



SUNSHINE ORDINANCE TASK FORCE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO MINUTES - DRAFT

REMOTE SPECIAL MEETING

November 2, 2022 - 4:00 PM

Seat 1	Dean Schmidt	Seat 7	Matthew Yankee - Chair
Seat 2	Lila LaHood	Seat 8	Chris Hyland
Seat 3	Vacant	Seat 9	Vacant
Seat 4	Jaya Padmanabhan	Seat 10	Thuan Thao Hill
Seat 5	Jennifer Wong - Vice-Chair	Seat 11	Bruce Wolfe
Seat 6	Laura Stein		

Ex-officio (*non-voting*) Clerk of the Board of Supervisors or his or her designee

Ex-officio (*non-voting*) Mayor or his or her designee

1. CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL, AND AGENDA CHANGES

Chair Yankee called the meeting to order at 4:04 PM. On the call of the roll Chair Yankee and Members, Schmidt, LaHood, Padmanabhan, Wong, Stein, Yankee, Hyland, Wolfe were noted present. Member Hill was noted not present. A quorum was present.

Chair Yankee asked the Task Force to recognize Member Laurie Neighbors who passed away unexpectedly with a moment of silence.

Public Comment:

Peter Warfield stated that he could not access items 8 and 9, of the agenda packet and went to the Clerk's office for further assistance.

Anonymous expressed sorrow for Member Neighbors' passing.

No actions taken.

1A. FINDINGS TO ALLOW TELECONFERENCED MEETINGS UNDER CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 54953(e).

The Task Force is expected to consider a motion setting forth findings required under Assembly Bill 361 (AB 361) that would allow the committee to hold the meeting remotely according to the modified Brown Act teleconferencing set forth in AB 361.

The SOTF noted that every thirty days, the SOTF must have findings for continued meetings of this body, to recognize that the state of emergency will continue to impact the body and if local officials continue to recommend that emergency procedures remain in place. The SOTF is required to approve these findings, or the remote meeting cannot take place.

Action: Moved by Member Wolfe, seconded by Member Stein, to approve the attached motion 1A.

Public Comment:

Peter Warfield expressed sorrow at Member Neighbors' passing.

The motion PASSED by the following vote:

Ayes: 8 - Wolfe, Stein, Schmidt, LaHood, Padmanabhan, Hyland, Wong, Yankee

Noes: 0 - None

Absent: 1 - Hill

2. **Approval of the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force October 5, 2022 meeting minutes.**

Action: Moved by Chair Yankee, seconded by Member LaHood, to approve the October 5, 2022, meeting minutes.

Public Comment:

Peter Warfield, Executive Director Library Users Association, libraryusers2004@yahoo.com, P.O. Box 170544, San Francisco, California, 94117-0544, provided his contact information because he feels it important and that live, in person meetings are better.

The motion PASSED by the following vote:

Ayes: 8 - Yankee, LaHood, Wolfe, Stein, Schmidt, Padmanabhan, Hyland, Wong

Noes: 0 - None

Absent: 1 - Hill

3. **Approval of the Order of Determination: October 5, 2022, Action - File No. 20084.**

Chair Yankee noted the correct file number to the Order of Determination.

Action: Moved by Chair Yankee, seconded by Vice-Chair Wong to approve the Order of Determination with the edit of changing the File No. from 22084 to 20084.

Public Comment:

Peter Warfield stated that he is happy that Orders of Determination are published because this gives the public an opportunity to see what they look like.

Anonymous stated that he did not agree with everything Mr. Warfield stated because there were months that Orders of Determination did not come out timely.

The motion PASSED by the following vote:

Ayes: 8 - Yankee, Wong, LaHood, Wolfe, Stein, Schmidt, Padmanabhan, Hyland
Noes: 0 - None
Absent: 1 - Hill

4. Administrator's Report, Complaints and Communications.

Administrator Leger presented the Administrator's Report to the Task Force and answered questions. The slide deck from former SOTF Member Washburn which was inadvertently misplaced from this Report will be included in the December SOTF Administrator's Report.

Public Comment:

Anonymous stated that the SOTF Clerk needs additional support which should be provided by the Clerk's office.

Peter Warfield stated that he didn't know what 'ARE' was and then found it was Anonymous. Mr. Warfield agrees that the SOTF Administrator and the SOTF need more support.

No actions taken.

4A. Communication from Member Hill: Consideration of a motion to waive Article II, Section 2 (Attendance) of the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force Bylaws for Member Hill due to his own serious medical condition for the period of September 1, 2022, through April 30, 2023.

The Task Force discussed the absence of Member Hill due to a medical condition that requires a long recovery as well as Member Neighbors vacant seat due to her unexpected passing.

Action: Moved by Member LaHood, seconded, by Member Schmidt, that Chair Yankee send a letter to the Board of Supervisors informing them of the situation stating that the Task Force would like to keep the seat for Member Hill because of his extenuating medical circumstances.

Public Comment:

Anonymous stated that he thinks this is the best course of action and he knows several people who are interested in Sunshine.

Mark Sullivan expressed sorrow at Member Neighbors' passing. Mr. Sullivan also noted that the SOTF works for the complainant and is accomplished only when all the seats have been assigned.

Wynship Hillier provided the following written public comment.

“Quoted an excerpt of RONR (12th ed.) 25:7 to the effect that the Task Force could not waive this provision of its bylaws.”

Peter Warfield stated that today's agenda is 1,500 pages and that he appreciates everything said about Member Hill and as noted by Mark Sullivan, an absence effectively means a no vote for the complainant.

David Pilpel agreed with speakers regarding finding a majority vote and that he has concerns for Member Hill and six months absence from a two-year term.

The motion PASSED by the following vote:

Ayes: 8 - LaHood, Schmidt, Yankee, Wolfe, Stein, Padmanabhan, Hyland, Wong

Noes: 0 - None

Absent: 1 - Hill

4B. Complaints Involving the SOTF: Development of procedures for handling the attached complaints naming a single member of the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, and consideration of standing procedures when an SOTF member, the SOTF as a policy body, or the SOTF Administrator is a party to a complaint.

Chair Yankee stated there is a complaint against one specific SOTF member. Chair Yankee stated that the SOTF has ruled in the past that the Task Force could not make a ruling on the body (themselves as the SOTF) however this case is about one specific member. Chair Yankee also noted this may not be something to decide tonight, or there may be a need for a new by-law policy. Chair Yankee asked the Task Force what to do if a member is named in a complaint? Chair Yankee stated that this could result in a committee referral.

Member Hyland suggested that there would be a conflict of interest and that possibly forming an ad hoc committee might be the solution. Member Hyland suggested that the review go to the Committee, they find jurisdiction, and then send the matter to the SOTF.

Action: Moved by Member Stein, seconded by Chair Yankee, to instruct the SOTF member to present their case as the respondent and to recuse themselves from participating in the discussion for that complaint voting and as a member of the SOTF.

Public Comment:

Anonymous stated that this motion makes sense, but that Member Wolfe has a point about Robert's Rules. Anonymous stated that you can hold a normal

meeting and have a special meeting and have a different roll call and then they can participate.

Mark Sullivan suggested that having a real discussion and wants to reiterate Hyland's comments and that it doesn't have to be the Complaint Committee and cited 67.21(e).

Wynship Hillier provided the following written public comment.

"Mr. Hillier said that there were no provisions in the rules of order regarding non-participation of members in debate regarding matters affecting themselves and quoted an excerpt from RONR (12th ed.) 45:4 regarding voting by members on matters affecting themselves. Then he excerpted from *S.F. Charter* § 4.104(b) regarding voting, said that it applied to the Task Force after its amendment by Prop. B in 2006, and that application of the interpretive canon *expressio unius est exclusio alterius* prevented recusal on the basis of conflict of interest alone. Then he quoted *S.F. Admin. Code* § 1.29 in full."

Peter Warfield noted that a similar case happened at the Library Commission where the member recused herself for the consideration and they did go ahead and on a six to zero vote this was a violation and ultimately went to the Ethics Commission.

David Pilpel wondered if this issue can be referred to the Ethics Commission and the Deputy City Attorney can explain the issues - can a SOTF member participate in the hearing and request a memo on this issue?

The motion PASSED by the following vote:

Ayes: 8 - Stein, Yankee, LaHood, Schmidt, Wolfe, Padmanabhan, Hyland, Wong
Noes: 0 - None
Absent: 1 - Hill

5. **Public Comment:** Members of the public may address the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force (SOTF) on matters that are within SOTF's jurisdiction, but not on today's agenda. *(No Action). Public comment shall be taken at 5:00 p.m. or as soon thereafter as possible.*

Anonymous stated that at the last SOTF meeting the SFPUC proclaimed to order him to destroy records from Harlan Kelly and Walter Wong and they cited *Arnon v. Los Angeles*. Anonymous stated he is a member of the public and they cannot force him to return a record only the court can.

Wynship Hillier provided the following written public comment.

"Mr. Hillier expressed shock and dismay at the recent passage of Task Force member Ms. Laurie Neighbors. Then he expressed disappointment with the amount of work and time it was taking to obtain compliance from the Behavioral Health Commission regarding the three Task Force rulings

against them. He said that, at this rate, it would take at least two additional years to obtain full compliance, when it had already taken over two years and twelve hearings since his first complaint. He suggested that compliance would be hastened if the Compliance and Amendments Committee would agendize a motion to recommend that the Task Force recommend that the Board of Supervisors dismiss members and Behavioral Health Services discipline staff, as suggested at the previous meeting and required by S.F. Admin. Code § 67.7(a)."

Peter Warfield suggested taking a picture of the computer screen showing the participating members and emailing it to the parties to see from their perspective.

David Pilpel stated that in the next months the Task Force may advise other policy bodies in the city to proceed with hybrid meetings and that he doesn't know when the mayor and policy bodies will go back to hybrid meetings. These meetings have allowed increased public meetings and hybrid is the way to do it and the SOTF should be advising other bodies to do so.

The meeting recessed from 6:32 p.m. to 6:42 p.m. .

Roll call – Members present: Schmidt, LaHood, Padmanabhan, Stein, Wolfe, Chris, Wong, Yankee

NOTE: Hearings on complaints and other agenda items listed below will begin no earlier than 5:00 P.M.

6. Review and Consider Proposed Efficiency Edits to the Complaint Process.

Member Schmidt provided proposed efficiency edits to the Complaint process to streamline the backlog. Member Schmidt stated that changes in targeting the backlog are important and can be changed based on the language in the Ordinance.

Member Stein stated that it is not inherent to have every case before the SOTF. It is very creative and in line with the Ordinance.

Member Hyland spoke about the 2016 Complaint Committee that cut through that backlog. Member Hyland stated that petitioners were very happy because complaints were resolved quickly.

Chair Yankee noted that there might be deliberations behind the scenes between the three chosen members and if ad hoc committees are doing their work outside the public and the average case takes 30 minutes it would take years to conquer the backlog. Also Chair Yankee agrees that the amount of time for hearings needs to be explained in three minutes. Finally, Chair Yankee noted that this deals with the ability of the petitioner not showing up to deal with and if this happens it could lead to filings of motions for reconsideration.

Public Comment:

David Pilpel stated that working through Member Schmidt's language was confusing and thinks this is not ready for prime time.

Mark Sullivan's recommendation was about making time limits shorter for everyone.

Anonymous stated that the law does not require a public hearing however every complainant receives one and there is no rule that two meetings are better than one and it seems like the committees can recommend an Order of Determination.

Peter Warfield stated that flagrant violations are taking place.

No actions taken.

7. **Proposed Bylaws Amendments – Consent Calendar:** Hearing and consideration of proposed amendments to the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force's Bylaws from the Rules Committee regarding the use of a Consent Calendar.

Member Stein stated this was Member Neighbors attempt to write the consent calendar process into the SOTF By-Laws.

Action: Moved by Member Hyland, seconded by Member Wolfe, to approve the By-law amendment changes with the addition of the words “or an admission of noncompliance” in section 6.

Chair Yankee noted that referral to the consent agenda makes no sense to have the matter heard again at the SOTF level and is in favor of moving forward on this.

Member Wolfe rescinded their second on the motion.

Action: Moved by Member Hyland, seconded by Member Stein to approve the By-law amendment changes with the addition of the words or “an admission of noncompliance in section 6.”

Public Comment:

David Pilpel stated in view of the way consent calendars work the complainant or respondent should be allowed to pull an item from the consent calendar.

Anonymous stated that he supports the motion but is not aware that a member of the public can cause something to be removed from the consent calendar.

Peter Warfield stated that he has had a complaint committee hearing and now is on the consent calendar, the library was not asked in the follow up request .

The motion PASSED by the following vote:

Ayes: 7 - Hyland, Stein, Yankee, LaHood, Schmidt, Padmanabhan, Wong

Noes: 1 - Wolfe

Absent: 1 - Hill

8. **File No. 22013: Hearing Regarding Request for Reconsideration of Complaint 22013.** Complaint filed by Yuli Huang against David Steinberg and Public Works for finding no violation of Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Section 67.21, by failing to respond to a public records request in a timely and/or complete manner.

Yuli Huang (Petitioner) stated that he was requesting a reconsideration of the SOTF ruling of his complaint. Mr. Huang stated that because the city has the right and controls the contractual information, and because the information is in the possession of the City it is a public record. Mr. Huang stated the requested information is the installation method the contractor used to complete the process of installing pilings. Mr. Huang stated the way and procedure the contractor used to install the piling is the method and could not be completed without the written procedure.

David Steinberg (Public Works) (Respondent) stated that reconsideration only happens when there is new information. Mr. Steinberg requested that Mr. Huang's request be denied because the record Mr. Huang is requesting does not exist.

A question and answer period occurred. The parties were provided an opportunity for rebuttals.

Action: Moved by Vice-Chair Wong, seconded by Member Hyland that the SOTF not grant the reconsideration due to lack of new evidence.

Public Comment:

Mark Sullivan agreed that this isn't going to change the motion, but if the contractors were told orally that could be considered Sunshineable public information.

Anonymous stated he supports Mr. Sullivan's and that the term evidence can also take the broad definition of oral form.

The motion PASSED by the following vote:

Ayes: 8 - Wong, Hyland, Stein, Yankee, LaHood, Schmidt, Padmanabhan, Wolfe
Noes: 0 - None
Absent: 1 - Hill

9. **File No. 21109: Hearing Regarding Request for Reconsideration of Complaint 18086.** Complaint filed by Mark Sullivan against the Mission Dolores Green Benefit District Formation Committee for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Section 67.14, by failing to allow video and audio recording filming and still photography of a policy body.

Mark Sullivan (Petitioner) provided a summary of the complaint and requested the Committee to find a violation. Mr. Sullivan has submitted new information on jurisdiction. Mr. Sullivan referenced , *Epstein v. Hollywood Entertainment Improvement District*, which is a court of appeals opinion confirming that the Green Benefits District

(GBDs) formation groups are covered by the Brown Act. In *Epstein* this GBD was set up by the Property Owners Association (POA). The court noted that any formation committee, only a city or property owner can create any type of benefits district committee including a green benefits district and that the city played a role in bringing the POA into the city. San Francisco actively creates GBDs. *Epstein* noted that the city played no role in the formation of their GBDs.

David Steinberg (Public Works, (DPW), (Respondent). Mr. Steinberg stated that they are not a party to the complaint, but have been involved with GBDs, noted that this committee was not created by the City, it no longer exists and that according to SOTF rules, reconsideration may be granted if the information was not available at the time of the hearing. Mr. Steinberg stated that this GBD is not a policy body whose members are not appointed by the mayor. Mr. Steinberg stated that there is no dispute that this GBD committee was created but under state laws this body is not under the jurisdiction of the SOTF.

A question and answer period occurred. The parties were provided an opportunity for rebuttals.

Action: Moved by Member Wolfe, seconded by Vice-Chair Wong to allow the reconsideration.

Public Comment:

Anonymous congratulated Mr. Sullivan, regardless of if he wins today and hopes that the City will reconsider allotting funds for a public purpose.

Yuli Huang stated that new information is subjective. Why was this information considered for this case and not his?

Chair Yankee stated that it would be helpful to have Deputy City Attorney Marc Price Wolf provide a presentation on these formation committees.

The motion PASSED by the following vote:

Ayes: 7 - Wolfe, Wong, Hyland, Stein, Yankee, LaHood, Padmanabhan,

Noes: 1 - Schmidt

Absent: 1 - Hill

The meeting was recessed from 9:38 p.m. until 9:43 p.m.

Roll Call - Schmidt, LaHood, Padmanabhan, Wolfe, Hyland, Stein, Yankee, Wong

10. **File No. 22030:** Complaint filed by Gizelle Rabi and Karl Kramer against Karen Fletcher and the Adult Probation Department for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Section(s) 67.21 by failing to respond to a request for public records in a timely and/or complete manner.

Karl Kramer (Petitioner) provided a summary of the complaint and requested the Committee to find a violation. Mr. Kramer stated that the request was for the Minimum Compensation Ordinance (MCO) and the Cost of Doing Business (COBD) allocations to city nonprofit organizations. Mr. Kramer stated that the department responded saying there were no responsive records and an email on January 25, that in fiscal year 2020-2021 money came into their account but has no records on how the money was allocated and why there is no tracking of the money.

Taras Madison (Adult Probation Department) (Respondent), provided a summary of the department's position. Ms. Madison stated that the request was received in December 2021 and staff asked for a 14-day extension to respond. Ms. Madison stated that there are instances when organizations do not meet the MCO requirements. However, in this instance there was no reason to add additional funding. Ms. Madison stated that her department did not have the specifics public records available for 2019-2021.

A question and answer period occurred. The parties were provided an opportunity for rebuttals.

Action: Moved by Member Wolfe, seconded by Vice-Chair Wong to find a violation 67.21(b) for timeliness and order Adult Probation Department to provide details from the CBO or contractors or budget that were originally submitted and after the funds were allocated in order to comply with the MCO (Minimum Compensation Ordinance) and COBD (Cost of Doing Business) rules and compel the department to produce the public and if they are unable to provide the details themselves they must assist the requestor by directing them to a proper office or staff person who has possession of those records.

Public Comment:

Anonymous stated that regarding timeliness there is a state rule that you can extend 14 days, California Public Records Act 6253(c)(2) and they cited this in violation of 6253(c) and that it makes no difference what staffing issues there are and the reasons are clear.

David Pilpel agrees with Members Stein and Padmanabhan. Mr. Pilpel stated that while he appreciates what Mr. Kramer is looking for it may not exist within the Budget Office and may not be in the form Mr. Kramer is looking for.

Mark Sullivan stated that he agrees with Anonymous.

Yuli Huang stated the SOTF continues to construe that the record is a document, and that public record information is used to conduct the people's business in this case.

Member Wolfe amended their motion.

Action: Moved by Member Wolfe, seconded by Vice-Chair Wong, to find the Adult Probation Department violated Administrative Code, Sunshine Ordinance, Section 67.21(c) by failing to assist the requester in identifying the existence, form and nature of any records or information maintained by, available to, or in the custody of the custodian, whether or not the contents of those records are exempt from disclosure and shall, when requested to do so, provide in writing within seven days following receipt of a request, a statement as to the existence, quantity, form and nature of records relating to a particular subject or questions with enough specificity to enable a requester to identify records in order to make a request and orders the respondent to assist the requestor in finding someone who can provide the requested information.

Member Hyland was noted absent at 10:55 PM

The motion FAILED by the following vote:

Ayes: 3 - Wolfe, Wong, LaHood

Noes: 4 - Schmidt, Padmanabhan, Stein, Yankee

Absent: 2 - Hyland, Hill

11. **File No. 21148:** Complaint filed by Jordan Santagata and Karl Kramer against the San Francisco Employees' Retirement System for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Section(s) 67.21, 67.24, and 67.25 and California Public Records Act, Section(s) 6254.26, by failing to respond to a request for public records in a timely and/or complete manner.

Karl Kramer (Petitioner) provided a summary of the complaint and requested the Committee to find a violation. Mr. Kramer stated that he requested from SFERS the contract with Vista Equity and was told there is an exemption in the Public Records Act and that it cannot be disclosed.

Kyle Alpizar (Petitioner) stated that the SFERS holds contracts with Vista Equity and was also told that those contracts are exempt from disclosure.

Ashley Dunning (San Francisco Employee Retirement System (SFERS)) (Respondent) provided a summary of the department's position. Ms. Dunning stated that the Public Records Act exempts from disclosure agreements with the retirement system under California Public Records Act 6254(a)(6). Ms. Dunning stated that all investment agreements and all related documents which Vista Equity are considered trade secrets. Ms. Dunning stated that SFERS did provide complainant with other materials.

A question and answer period occurred. The parties were provided an opportunity for rebuttals.

Action: Moved by Member Stein, seconded by Chair Yankee to find that the San Francisco Employees' Retirement System did not violate Sunshine Ordinance, Section(s), 67.21, 67.24 and 67.25, because the records are exempt from the California Public Records Act 6254.26(a)(6).

Public Comment:

Anonymous agreed with the majority that the record is exempt and there is a violation of 67.26 for withholding records from disclosure. Anonymous stated that they should have redacted most of the contract and that 67.26 was violated for that reason.

The motion PASSED by the following vote:

Ayes: 7 - Stein, Yankee, Wolfe, Wong, LaHood, Padmanabhan, Schmidt

Noes: 0 - None

Absent: 2 - Hill, Hyland

12. **File No. 21086:** Complaint filed by Anonymous against District Attorney Chesa Boudin and the Office of the District Attorney for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Sections 67.21, 67.26, 67.27, 67.25, 67.24 and California Government Code 6254.5 by failing to respond to a public records request in a timely and/or complete manner.

Anonymous (Petitioner) provided a summary of the complaint and requested the Committee to find a violation. Anonymous made a request for various communications regarding Chesa Boudin. Anonymous stated that there was a missing document from Boudin's Office records which they said they would produce but never did. Anonymous stated that the new administration promised they would provide the missing record and never did. Anonymous requested the SOTF order the record to be produced and that confidential information about witnesses be redacted.

Nikki Moore (District Attorney's Office) (Respondent) provided a summary of the department's position. Ms. Moore stated that this request was originally handled by the previous administration. Ms. Moore provided information regarding specific aspects of the request.

A question and answer period occurred. The parties were provided an opportunity for rebuttals.

Action: Moved by Member Schmidt, seconded by Member Padmanabhan, to find that Chesa Boudin and the District Attorney's Office violated California Public Records Act 6253(c) by failing to notify the requestor of records in its possession and produce those records in a complete and timely manner; and Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Section(s) 67.26 for unlawful withholding of records which includes the parties' communications including texts and hyperlinks and by failing to properly key redacted items to specific claims exemptions and orders that anything not properly produced, be produced.

Public Comment:

None.

The motion PASSED by the following vote:

Ayes: 7 - Schmidt, Padmanabhan, Wolfe, Wong, Stein, Yankee, LaHood

Noes: 0 - None

Absent: 2 - Hill, Hyland

13. Discussion on the Process and Scope of the 2022 Annual Report.

Member Stein summarized what has and has not worked in the past. Member Stein noted that if the Committee had the most comprehensive qualitative and quantitative information, it should be reported. Question, how ambitious does the committee want to be? Member Stein stated that there should be five or less members of an ad hoc committee and to make sure that the report is on the Rules Committee agenda.

Action: Moved by Chair Yankee, seconded by Vice-Chair Wong, to officially form an Annual Report ad hoc committee naming Member Stein as the Chair and continue the annual report discussion to the December SOTF meeting.

Public Comment:

David Pilpel stated that he is not in favor of creating a new ad hoc committee and believes that the Rules Committee can handle the processes.

Anonymous stated there does not need to be many meetings because the SOTF members are appointed public officials and that a consensus from the public is not necessary.

Peter Warfield stated he did not understand what is meant by an ad hoc committee.

The motion PASSED by the following vote:

Ayes: 7 - Yankee, Wong, Schmidt, Padmanabhan, Wolfe, Stein, LaHood

Noes: 0 - None

Absent: 2 - Hill, Hyland

14. Announcements, Comments, Questions, and Future Agenda Items by Members of the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force.

Member Wolfe expressed sorrow at Member Laurie Jones Neighbors passing, asked the Task Force to adjourn in her memory and stated that there will be a memoriam at Tuesday's Board of Supervisors meeting

Member LaHood also expressed sorrow at Member Neighbors passing.

Public Comment:

Anonymous also expressed sorrow at Member Neighbors' passing noting that she always said what is important is the letter of the law.

Peter Warfield thanked the Task Force for alerting the public to the upcoming memoriam because people might want to participate.

15. **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 12:50 am.

APPROVED: DRAFT
Sunshine Ordinance Task Force

N.B. The Minutes of this meeting set forth all actions taken by the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force on the matters stated, but not necessarily in the chronological sequence in which the matters were taken up.