value from their subordinates, and they must not participate in decisions related to their own character or conduct or that of their family members.

Public officers and employees must be independent, impartial, and responsible to the people and not use public office and employment for personal gain. Their decisions should be, and should appear to be, made on a fair and impartial basis.

This Jury cannot emphasize strongly enough the importance of avoiding the appearance of impropriety. The laws in this area grow more and more complex; avoiding inadvertent violations becomes difficult. But an effort to soften the law in special cases often creates loopholes that swallow the entire law.

State law bars contractual conflicts of interest of public officers and employees.⁶⁸ This was first placed in California laws in 1851 and codified common law prohibitions against self-dealing.

⁶³ C&GCC §1.126(c) and (d) - added by 2008 Prop H

⁶⁴ C&GCC §1.126(b)

⁶⁵ § 15.103 of the San Francisco Charter

⁶⁶ § 15.105(e) of the San Francisco Charter

⁶⁷ Chapter 2 of Article III of C&GCC, re-adopted by the voters in 2003

⁶⁸ Government Code § 1090 provides:

"Members of the Legislature, state, county, district, judicial district, and city officers or employees shall not be financially interested in any contract made by them in their official capacity, or by any body or board of which they are members."

Courts routinely void contracts entered into in violation of §1090.

Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense

The Political Reform Act of 1974 adds more laws on conflict of interest, mandating disclosure of economic interests, gifts, behested payments among others.

In 2000, the Board of Supervisors gathered together all these local laws into the San Francisco Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code. State laws on financial conflict of interest - both in the California Political Reform Act and in §1090 of Government Code - are expressly incorporated into San Francisco ordinances by §3.206 of the C&GCC.

In 2003, voters approved an “omnibus ethics reform.” Proposition E was promoted as updating and clarifying City laws on ethics and conflicts of interest.⁶⁹ It moved some Charter provisions into ordinance, and authorized future amendments to the Campaign Finance ordinance and to the Conflict of Interest ordinance by 4/5 of the Ethics Commission and 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors rather than by the voters.

Anti-Corruption Laws

Corruption is the abuse of entrusted power for private gain.

Corrupt behavior is the opposite of ethical behavior. Rather than using power consistent with public trust, the entrusted power is used for private gain. Corruption is a crime and is controlled by treating it as a crime—charging corrupt officials as criminals and jailing them.

Corruption charges tend to be brought under more general criminal laws: bribery, fraud, extortion, embezzlement, conflict of interest, nepotism, influence-peddling, mail fraud wire fraud, failure to provide honest services, some racketeering laws, and facilitating criminal activity (i.e., money laundering and drug trafficking).⁷⁰

Quid pro quo corruption, both actual and in appearance, is currently where campaign regulation is allowed. But there are definitional problems once one goes beyond the obvious “money for a permit”.

Process To Amend The Laws

Some laws can be amended more easily than others because some of these laws were passed by the voters, some are modeled on state laws, and others were passed by the Board of Supervisors.

We count at least 22 local ballot questions in the last 65 years related to campaign finance, ethics, conflict of interest, and transparency, 16 since 1980. And we certainly have not identified all of them.

The voters approved many of the San Francisco laws we discuss here. Unless the voters approved a different process to amend the proposition in the future, the voters must approve any future amendments.

At the state level, the Political Reform Act when approved by the voters contained such a process—the Act can be amended in ways to further its purposes by a two-thirds vote of the

⁶⁹ Put on the ballot by the Board of Supervisors – Legislative File No. 030681 – Ammiano lead sponsor.

⁷⁰ See <http://www.fbi.gov/news/stories/2013/april/a-look-back-at-the-william-j.-jefferson-corruption-case>

Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense

legislature and signed by the governor. Other amendments or a repeal require a vote of the people.⁷¹

The original Ethics Commission Charter amendment had no provision for its amendment, nor did the many conflict of interest provisions then in the Charter.

A significant feature of Proposition E, passed the voters in 2003, was to allow future amendments to the campaign finance laws⁷² and the conflict of interest laws⁷³ by a 4/5 vote of the Ethics Commission followed by a 2/3 vote of the Board of Supervisors if the amendment "furthers the purposes of this Chapter". Meet and confer may apply before changes take effect - conflict of interest rules affect City employees, for example, who are virtually all unionized.

The Sunshine Ordinance, though originally passed by the Board of Supervisors, was completely re-enacted by the voters when revised in 1999, and has no section on how it can be amended. As a result, any amendments will require submission to the voters.

The Campaign Consultant chapter - passed by the voters - can only be amended by the voters.

The Board of Supervisors, Ethics Commission and City Attorney have a "work around" that allows some small amendments to these laws by ordinances that supplement them. A new chapter banning the use of cell phones at public meetings supplemented the Sunshine Ordinance.⁷⁴ New sections requiring that campaign consultant reports be filed electronically and cross-referencing certain lobbying prohibitions for campaign consultants supplemented the Campaign Consultant ordinance.⁷⁵

Finding The Laws

We considered having an appendix with the laws, but there are so many of them and they keep changing. With the Web tools available today, the laws can be easily found.

One good starting site is a page on the laws maintained by the Ethics Commission, currently found at: <http://www.sfethics.org/ethics/2009/05/law-advice.html#i>

This has links to the San Francisco Charter and Codes currently maintained by City American Legal:
http://www.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll?f=templates&fn=default.htm&vid=amlegal:sanfrancisco_ca

This page also links to the Commission's own regulations and bylaws, Statements of Incompatible Activities and the Sunshine Ordinance.

⁷¹ See § 81012

⁷² C&GCC Article 1, Chapter 1— § 1.103

⁷³ C&GCC Article 3, Chapter 2 — § 3.204 "the Board of Supervisors may amend this chapter if..."

⁷⁴ §67a.1 of the Administrative Code, added by Ord. 286-00, File No. 001155, App. 12/22/2000.

⁷⁵ §1.540 - Electronic Reporting and §1.545 Construction with other laws - were adopted later by ordinance as part of this chapter.

Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense

When researching the San Francisco Code, note that each section has some notes on when it was adopted and amended. The File Number of each change can searched on the Board of Supervisors Web site.⁷⁶

State law is best found on the FPPC site: Their home page: <http://www.fppc.ca.gov/>

The Political Reform Act is found at: <http://www.fppc.ca.gov/index.php?id=51>

⁷⁶ For example, a recent change in the Findings in the Lobbyist Ordinance is "Ord. 235-09, File No. 090833, App. 11/10/2009". The Ordinance number ends in 09, meaning 2009; the file number starts with 09, meaning it was considered in 2009. <https://sfgov.legistar.com/Legislation.aspx> is a search page for legislation. Put the number into the search box and specify the search is for 2009 and you get the link to file: <https://sfgov.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=483810&GUID=6FE013C0-2582-4665-B766-92A9A0C60143&Options=ID|Text|&Search=090833> The new page gives links to versions and the meeting information for each step of the legislative process.

APPENDIX TWO

Behested Payments - Example

Here are some large recently reported behested payment reports. Behested payment reports are filed with the Ethics Commission with the most recent filings found at:

http://www.sfethics.org/ethics/Payments_Made_at_the_Behest_of_an_Elected_Officer/

Example forms include:

Four payments to the America's Cup Organizing Committee. Three from June 2013 and one from January 2014.

Behested Payment Report		A Public Document		Behested Payment Report
1. Elected Officer or CPUC Member <i>(Last name, First name)</i> Lee, Edwin M. Agency Name Office of the Mayor Agency Street Address City Hall, Room 200, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, S.F., CA 94102 Designated Contact Person <i>(Name and title, if different)</i> Olga A. Ryerson Area Code/Phone Number E-mail <i>(Optional)</i> (415) 554-6910 olga.ryerson@sfgov.org		Date Stamp 2013 JUL 11 AM 10:42 SAN FRANCISCO FPPC COMMISSION	California Form 803 For Official Use Only	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Amendment <i>(See Part 5)</i> Date of Original Filing: _____ <i>(month, day, year)</i>		
2. Payor Information <i>(For additional payors, include an attachment with the names and addresses.)</i> TMG Partners Name Address: _____ San Francisco CA 94104 City State Zip Code				
3. Payee Information <i>(For additional payees, include an attachment with the names and addresses.)</i> America's Cup Organizing Committee (ACOC) Name Address: _____ San Francisco CA 94133 City State Zip Code				
4. Payment Information <i>(Complete all information.)</i> Date of Payment: <u>06/12/2013</u> Amount of Payment: <i>(In-Kind FMV)</i> \$ <u>\$25,000.00</u> <i>(month, day, year)</i> <i>(Round to whole dollars.)</i> Payment Type: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Monetary Donation or <input type="checkbox"/> In-Kind Goods or Services <i>(Provide description below.)</i> Brief Description of In-Kind Payment: <u>Stock Transfer</u> Purpose: <i>(Check one and provide description below.)</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Legislative <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Governmental <input type="checkbox"/> Charitable Describe the legislative, governmental, charitable purpose, or event: <u>America's Cup Organizing Committee (ACOC) - To help pay for costs associated with the City hosting the San Francisco America's Cup.</u>				
5. Amendment Description or Comments _____ _____ _____				
6. Verification I certify, under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California, that to the best of my knowledge, the information contained herein is true and complete.				
Executed on <u>July 10, 2013</u> DATE		By _____ SIGNATURE OF ELECTED OFFICER OR CPUC MEMBER		

Behested Payment Report **A Public Document** Behested Payment Report

1. Elected Officer or CPUC Member <i>(Last name, First name)</i> Lee, Edwin M. Agency Name Office of the Mayor Agency Street Address City Hall, Room 200, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, S.F., CA 94102 Designated Contact Person <i>(Name and title, if different)</i> Olga A. Ryerson Area Code/Phone Number E-mail <i>(Optional)</i> (415) 554-6910 olga.ryerson@sfgov.org	Date Stamp 2013 JUL 11 AM 10:45 SAN FRANCISCO ETHICS COMMISSION	California Form 803 For Official Use Only
BY <input type="checkbox"/> Amendment <i>(See Part 5)</i> Date of Original Filing: _____ <i>(month, day, year)</i>		

2. Payor Information *(For additional payors, include an attachment with the names and addresses.)*

Name: Kilroy Realty Corporation

Address: _____ San Francisco CA 94105
City State Zip Code

3. Payee Information *(For additional payees, include an attachment with the names and addresses.)*

Name: America's Cup Organizing Committee (ACOC)

Address: _____ San Francisco CA 94133
City State Zip Code

4. Payment Information *(Complete all information.)*

Date of Payment: 06/24/2013 Amount of Payment: *(In-Kind FMV)* \$ \$500,000.00
(month, day, year) *(Round to whole dollars.)*

Payment Type: Monetary Donation or In-Kind Goods or Services *(Provide description below.)*

Brief Description of In-Kind Payment: Check

Purpose: *(Check one and provide description below.)* Legislative Governmental Charitable

Describe the legislative, governmental, charitable purpose, or event: America's Cup Organizing Committee
(ACOC) - To help pay for costs associated with the City hosting the San Francisco America's Cup.

5. Amendment Description or Comments

6. Verification

I certify, under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California, that to the best of my knowledge, the information contained herein is true and complete.

Executed on July 10, 2013 By _____
DATE SIGNATURE OF ELECTED OFFICER OR CPUC MEMBER

FPPC Form 803 (December/09)
 FPPC Toll-Free Helpline: 866/ASK-FPPC (866/275-3772)

Behested Payment Report		A Public Document		Behested Payment Report
1. Elected Officer or CPUC Member <i>(Last name, First name)</i> Lee, Edwin M. Agency Name Office of the Mayor Agency Street Address City Hall, Room 200, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, S.F., CA 94102 Designated Contact Person <i>(Name and title, if different)</i> Olga A. Ryerson Area Code/Phone Number E-mail <i>(Optional)</i> (415) 554-8910 olga.ryerson@sfgov.org		Date Stamp 2013 JUL 11 AM 10:46 FPPC COMMISSION	California Form 803 For Official Use Only	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Amendment <i>(See Part 5)</i> Date of Original Filing: _____ <i>(month, day, year)</i>		
2. Payor Information <i>(For additional payors, include an attachment with the names and addresses.)</i> Bay Area Council Name Address: _____ San Francisco CA 94111 City State Zip Code				
3. Payee Information <i>(For additional payees, include an attachment with the names and addresses.)</i> America's Cup Organizing Committee (ACOC) Name Address: _____ San Francisco CA 94133 City State Zip Code				
4. Payment Information <i>(Complete all information.)</i> Date of Payment: <u>06/26/2013</u> Amount of Payment: <i>(In-Kind FMV)</i> \$ <u>\$150,000.00</u> <i>(month, day, year)</i> <i>(Round to whole dollars.)</i> Payment Type: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Monetary Donation or <input type="checkbox"/> In-Kind Goods or Services <i>(Provide description below.)</i> Brief Description of In-Kind Payment: <u>Check</u> Purpose: <i>(Check one and provide description below.)</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Legislative <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Governmental <input type="checkbox"/> Charitable Describe the legislative, governmental, charitable purpose, or event: <u>America's Cup Organizing Committee (ACOC) - To help pay for costs associated with the City hosting the San Francisco America's Cup.</u>				
5. Amendment Description or Comments _____ _____				
6. Verification I certify, under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California, that to the best of my knowledge, the information contained herein is true and complete. Executed on <u>July 10, 2013</u> By _____ DATE SIGNATURE OF ELECTED OFFICER OR CPUC MEMBER				

Behested Payment Report **A Public Document** **Behested Payment Report**

1. Elected Officer or CPUC Member (Last name, First name)		Date Stamp FIL 14 FEB 12 PM 2:35	California Form 803 For Official Use Only
Lee, Edwin M.			
Agency Name		SAN FRANCISCO ETHICS COMMISSION	
Office of the Mayor			
Agency Street Address			
City Hall, Room 200, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, S.F., CA 94102			
Designated Contact Person (Name and title, if different)		<input type="checkbox"/> Amendment (See Part 5)	
Olga A. Ryerson		Date of Original Filing: _____ (month, day, year)	
Area Code/Phone Number	E-mail (Optional)		
(415) 554-6910	olga.ryerson@sfgov.org		

2. Payor Information (For additional payors, include an attachment with the names and addresses.)

Kilroy Realty Corporation

Name

Address: [Redacted] Los Angeles CA 90064

City State Zip Code

3. Payee Information (For additional payees, include an attachment with the names and addresses.)

America's Cup Organizing Committee (ACOC)

Name

Address: [Redacted] San Francisco CA 94111

City State Zip Code

4. Payment Information (Complete all information.)

Date of Payment: 1/31/2014 (month, day, year) Amount of Payment: (In-Kind FMV) \$ \$500,000 (Round to whole dollars.)

Payment Type: Monetary Donation or In-Kind Goods or Services (Provide description below.)

Brief Description of In-Kind Payment: _____

Purpose: (Check one and provide description below.) Legislative Governmental Charitable

Describe the legislative, governmental, charitable purpose, or event: America's Cup Organizing Committee (ACOC) - To help pay for costs associated with the City hosting the San Francisco America's Cup.

5. Amendment Description or Comments

6. Verification

I certify, under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California, that to the best of my knowledge, the information contained herein is true and complete.

Executed on February 10, 2014 By [Redacted Signature]

DATE SIGNATURE OF ELECTED OFFICER OR CPUC MEMBER

APPENDIX THREE

Gifts of Travel Example

Here are examples of Gifts of Travel Forms files in 2013. For most trips, a form is filed before the trip, and a revised form is filed after the trip when the final costs are known.

Forms are filed with the Ethics Commission and are posted online in a series of web pages with the most recent filings found at:

http://www.sfethics.org/ethics/Gifts_of_Travel/

Example forms include:

- Trip to Hong Kong/Beijing/Guangzhou/Macao 3/29/13 to 4/07/13
- Trip to Shanghai/Seoul 10/16/13-10/21/13
- Trip to Bangalore, India 11/29/13-12/10/13

Form SFEC-3.216(d)
Cover Page

FILED
Amended 4/29/2013
13 APR 30 PM 4:33
SAN FRANCISCO
ETHICS COMMISSION

Please type or print legibly in ink.

1. Information regarding Elected Officer:			BY _____
Name (Last)	(First)	(Middle)	Daytime Telephone
Lee	Edwin	Mah	(415) 554-6910
Mailing Address	Street	Zip	Fax Telephone
City Hall, Room 200, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place 94102			(415) 554-6113
Office Held	Email Address		
Mayor	mayoredwinlee@sfgov.org		

2. Purpose of Travel:
To visit China to promote business and cultural exchange and to sign an MOU at the Cultural Ministry.

To promote the Chinese New Year Parade, the San Francisco Symphony, and the Asian Art Museum.

To meet with the new leadership of China.

3. Dates of Travel and Itinerary:

03/29/13	SF/Hong Kong (thru 3/31/13)
03/31/13	Hong Kong/Beijing (thru 4/3/13)
04/03/13	Beijing/Guangzhou (thru 4/5/13)
04/05/13	Guangzhou/Chuhai/Macau (thru 4/7/13)
04/07/13	Macau/San Francisco

4. Schedule Summary:
Total number of pages, including this cover page 3

Check applicable schedules:

Schedule A Yes - schedule attached
Gift of transportation, lodging or subsistence

Schedule B Yes - schedule attached
Gift to the City of transportation, lodging or subsistence

Schedule C Yes - schedule attached
Reimbursement to the City of gift of transportation, lodging or subsistence

5. Verification:
I have used all reasonable diligence in preparing this statement. I have reviewed this statement and to the best of my knowledge, the information contained herein and in any attached schedules is true and complete.

I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Date signed 4/29/2013

Signature _____

**Form SFEC-3.216(d)
Schedule A – Gifts of Travel**

1. Information regarding entity funding gift of transportation, lodging or subsistence

Full Name of Entity:
San Francisco Chinese Chamber of Commerce*

Address:
[Redacted] San Francisco CA 94108
Street City State Zip

Name of Contact Person:
Rose Pak

Email Address: [Redacted] Telephone:
[Redacted] (415) 982-3000

3. Cost of transportation, lodging or subsistence

A. Please list the total amount of costs that will be paid by the entity to fund the elected officer's travel, including but not limited to the amount directly related to the cost of the officer's transportation, lodging and subsistence.
**\$9,240.00

B. Please list the amount in Item A that is directly related to the cost of the officer's transportation, lodging and subsistence.
**\$9,240.00

2. Information regarding contributors who contributed more than \$500 to the entity to fund the trip

Please list the name, occupation and employer of any contributor who contributed more than \$500 to the entity funding the trip and whose contributions were used in whole or in part to fund the trip:

None (Please see attached schedule for additional information)

Name of Contributor

Occupation of Contributor

Employer of Contributor

Name of Contributor

Occupation of Contributor

Employer of Contributor

Name of Contributor

Occupation of Contributor

Employer of Contributor

Check box if additional schedules are attached.

4. Information regarding persons accompanying the elected officer

Please list the name of any individual who is

- (a) a City employee required to file a Statement of Economic Interests,
- (b) a lobbyist or campaign consultant registered with the Ethics Commission;
- (c) an employee of or individual who has an ownership interest in a lobbyist or campaign consultant registered with the Ethics Commission; or
- (d) an employee or officer of the entity that will pay for the gift of transportation, lodging or subsistence, and

who is accompanying the elected officer on the trip.

Please identify whether the individual is category (a), (b), (c), or (d), as described above.

Name of Individual	Category
Please see attached.	
_____	_____
_____	_____

Check box if additional schedules are attached.

Notes:
*The SF Chinese Chamber of Commerce acted as the intermediary for gifts of travel listed on the attached schedule. Each person listed contributed \$220 to help defray Mayor's cost of the trip. One additional donor is reported on this form.
**The cost of transportation, lodging or subsistence is updated. The amount listed is half of the total cost of this trip for the Mayor and Mrs. Anita Lee. The cost reported on the original Form SFEC-3.216(d), filed with the Ethics Commission on March 28, 2013, included the total cost for lodging for both the Mayor and Mrs. Lee. Mrs. Lee's total cost will be reported on the Mayor's Form 700 for 2013, due to the Ethics Commission by April 1, 2014. This is consistent with our reporting criteria.

Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense

Form SFEC-3.216(d)
 Edwin M. Lee
 3/29/13 – 4/7/13 China

Section 2. Information regarding contributors who contributed more than \$500 to the entity to fund the trip.

*Following is a schedule of persons contributing \$220 to defray the cost of the Mayor's trip:

Name of Contributor	Occupation of Contributor	Employer of Contributor
Willie L. Brown, Jr.	Former SF Mayor	N/A
Rose Lan Pak	General Consultant	SF Chinese Chamber of Commerce
Eddie Kwok-Hung Au	First Vice President	SF Chinese Chamber of Commerce
Susana Lau Au	Owner	Man Hing Ivory
Serena Huaidan Chen	Director	American Pacific International Capital, Inc.
Wilson Huaisheng Chen	President	American Pacific International Capital, Inc.
Kwan Shan Cheung	President	Huntar Company
Denn Hu	Chairman	Universal Paragon Corporation, SF
Gorretti Lui Lo	Director	Harbor View Holdings, Inc.
Sonya Molodelskaya	Commissioner	Immigrant Rights Commission
Geoffrey Mark Palermo	President	Evon Corporations
Wayne Perry	Chairman	Cornerstone Concillum, Inc.
Edward Michael Riordan	Lawyer	Retired
Gloria Becerra Riordan	N/A	N/A
Justin Tin	Dentist	JT Dental Group
Kinson Kin Wong	Owner	R & G Lounge
Ringo Wong	Owner	Tomokazu Japanese Cuisine
Tony Zhang	Owner	Bel Builders
Benny Zhang	Chief Financial Officer	Bel Builders
Alan Chan	Manager	Good View Lumber and Building Supply
Stephen Huang	Manager	MTC Maple Trade Corporation
Alfred Lee	President	GLT Investment
Xiao Dan Zhou	Manager Member	Urban Property Venture
Monica Huie	Buyer	Kwan Wo Construction
David Li	Project Manager	Kwan Wo Construction
Fay Chu	Administrator	Kwan Wo Construction
Kelvin Shum	Account Manager	Kwan Wo Construction
Double AA Corporation	N/A	N/A
GAWFCO Enterprises	N/A	N/A
Anderson Enterprises, Inc.	N/A	N/A
Mercedes-Benz of SF	N/A	N/A
John Khau	Vice President	Boyett Construction
James Robert	President	Boyett Construction
Wayne Huie	President	Young Electric
Chuck Walters	Vice President	Young Electric
Gin Yi Ho	Loan Officer	Chinese Trust Bank
Ed Lew	N/A	Retired
Stephen Fong	N/A	Retired
Hongli Wang	Housewife	N/A
Victor Zhang	Director of Purchasing	Haiyi Hotel
Kebing Zhang	Manager	American Pacific International Capital, Inc.
*Clement Chan	Office Manager	JT Dental Group

Section 4. Information regarding persons accompanying the elected officer:

Rose Lan Pak, General Consultant, Chinese Chamber of Commerce (d)
 Eddie Kwok-Hung, First Vice President, Chinese Chamber of Commerce (d)
 Shih-Wei Lu, Mayor's Office of Communications (a)
 Matthew Goudeau Director, Mayor's Office of Protocol (a)
 Mark Chandler, Director, Mayor's Office of International Trade & Commerce (a)
 Harlan L. Kelly, Jr., General Manager, Public Utilities Commission (a)
 Mohammed Nuru, Director, Department of Public Works (a)
 Jay Xu, Director and CEO, Asian Art Museum of San Francisco (a)
 Kandance Bender, Deputy Airport Director, SF International Airport (a)

**Form SFEC-3.216(d)
Cover Page**

FILED
13 MAR 28 PM 3:05

SAN FRANCISCO
ETHICS COMMISSION

Please type or print legibly in ink.

I. Information regarding Elected Officer:			
Name (Last)	(First)	(Middle)	BY _____
Lee	Edwin	Mah	Daytime Telephone (415) 554-6910
Mailing Address	Street	Zip	Fax Telephone
City Hall, Room 200, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place		94102	(415) 554-6113
Office Held	Email Address		
Mayor	mayoredwinlee@sfgov.org		

2. Purpose of Travel:
To visit China to promote business and cultural exchange and to sign an MOU at the Cultural Ministry.

To promote the Chinese New Year Parade, the San Francisco Symphony, and the Asian Art Museum.

Top meet with the new leadership of China.

3. Dates of Travel and Itinerary:

03/29/13	SF/Hong Kong (thru 3/31/13)
Month/Day/Year	City, State, Country
03/31/13	Hong Kong/Beijing (thru 4/3/13)
04/03/13	Beijing/Guangzhou (thru 4/5/13)
04/05/13	Guangzhou/Chuhai/Macau (thru 4/7/13)
04/07/13	Macau/San Francisco

4. Schedule Summary:
Total number of pages, including this cover page 3

Check applicable schedules:

Schedule A Yes - schedule attached
Gift of transportation, lodging or subsistence

Schedule B Yes - schedule attached
Gift to the City of transportation, lodging or subsistence

Schedule C Yes - schedule attached
Reimbursement to the City of gift of transportation, lodging or subsistence

5. Verification:
I have used all reasonable diligence in preparing this statement. I have reviewed this statement and to the best of my knowledge, the information contained herein and in any attached schedules is true and complete.

I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Date signed 3/28/13

Signature _____

**Form SFEC-3.216(d)
Schedule A – Gifts of Travel**

1. Information regarding entity funding gift of transportation, lodging or subsistence

Full Name of Entity:
San Francisco Chinese Chamber of Commerce*

Address:
[Redacted] San Francisco CA 94108
Street City State Zip

Name of Contact Person:
Rose Pak

Email Address: [Redacted] Telephone:
[Redacted] (415) 982-3000

3. Cost of transportation, lodging or subsistence

A. Please list the total amount of costs that will be paid by the entity to fund the elected officer's travel, including but not limited to the amount directly related to the cost of the officer's transportation, lodging and subsistence.
\$11,970

B. Please list the amount in Item A that is directly related to the cost of the officer's transportation, lodging and subsistence.
\$11,970

2. Information regarding contributors who contributed more than \$500 to the entity to fund the trip

Please list the name, occupation and employer of any contributor who contributed more than \$500 to the entity funding the trip and whose contributions were used in whole or in part to fund the trip:

None (Please see attached schedule for additional information)

Name of Contributor: _____
Occupation of Contributor: _____
Employer of Contributor: _____

Name of Contributor: _____
Occupation of Contributor: _____
Employer of Contributor: _____

Name of Contributor: _____
Occupation of Contributor: _____
Employer of Contributor: _____

Check box if additional schedules are attached.

4. Information regarding persons accompanying the elected officer

Please list the name of any individual who is

- (a) a City employee required to file a Statement of Economic Interests,
- (b) a lobbyist or campaign consultant registered with the Ethics Commission;
- (c) an employee of or individual who has an ownership interest in a lobbyist or campaign consultant registered with the Ethics Commission; or
- (d) an employee or officer of the entity that will pay for the gift of transportation, lodging or subsistence, and

who is accompanying the elected officer on the trip.

Please identify whether the individual is category (a), (b), (c), or (d), as described above.

Name of Individual	Category
Please see attached.	

Check box if additional schedules are attached.

*Note: The SF Chinese Chamber of Commerce acted as the intermediary for gifts of travel listed on the attached schedule. Each person listed contributed \$440 to help defray the cost of the Mayor's trip.

Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense

Form SFEC-3.216(d)
 Edwin M. Lee
 3/29/13 – 4/7/13 China

Section 2. Information regarding contributors who contributed more than \$500 to the entity to fund the trip.

Following is a schedule of persons contributing \$440 to defray the cost of the Mayor's trip:

Name of Contributor	Occupation of Contributor	Employer of Contributor
Willie L. Brown, Jr.	Former SF Mayor	N/A
Rose Lan Pak	General Consultant	SF Chinese Chamber of Commerce
Eddie Kwok-Hung Au	First Vice President	SF Chinese Chamber of Commerce
Susana Lau Au	Owner	Man Hing Ivory
Serena Huaidan Chen	Director	American Pacific International Capital, Inc.
Wilson Huaisheng Chen	President	American Pacific International Capital, Inc.
Kwan Shan Cheung	President	Hunter Company
Denn Hu	Chairman	Universal Paragon Corporation, SF
Gorretti Lui Lo	Director	Harbor View Holdings, Inc.
Sonya Molodetskaya	Commissioner	Immigrant Rights Commission
Geoffrey Mark Palermo	President	Evon Corporations
Wayne Perry	Chairman	Cornerstone Concillum, Inc.
Edward Michael Riordan	Lawyer	Retired
Gloria Becerra Riordan	N/A	N/A
Justin Tin	Dentist	JT Dental Group
Kinson Kin Wong	Owner	R & G Lounge
Ringo Wong	Owner	Tomokazu Japanese Cuisine
Tony Zhang	Owner	Bel Builders
Benny Zhang	Chief Financial Officer	Bel Builders
Alan Chan	Manager	Good View Lumber and Building Supply
Stephen Huang	Manager	MTC Maple Trade Corporation
Alfred Lee	President	GLT Investment
Xiao Dan Zhou	Manager Member	Urban Property Venture
Monica Huie	Buyer	Kwan Wo Construction
David Li	Project Manager	Kwan Wo Construction
Fay Chu	Administrator	Kwan Wo Construction
Kelvin Shum	Account Manager	Kwan Wo Construction
Double AA Corporation	N/A	N/A
GAWFCO Enterprises	N/A	N/A
Anderson Enterprises, Inc.	N/A	N/A
Mercedes-Benz of SF	N/A	N/A
John Khau	Vice President	Boyett Construction
James Robert	President	Boyett Construction
Wayne Huie	President	Young Electric
Chuck Walters	Vice President	Young Electric
Gin Yi Ho	Loan Officer	Chinese Trust Bank
Ed Lew	N/A	Retired
Stephen Fong	N/A	Retired
Hongli Wang	Housewife	N/A
Victor Zhang	Director of Purchasing	Haiyi Hotel
Kebing Zhang	Manager	American Pacific International Capital, Inc.

Section 4. Information regarding persons accompanying the elected officer:

- Rose Lan Pak, General Consultant, Chinese Chamber of Commerce (d)
- Eddie Kwok-Hung, First Vice President, Chinese Chamber of Commerce (d)
- Shih-Wei Lu, Mayor's Office of Communications (a)
- Matthew Goudeau Director, Mayor's Office of Protocol (a)
- Mark Chandler, Director, Mayor's Office of International Trade & Commerce (a)
- Harlan L. Kelly, Jr., General Manager, Public Utilities Commission (a)
- Mohammed Nuru, Director, Department of Public Works (a)
- Jay Xu, Director and CEO, Asian Art Museum of San Francisco (a)
- Kandance Bender, Deputy Airport Director, SF International Airport (a)

Revised 11/07/13
(Dates changed to reflect shortened trip)

**Form SFEC-3.216(d)
Cover Page**

13 NOV -3 AM 11:42

SAFRANCSICO
ETHICS COMMISSION

Please type or print legibly in ink.

1. Information regarding Elected Officer:			
Name (Last)	(First)	(Middle)	Daytime Telephone
Lee	Edwin	Mah	(415) 554-6910
Mailing Address	Street	Zip	Fax Telephone
City Hall, Rm. 200, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., S.F., CA		94102	(415) 554-6113
Office Held	Email Address		
Mayor	mayoredwinlee@sfgov.org		

2. Purpose of Travel:
This mission to China and Korea will provide significant opportunities for cultural and educational exchanges and economic partnerships of great benefit to San Francisco.

4. Schedule Summary:
Total number of pages, including this cover page 2

Check applicable schedules:

Schedule A Yes - schedule attached
Gift of transportation, lodging or subsistence

Schedule B Yes - schedule attached
Gift to the City of transportation, lodging or subsistence

Schedule C Yes - schedule attached
Reimbursement to the City of gift of transportation, lodging or subsistence


3. Dates of Travel and Itinerary:

10/16/13	San Francisco - Shanghai, China
Month/Day/Year	City, State, Country
10/20/13	Shanghai - Seoul, Korea
10/21/13	Seoul - San Francisco

5. Verification:
I have used all reasonable diligence in preparing this statement. I have reviewed this statement and to the best of my knowledge, the information contained herein and in any attached schedules is true and complete.

I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Date signed 11/08/13

Signature 

**Form SFEC-3.216(d)
Schedule A – Gifts of Travel**

1. Information regarding entity funding gift of transportation, lodging or subsistence

Full Name of Entity:
San Francisco Shanghai Sister City Committee

Address:
809 Sacramento St. San Francisco CA 94108
Street City State Zip

Name of Contact Person:
James Fang, Chairman

Email Address: _____ Telephone: _____
(415) 397-0220

3. Cost of transportation, lodging or subsistence

A. Please list the total amount of costs that will be paid by the entity to fund the elected officer's travel, including but not limited to the amount directly related to the cost of the officer's transportation, lodging and subsistence.
\$20,500.00

B. Please list the amount in Item A that is directly related to the cost of the officer's transportation, lodging and subsistence.
\$20,500.00

2. Information regarding contributors who contributed more than \$500 to the entity to fund the trip

Please list the name, occupation and employer of any contributor who contributed more than \$500 to the entity funding the trip and whose contributions were used in whole or in part to fund the trip:

See attached.

Name of Contributor	
Occupation of Contributor	
Employer of Contributor	
Name of Contributor	
Occupation of Contributor	
Employer of Contributor	
Name of Contributor	
Occupation of Contributor	
Employer of Contributor	

Check box if additional schedules are attached.

4. Information regarding persons accompanying the elected officer

Please list the name of any individual who is

- (a) a City employee required to file a Statement of Economic Interests,
- (b) a lobbyist or campaign consultant registered with the Ethics Commission;
- (c) an employee of or individual who has an ownership interest in a lobbyist or campaign consultant registered with the Ethics Commission; or
- (d) an employee or officer of the entity that will pay for the gift of transportation, lodging or subsistence, and

who is accompanying the elected officer on the trip.

Please identify whether the individual is category (a), (b), (c), or (d), as described above.

Name of Individual	Category
See attached.	

Check box if additional schedules are attached.

*The cost of transportation, lodging or subsistence is the total cost of this trip for the Mayor and shared costs for Mrs. Anita Lee (lodging and transportation). Mrs. Lee's total costs will be reported on the Mayor's Form 700 for 2013, due to the Ethics Commission by April 1, 2014.

**Form SFEC-3.216(d)
Cover Page**

FILED
19 OCT 11 PM 3:38
SUTHERLAND
ETHICS COMMISSION

Please type or print legibly in ink.

1. Information regarding Elected Officer:			BY _____
Name (Last)	(First)	(Middle)	Daytime Telephone
Lee	Edwin	Mah	(415) 554-6910
Mailing Address	Street	Zip	Fax Telephone
City Hall, Rm. 200, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., S.F., CA 94102			(415) 554-6113
Office Held	Email Address		
Mayor	mayoredwinlee@sfgov.org		

2. Purpose of Travel:
This mission to China and Korea will provide significant opportunities for cultural and educational exchanges and economic partnerships of great benefit to San Francisco.

4. Schedule Summary:
Total number of pages, including this cover page 2

Check applicable schedules:

Schedule A Yes - schedule attached
Gift of transportation, lodging or subsistence

Schedule B Yes - schedule attached
Gift to the City of transportation, lodging or subsistence

Schedule C Yes - schedule attached
Reimbursement to the City of gift of transportation, lodging or subsistence


3. Dates of Travel and Itinerary:

10/14/13	San Francisco - Beijing, China
Month/Day/Year	City, State, Country
10/17/13	Beijing - Shanghai
10/21/13	Shanghai - Seoul, Korea
10/23/13	Seoul - San Francisco

5. Verification:
I have used all reasonable diligence in preparing this statement. I have reviewed this statement and to the best of my knowledge, the information contained herein and in any attached schedules is true and complete.

I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Date signed 10/11/2013

Signature 

**Form SFEC-3.216(d)
Schedule A – Gifts of Travel**

1. Information regarding entity funding gift of transportation, lodging or subsistence

Full Name of Entity:
San Francisco Shanghai Sister City Committee

Address:
[Redacted] San Francisco CA 94108
Street City State Zip

Name of Contact Person:
James Fang, Chairman

Email Address: [Redacted] Telephone:
[Redacted] (415) 397-0220

3. Cost of transportation, lodging or subsistence

A. Please list the total amount of costs that will be paid by the entity to fund the elected officer's travel, including but not limited to the amount directly related to the cost of the officer's transportation, lodging and subsistence.
\$20,500.00

B. Please list the amount in Item A that is directly related to the cost of the officer's transportation, lodging and subsistence.
\$20,500.00

2. Information regarding contributors who contributed more than \$500 to the entity to fund the trip

Please list the name, occupation and employer of any contributor who contributed more than \$500 to the entity funding the trip and whose contributions were used in whole or in part to fund the trip:

See attached.

Name of Contributor _____
Occupation of Contributor _____
Employer of Contributor _____

Name of Contributor _____
Occupation of Contributor _____
Employer of Contributor _____

Name of Contributor _____
Occupation of Contributor _____
Employer of Contributor _____

Check box if additional schedules are attached.

4. Information regarding persons accompanying the elected officer

Please list the name of any individual who is

- (a) a City employee required to file a Statement of Economic Interests,
- (b) a lobbyist or campaign consultant registered with the Ethics Commission;
- (c) an employee of or individual who has an ownership interest in a lobbyist or campaign consultant registered with the Ethics Commission; or
- (d) an employee or officer of the entity that will pay for the gift of transportation, lodging or subsistence, and

who is accompanying the elected officer on the trip.

Please identify whether the individual is category (a), (b), (c), or (d), as described above.

Name of Individual	Category
See attached.	
_____	_____
_____	_____

Check box if additional schedules are attached.

*The cost of transportation, lodging or subsistence is the total cost of this trip for the Mayor and shared costs for Mrs. Anita Lee (lodging and transportation). Mrs. Lee's total costs will be reported on the Mayor's Form 700 for 2013, due to the Ethics Commission by April 1, 2014.

Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense

Attachment to Form SFEC-3.216(d)
 Edwin M. Lee
 10-14-13 – 10-23-13 China/Korea

Section 2. Information regarding contributors who contributed more than \$500 to the entity to fund the trip.

Contributors
UBER Technology Inc.
Equity Realty
GoDigital Media Group
AppDirect
AirBnB
San Francisco Travel
City of Seoul
Shanghai Foreign Affairs Office
Beijing Foreign Affairs Office
Shaklee
Bombardier
Chec
Doppelmayr Cable Car
Cubic
Hilton
Parsons
Gap, Inc.
United Airlines
Koret Foundation

Name	Occupation	Employer
Walter Allen, CEO & President	CEO of transportation infrastructure	Acumen Building Enterprise, Inc.
Anne Alvarez, President of the Board	Charitable work	Little Children's Aid
Yat-Pang Au, CEO & Founder	Finance	Veritas
Helena Au	Finance	Veritas
Walter Baczkowski, Chief Executive Officer	Realty	San Francisco Association of Realtors
Laurence Baer, CEO	CEO of sports franchise	San Francisco Giants
Pam Baer		Spouse of Larry Baer
John Curson, Managing Partner	Manager	Approach Partners
Thomas Escher, President & Chairman		Red and White Fleet
William Fong, Executive Vice President	Banker	East West Bank
Boe Hayward, Partner	Registered lobbyist	Goodyear-Peterson, LLC
Mike Healy, Partner	Lawyer	Sedgwick Law
Jeffrey Heller, President	Architect	Heller Manus Architects
Tom Henderson, CEO	CEO	San Francisco Regional Center, LLC
Lily Huang, Director, Global Gateway Division	Banker	Silicon Valley Bank
Mary Jung, Chair	Realtor	San Francisco Democratic Party
Jerry Kennelly, Chairman & Chief Executive Officer	CEO technology firm	Riverbed Technology, Inc.
Dev Krishnan, President & CEO	CEO of transportation infrastructure	Kal Krishnan Consulting Services, Inc.
George Lam, President	President of property corp	LF Properties Corporation
Richard Peterson, Principal	Registered lobbyist	Goodyear-Peterson, LLC
Tanya Peterson, President & Director	Director of non-profit organization	San Francisco Zoological Society

Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense

Name	Occupation	Employer
Ross Portugles	Manager	Shanghai Baosan
Betty Wong, Broker	Real estate	Pacific Union Real Estate
John Wong, Founding Chairman	Real estate	Asian Real Estate Association of America
Ronald Wong, President & CEO	Manager of communications firm	Imprinta Communications Group, Inc.

Section 4. Information regarding persons accompanying the elected officer:

Name	Category
Mark Chandler	(a)
Matthew Goudeau	(a)
Francis Tsang	(a)
Jennifer Matz	(a)
Phil Ginsburg	(a)
Supervisor Jane Kim	(a)
Supervisor London Breed	(a)
Supervisor Norman Yee	(a)
Commissioner Kimberly Brandon	(a)
Al Perez	(a) and (d)
Boe Hayward	(b) and (c)
Richard Peterson	(b) and (c)
Claudine Cheng	(b)
James Fang	(d)
Jesus Coronel	(d)
Sandra Siharath	(d)

Form SFEC-3.216(d)
Cover Page

FILED

13 NOV 27 PM 3:44

SAN FRANCISCO
ETHICS COMMISSION

Please type or print legibly in ink.

1. Information regarding Elected Officer:

Name (Last)	(First)	(Middle)	Daytime Telephone
Lee	Edwin	Mah	(415) 554-6910
Mailing Address	Street	Zip	Fax Telephone
City Hall, Rm. 200, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., S.F., CA 94102			(415) 554-6113
Office Held	Email Address		
Mayor	mayoredwinlee@sfgov.org		

2. Purpose of Travel:

To expand ties with Bangalore Sister City with a special focus on areas with significant opportunities for cultural and educational exchanges, economic partnerships, and humanitarian assistance.

4. Schedule Summary:

Total number of pages, including this cover page 4

Check applicable schedules:

Schedule A Yes - schedule attached
Gift of transportation, lodging or subsistence

Schedule B Yes - schedule attached
Gift to the City of transportation, lodging or subsistence

Schedule C Yes - schedule attached
Reimbursement to the City of gift of transportation, lodging or subsistence

3. Dates of Travel and Itinerary:


Nov 29 - Dec 1, 2013	SFO-Bangalore, India
Month/Day/Year	City, State, Country
Dec 1-5, 2013	Bangalore, India
Dec 5-10, 2013	Personal Travel
Dec 10, 2013	Return to San Francisco

5. Verification:

I have used all reasonable diligence in preparing this statement. I have reviewed this statement and to the best of my knowledge, the information contained herein and in any attached schedules is true and complete.

I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Date signed 11/27/13

Signature 

FILED
 JUN 18 10 51 AM '14
 OFFICE OF THE CLERK
 SAN FRANCISCO

Form SFEC-3.216(d)
Schedule A – Gifts of Travel

1. Information regarding entity funding gift of transportation, lodging or subsistence

Full Name of Entity:
 San Francisco-Bangalore Sister City Committee

Address:

 Palo Alto CA 94301
Street City State Zip

Name of Contact Person:
 Uday Bellary

Email Address: _____ Telephone: _____
 _____ 408 315-6767

3. Cost of transportation, lodging or subsistence

A. Please list the total amount of costs that will be paid by the entity to fund the elected officer's travel, including but not limited to the amount directly related to the cost of the officer's transportation, lodging and subsistence.
 * \$19,837.00

B. Please list the amount in Item A that is directly related to the cost of the officer's transportation, lodging and subsistence.
 * \$19,837.00

2. Information regarding contributors who contributed more than \$500 to the entity to fund the trip

Please list the name, occupation and employer of any contributor who contributed more than \$500 to the entity funding the trip and whose contributions were used in whole or in part to fund the trip:

Please see Attached

Name of Contributor _____
 Occupation of Contributor _____
 Employer of Contributor _____

Name of Contributor _____
 Occupation of Contributor _____
 Employer of Contributor _____

Name of Contributor _____
 Occupation of Contributor _____
 Employer of Contributor _____

Check box if additional schedules are attached.

4. Information regarding persons accompanying the elected officer

Please list the name of any individual who is

- (a) a City employee required to file a Statement of Economic Interests,
- (b) a lobbyist or campaign consultant registered with the Ethics Commission;
- (c) an employee of or individual who has an ownership interest in a lobbyist or campaign consultant registered with the Ethics Commission; or
- (d) an employee or officer of the entity that will pay for the gift of transportation, lodging or subsistence, and

who is accompanying the elected officer on the trip.

Please identify whether the individual is category (a), (b), (c), or (d), as described above.

Name of Individual _____ Category _____

Please see Attached

Check box if additional schedules are attached.

*The cost of transportation, lodging or subsistence is the total cost of this trip for the Mayor and shared costs for Mrs. Anita Lee (lodging and transportation). Mrs. Lee's total costs will be reported on the Mayor's Form 700 for 2013, due to the Ethics Commission by April 1, 2014.

Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense

Form SFEC-3.216(d)
 Edwin M. Lee
 11/29/13 – 12/10/13

Section 2. Information regarding contributors who contributed more than \$500 to the entity to fund the trip.

Name of Contributor	Occupation of Contributor
Acutherm LLC	
Andy Mercy	CEO, Tam Brand Restaurants Group LLC
Anu Natarajan	Fremont Vice Mayor
Asian Art Museum	
Bay Area Council Economic Institute	
Biocon	
Brayton Wilbur Foundation	
Brown and Caldwell	
Catamount Ventures	
CH2M Hill	
Cisco Systems	
City Lights Promotions	
El Camino Hospital	
Emirates Airlines	
FKCCI	
Franklin Templeton Investment	
Gary Jacobs	Glaser Weil Fink Jacobs Howard Avchen & Shapiro LLP
Government of Karnataka	
Karnataka Udyoga Mitra	
Kiran-Mazumdar-Shaw	
Kumar Malavalli	CEO, InMage Board, San Francisco-Bangalore Sister City Committee
Mango Marketing Design	
Mark Dana	Fremont Assistant City Manager
Michael Alvarez	MD Anderson Center for Professional Development & Entrepreneurship
Microsoft	
Montgomery Entertainment, LLC	
Palo Alto Medical Center	
Recology	
Rickshaw	
San Francisco Bangalore Sister City	
Scott Fearon	Crown Capital Management
Sparks and Associate	
Strand Life Science	
Taj, Campton Place	
Taj West End	
The Hive	
Vilaya Malavalli	
Viva Mogi	Platinum Advisors, LLC
Webcor Builders	

Section 4. Information regarding persons accompanying the elected officer:

Christine Falvey	Director of Communications, Office of the Mayor	a
Jason Elliott	Director of Legislative & Government Affairs, office of the Mayor	a
Jay Xu	Director and CEO, Asian Art Museum of San Francisco Director, Asian Art Commission	a&d
Mark Chandler	Director, Mayor's Office of International Trade & Commerce	a
Matthew Goudeau	Director, Mayor's Office of Protocol	a
Michael Carlin	Deputy General Manager, Public Utilities Commission	a
Tamar Hurwitz	School Education Program Manager, Department of the Environment Board, San Francisco-Bangalore Sister City Committee	a&d
Una Fannon	Senior Manager for International Business Development, Office of Economic and Workforce Development	a
Nicole Wheaton	Director of Appointments Commission and Board Liaison	a

Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense

Form SFEC-3.216(d)
 Edwin M. Lee
 11/29/13 – 12/10/13

Viva Mogi	Platinum Advisors	b&c
Anil Menon	President of Smart + Connected Communities, Cisco	d
Ashley Montgomery	Contractor, San Francisco-Bangalore Sister City Committee Montgomery Entertainment, LLC	d
Avinash S. Patwardhan	Global Technology Director - Urban Programs VP & Technology Fellow, CH2M Hill	d
Cesar Molina	Head, El Camino Hospital	d
Chad Rammohan	Cardiovascular Surgeon, El Camino Hospital	d
Conrad Vial	Renowned Cardiovascular Surgeon, El Camino Hospital	d
Deepa Harris	Board, San Francisco-Bangalore Sister City Committee Sr. Vice President of Sales and Marketing, TAJ Group	d
Elizabeth Vilardo	President, Palo Alto Medical Foundation	d
Eric Pifer	CMO, El Camino Hospital	d
Eric Potashner	Sr. Director Strategic Affairs, Recology	d
Gordon Feller	Director, Cisco Systems	d
James Herlihy	Board, San Francisco-Bangalore Sister City Committee Deutsche Bank Private Wealth Management	d
Jay Patil	Senior Vice President, Brown & Caldwell	d
Kumar Malavalli	Board, San Francisco-Bangalore Sister City Committee CEO, Co-Founder, InMage	d
Kurt Herzog	President and CEO, Acutherm, LLC	d
Latha P. Palaniappan	Biobanking and Clinical Research, Palo Alto Medical Foundation	d
Madhav Misra	Board, San Francisco-Bangalore Sister City Committee Misra Capital Management, LLC	d
Manoj Shalendra	National Sales, Emirates	d
Marc Musgrove	Corporate Communications, Cisco	d
Meera Prashad	Board, San Francisco-Bangalore Sister City Committee GetGoing, Inc.	d
Peter Paul Yu	President, American Society of Oncology	d
Robert Sinha	Radiation Oncologist, El Camino Hospital	d
Scott Heldfond	Board, San Francisco-Bangalore Sister City Committee Aon, PLC/UB Group	d
Sean Randolph	Board, San Francisco-Bangalore Sister City Committee President and CEO, Bay Area Council	d
Shyamall Singhal	Head of Oncology Center, El Camino Hospital	d
Tomi Ryba	President & CEO, El Camino Hospital	d
Uday Bellary	Board, San Francisco-Bangalore Sister City Committee Verifaya Corp.	d
Vijay Advani	Board, San Francisco-Bangalore Sister City Committee Executive Vice President, Franklin Templeton Investment	d
Vijay Bist	Board, San Francisco-Bangalore Sister City Committee Amber India Inc.	d
Vijay Kumar	Board, San Francisco-Bangalore Sister City Committee Vice President, CH2M Hill	d

APPENDIX FOUR

Proposition J Voters Guide Materials

Proposition	J
Title	City Contractor Contributions
Date	11/7/2000
Vote Count	Yes: 236,094 No: 49,538
Percentage of votes	Yes: 82.66% No: 17.34%
Percentage of votes required to pass	50%+1
How it was placed on the ballot	Initiative
Kind	Ordinance
Question Stated on the Ballot	Shall the City ban officials from accepting gifts, payments, or campaign contributions from a person or group if the official previously approved granting the donor a contract or special benefit?

City Contractor Contributions



PROPOSITION J

Shall the City ban officials from accepting gifts, payments, or campaign contributions from a person or group if the official previously approved granting the donor a contract or special benefit?

YES ←
NO ←

Digest

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under state and local law, public officials may not participate in decisions in which they have a financial interest. For example, officials may not vote to give a contract to a company that they own in whole or in part.

Officials must report all gifts they receive worth more than \$50, and may not accept more than \$300 in gifts per year from any single source. An official may not participate in making a government decision affecting anyone who has given \$250 or more in gifts or income to the official in the past year. Campaign contributions to an official are not considered gifts or income.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J is an ordinance that would ban any City official from accepting a gift, payment, job offer, or campaign contribution from a person or group, if the City official previously had approved granting a contract, lease, franchise, land use variance, special tax

benefit, or monetary payment to that person or group. This ban would apply from the date of approval of the benefit until two years after the official's term of office ended or the official otherwise left office, or six years after the approval, whichever came first.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to ban City officials from accepting gifts or campaign contributions from a person or group where the official has previously approved granting a contract or special benefit to that person or group.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to ban City officials from accepting gifts or campaign contributions from a person or group where the official has previously approved granting a contract or special benefit to that person or group.

Controller's Statement on "J"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

Should the proposed ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would have a minor effect on the cost of government.

How "J" Got on the Ballot

On June 30, 2000 the Department of Elections certified that the initiative petition, calling for Proposition J to be placed on the ballot, had qualified for the ballot.

9,735 signatures were required to place an ordinance on the ballot.

This number is equal to 5 % of the total number of people who voted for Mayor in 1999. A random check of the signatures submitted on June 1, 2000 by the proponent of the initiative petition showed that more than the required number of signatures were valid.

THIS MEASURE REQUIRES 50%+1 AFFIRMATIVE VOTES TO PASS.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE. THE FULL TEXT BEGINS ON PAGE P-133
SOME OF THE WORDS USED IN THE BALLOT DIGEST ARE EXPLAINED ON PAGE P-2

P-127



City Contractor Contributions

PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

No arguments were submitted

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

P-128

City Contractor Contributions



OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

No arguments were submitted

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

P-129



City Contractor Contributions

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Republicans stand for good government. This reform proposition was put on the ballot by a non-partisan, grassroots, good-government group. It should enjoy the respect of all citizens. This measure would help stop bribery and corruption in city hall. **And in San Francisco, that'll be a full time job!**

Adam Sparks
GOP Candidate for Congress, San Francisco

The true source of funds used for the printing fee of this argument is Adam Sparks.

The flow of corporate campaign contributions and gifts to public officials is corrupting our local democracy.

Joel Ventresca
President, Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods (1987-89; 1992-94)

The true source of funds used for the printing fee of this argument is Joel Ventresca.

Ralph Nader, both the San Francisco Democratic AND Republican committees and California Common Cause all agree on only one thing this year. They all endorse Measure J. That's because Measure J is good government without politics.

The signatures needed to qualify Measure J were collected by the non-partisan Oaks Project through an unprecedented 100% volunteer petition effort.

Measure J prevents corruption by banning "legal" kickbacks. J bars politicians from taking money, gifts, or jobs from anyone benefiting from the politician's actions (i.e. granting city contracts, special tax breaks of land deals).

VOTE YES on Measure J.

Ben Gertner
Oaks Project Volunteer

The true source of funds used for the printing fee of this argument is Nicholas Wirz.

Stop *special deals* to downtown special interests like *Bloomingdales!*

Vote YES on Prop J!

Jake McGoldrick
Candidate for District 1 Supervisor

The true source of funds used for the printing fee of this argument is McGoldrick for Supervisor.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee are 1. Hiroshi Fukuda 2. Mowitza Biddle 3. Steve Williams.

Elected officials shouldn't reward campaign contributors with city contracts and money. But that's exactly what has brought the FBI into City Hall. Keep everyone's hands out of the cookie jar. **Vote Yes on Proposition J.**

Harvey Milk Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender Democratic Club

The true source of funds used for the printing fee of this argument is Harvey Milk Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender Democratic Club.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee are 1. Californians for Indian Self-Reliance 2. Assemblywoman Carole Migden 3. Harvey Milk Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender Democratic Club.

We support city government for the public interest, not special interests!

Proposition J promotes integrity in city officials, saving taxpayers from wasteful contracts and favoritism. Vote Yes on J.

San Francisco Green Party

The true source of funds used for the printing fee of this argument is the San Francisco Green Party.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee are: 1. Marge Harburg 2. Jo Chamberlain 3. John Strawn.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.



City Contractor Contributions

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION J

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Measure J

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

P-132

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE PROPOSITION J

Amendment to San Francisco Administrative Code

Chapter 16 of the San Francisco Administrative Code shall be amended by the addition of the following Article:

ARTICLE XX. TAXPAYER PROTECTION

Section 16.990. Title

This Article shall be known as the City and County of San Francisco Taxpayer Protection Amendment of 2000.

Section 16.991. Findings and Declarations

(a) The people of the City and County of San Francisco ("City and County") find that the use or disposition of public assets is often tainted by conflicts of interest among local public officials entrusted with their management and control. Such assets, including publicly owned real property, land use decisions conferring substantial private benefits, conferral of a franchise without competition, public purchases, taxation, and financing, should be arranged strictly on the merits for the benefit of the public, and irrespective of the separate personal or financial interests of involved public officials.

(b) The people find that public decisions to sell or lease property, to confer cable, trash hauling and other franchises, to award public construction or service contracts, or to utilize or dispose of other public assets, and to grant special land use or taxation exceptions have often been made with the expectation of, and subsequent receipt of, private benefits from those so assisted to involved public 'decision makers'. The people further find that the sources of such corruptive influence include gifts and honoraria, future employment offers, and anticipated campaign contributions for public officials who are either elected or who later seek elective office. The trading of special favors or advantage in the management or disposal of public assets and in the making of major public purchases compromises the political process, undermines confidence in democratic institutions, deprives meritorious prospective private buyers, lessees, and sellers of fair opportunity, and deprives the public of its rightful enjoyment and effective use of public assets.

(c) Accordingly, the people declare that there is a compelling state interest in reducing the corruptive influence of emoluments, gifts, and prospective campaign contributions on the decisions of public officials in the management of public assets and franchises, and in the disposition of public funds. The people, who compensate public officials, expect and declare that as a condition of such public office, no gifts, promised employment, or campaign contributions shall be received from any substantial

beneficiary of such a public decision for a reasonable period, as provided herein.

Section 16.992. Definitions

(a) As used herein, the term public benefit does not include public employment in the normal course of business for services rendered, but includes a contract, benefit, or arrangement between the City and County and any individual, corporation, firm, partnership, association, or other person or entity to:

(1) provide personal services of a value in excess of \$50,000 over any 12 month period;

(2) sell or furnish any material, supplies or equipment to the City and County of a value in excess of \$50,000 over any 12 month period;

(3) buy or sell any real property to or from the City and County with a value in excess of \$50,000, or lease any real property to or from the City and County with a value in excess of \$50,000 over any 12 month period;

(4) receive an award of a franchise to conduct any business activity in a territory in which no other competitor potentially is available to provide similar and competitive services, and for which gross revenue from the business activity exceeds \$50,000 in any 12 month period;

(5) confer a land use variance, special use permit, or other exception to a pre-existing master plan or land use ordinance pertaining to real property where such decision has a value in excess of \$50,000;

(6) confer a tax abatement, exception, or benefit not generally applicable of a value in excess of \$5,000 in any 12 month period;

(7) receive cash or specie of a net value to the recipient in excess of \$10,000 in any 12 month period.

(b) Those persons or entities receiving public benefits as defined in Section 16.992(a)(1)-(7) shall include the individual, corporation, firm, partnership, association, or other person or entity so benefiting, and any individual or person who, during a period where such benefit is received or accrues,

(1) has more than a ten percent (10%) equity, participation, or revenue interest in that entity; or

(2) who is a trustee, director, partner, or officer of that entity.

(c) As used herein, the term personal or campaign advantage shall include:

(1) any gift, honoraria, emolument, or personal pecuniary benefit of a value in excess of \$50;

(2) any employment for compensation;

(3) any campaign contributions for any elective office said official may pursue.

(d) As used herein, the term public official includes any elected or appointed public official acting in an official capacity.

Section 16.993. Prohibitions

(a) No City and County public official who has

exercised discretion to approve and who has approved or voted to approve a public benefit as defined in Section 16.992(a) may receive a personal or campaign advantage as defined in Section 16.992(c) from a person as defined in Section 16.992(b) for a period beginning on the date the official approves or votes to approve the public benefit, and ending no later than

(1) two years after the expiration of the term of office that the official is serving at the time the official approves or votes to approve the public benefit;

(2) two years after the official's departure from his or her office whether or not there is a pre-established term of office; or

(3) six years from the date the official approves or votes to approve the public benefit; whichever is first.

(b) Section 16.993(a) shall also apply to the exercise of discretion of any such public official serving in his or her official capacity through a redevelopment agency, or any other public agency, whether within or without the territorial jurisdiction of the City and County either as a representative or appointee of the City and County.

Section 16.994. Responsibilities of City and County Public Officials and Advantage Recipients

(a) City and County public officials shall practice due diligence to ascertain whether or not a benefit defined under Section 16.992(a) has been conferred, and to monitor personal or campaign advantages enumerated under Section 16.992(c) so that any such qualifying advantage received is returned forthwith, and no later than ten days after its receipt.

(b) City and County public officials shall provide, upon inquiry by any person, the names of all entities and persons known to them who respectively qualify as public benefit recipients under the terms of Sections 16.992 and 16.993.

Section 16.995. Disclosure of the Law

The City and County shall provide any person, corporation, firm, partnership, association, or other person or entity applying or competing for any benefit enumerated in Section 16.992(a) with written notice of the provisions of this Article and the future limitations it imposes. Said notice shall be incorporated into requests for 'proposal,' bid invitations, or other existing informational disclosure documents to persons engaged in prospective business with, from, or through the City and County.

Section 16.996. Penalties and Enforcement

(a) In addition to all other penalties which might apply, any knowing and willful violation

(Continued on next page)

LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION J (CONTINUED)

of this Article by a public official constitutes a criminal misdemeanor offense.

(b) A civil action may be brought under this Article against a public official who receives a personal or campaign advantage in violation of Section 16.993. A finding of liability shall subject the public official to the following civil remedies:

(1) restitution of the personal or campaign advantage received, which shall accrue to the General Fund of the City and County;

(2) a civil penalty of up to five times the value of the personal or campaign advantage received;

(3) injunctive relief necessary to prevent present and future violations of this Article;

(4) disqualification from future public office or position within the jurisdiction, if violations are willful, egregious, or repeated.

(c) A civil action under subdivision (b) of this section may be brought by any resident of the City and County. In the event that such an action is brought by a resident of the City and County and the petitioner prevails, the respondent public official shall pay reasonable attorney's fees and costs to the prevailing petitioner. Civil penalties collected in such a prosecution shall accrue 10% to the petitioner and 90% to the General Fund of the City and County.

(d) Any person who believes that the provisions of this Article have been violated may file a complaint with the Ethics Commission. Upon receipt of a complaint, or upon its own initiative, the Commission may investigate alleged violations of this Article and may enforce the provisions of this Article pursuant to Charter Section C3.699-13 and to the rules and regulations adopted pursuant to Charter Section 15.102.

Section 16.997. Effect of Article

The provisions of this Article are intended to supplement, and not to replace, any provisions of the San Francisco Charter and Administrative Code that relate to campaign finance, lobbying, conflicts of interest or governmental ethics.

Section 16.998. Severability

If any provision of this Article is held invalid, such invalidity or unconstitutionality shall not affect other provisions or applications which can be given effect without the invalidated provision, and to this end the provisions of this Article are severable.

City Contractor Contributions



PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Should contractors with business before boards and commissions be prohibited from donating to the members of those boards? This is a tough one, I just don't know, hmmm, let me think...

Vote YES on J.

Matt Gonzalez

The true source of funds used for the printing fee of this argument is Matt Gonzalez.

Proposition J bans the quid pro quo of awarding city contracts for campaign contributions. It stops city officials from taking money and jobs from those they award contracts to.

Vote Yes on Proposition J!

San Francisco Tomorrow

The true source of funds used for the printing fee of this argument is San Francisco Tomorrow.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee are 1. Jane Morrison 2. Zoanne Nordstrom 3. Jennifer Clary.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J!

There are at least two reasons for voters and taxpayers to support Proposition J strongly: First, it's a sincere initiative by real voters, not elected officials, to control the disturbing syndrome of money and other gifts dictating Board of Supervisors and various commissions' actions. Secondly, it's plain good government policy to prohibit decision-makers from voting on matters where proponents or opponents have given campaign contributions or gifts or anything of value.

Proposition J stops that kind of purchased influence from dominating City Hall decisions that affect our lives and well-being. This measure was painstakingly qualified for the ballot by people like our neighbors and yours. Don't let them down. Send malodorous City Hall a strong message - San Francisco is not for sale. **Vote YES ON PROPOSITION J.**

Good Government Alliance

The true source of funds used for the printing fee of this argument is Good Government Alliance.

The largest contributor to the true source recipient committee is:
1. Kopp's Good Government Alliance.

The San Francisco Republican Party supports reasonable and workable reforms of the political system.

That is why we are supporting Proposition J. Prop. J will help eliminate undue influence, whether in fact or in appearance, by entities or individuals doing or seeking business with the City.

Vote Yes on Proposition J.

San Francisco Republican Party

Donald A. Casper, Chairman

Mike Garza, Candidate

Terence Faulkner, Candidate

3rd Senate District

Julie Bell

Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.

Gail E. Neira

Grace Norton-Fitzpatrick

Les Payne

Howard Epstein, Candidate

12th Assembly District

Harold Hoogasian, Candidate

District VII Supervisor

Albert Chang

Joel Hornstein

Denis Norrington

Rita O'Hara

Dana Walsh

The true source of funds used for the printing fee of this argument is the above signers and the San Francisco Republican Party.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.