

Item No. 14

Date: 6/3/2026

Completed By: Patricia H. Petersen (5/28/2026)

Order of Determination

**SUNSHINE ORDINANCE
TASK FORCE**



City Hall
1 Dr Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Tel. No. (415) 554-7724
Fax No. (415) 554-7854
TTD/TTY No. (415) 554-5227

ORDER OF DETERMINATION

DATE DECISION ISSUED: 3/4/2026

File No. 25134: Complaint filed by Minh Cantarutti against the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Section(s) 67.21, by failing to respond to a public records request in a timely and/or complete manner.

HEARING AND ACTION ON THE COMPLAINT

On 1/27/2026, the Education, Outreach, and Training Committee, acting in its capacity to hear petitions/complaints, heard the matter.

Action: Moved by Member Pilpel, seconded by Member Kumar, to find that the Task Force has jurisdiction, that the requested records are public, and forwarded the matter to the Consent Agenda with a recommendation of a finding of a violation Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Section(s) 67.21, by failing to respond to a public records request in a timely and/or complete manner, Section(s) 67.26, by failing to keep withholdings to a minimum, and Section(s) 67.27, by failing to provide written justification of withholdings.

The motion **PASSED** by the following vote:

Ayes: 3 – Pilpel, Kumar, Hyland

Noes: 0 – None

Absent: 0 - None

On 3/4/2026, the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force held a hearing to review the recommendation from the Committee and/or review the merits of the petition/complaint.

Action: Moved by Member Hyland, seconded by Member Wolfe, to approve the Consent Agenda and adopt the recommendation of the Committee, finding that the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing violated Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Section(s) 67.21, by failing to respond to a public records request in a timely and/or complete manner; Section(s) 67.26, by failing to keep withholdings to a minimum, and Section(s) 67.27, by failing to provide written justification of withholdings.

The motion **PASSED** by the following vote:

Ayes: 10 – Hyland, Wolfe, Schmidt, LaHood, Sugarman, Kumar, Anderson, Sangirardi, Stein, Yankee

Noes: 0 – None

Absent: 1 – Pilpel

This Order of Determination was approved
by the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force
on: 4/1/2026

#

Complaint Summary

**Sunshine Ordinance Task Force
Complaint Summary**

File No. 25134

Minh Cantarutti v. Homelessness and Supportive Housing

Date filed with SOTF: 12/30/2025

Contact information:

Party	Name(s)	Email(s)	Telephone
Petitioner	Minh Cantarutti	mcantarutti26@gmail.com	
Respondent	Homelessness and Supportive Housing	HSHsunshine@sfgov.org; dylan.schneider@sfgov.org	

File No. 25134: Complaint filed by Minh Cantarutti against Homeless and Supportive Housing for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Section(s) 67.21, by failing to respond to a public records request in a timely and/or complete manner.

Administrator's Notes

- 4/1/2026 – Order of Determination granted
- 4/8/2026 – Petitioner submits timely Request for Reconsideration
- 5/6/2026 – Reconsideration granted

Complainant's Supporting Documents

From: [Minh Cantarutti](#)
To: [SOTF \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Schneider, Dylan \(HOM\)](#); [HSHSunshine](#); [Robinson, Davares \(HOM\)](#)
Subject: Petitioner Compliance Response and Audit of Responsive Records — File No. 25134 — Compliance Hearing Requested
Date: Monday, April 6, 2026 8:07:43 AM
Attachments: [Request 25-10317 - NextRequest - SFMTA VAN TOW.pdf](#)
[Request 26-105 - NextRequest - Pete.pdf](#)
[Request 26-134 - NextRequest - HSH.pdf](#)

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

To the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force Administrator,

I write as Petitioner in File No. 25134 (Cantarutti v. HSH) to submit my compliance response following the Task Force's April 1, 2026 approval of the Order of Determination, and to formally request a compliance hearing. I have performed a complete audit of past, improperly redacted, and outstanding records.

I have include copies of Dylan Schnieders stated refusals to comply, as well as failure to publish/make visible records to the next request portal. including 25-134, the controlling request of this complaint. The following issues remain unresolved:

Any records not attached are available on request. All claims are supported by documentary evidence.

1. UNILATERAL PRE-OOD DECLARATION OF COMPLETION

On February 20, 2026 — before the Order of Determination was formally approved — HSH's Manager of Legislative Affairs Dylan Schneider sent an email stating: "With this email we consider HSH's commitments related to File No. 25134 completed." This declaration was premature and without legal effect. The OOD was not approved until April 1, 2026. HSH's self-certification of compliance before the OOD existed is not a basis for closure, and any compliance assessment must be measured against the now-approved Order.

2. CONTINUED APPLICATION OF INVERTED REDACTION STANDARD (Sections 67.26 and 67.27)

In the same February 20 email, HSH maintained the following redaction standard: "As this employee worked directly with clients, we must assume that phone numbers included in this log could belong to clients and should be protected unless we can otherwise verify the identity of that phone number."

This is the burden of proof inverted. The Sunshine Ordinance places the burden on the agency to justify each withholding — not on the petitioner to prove information is public. This standard was identified as the violation at the January 27 hearing and is the basis for the Section 67.26 and 67.27 findings. HSH's February 20 production maintained this framework, applying presumptive redaction to phone numbers that may belong to City employees or contractors operating in their official capacity. That is not compliance with the OOD.

3. PHOTO AND VIDEO MESSAGES INCORRECTLY CLAIMED UNRESPONSIVE

HSH's production treated photo and video messages within the January 17–18, 2024 call and text logs as unresponsive. These messages fall squarely within the timeframe and subject matter of the original request. Classifying them as unresponsive without justification is a withholding requiring specific legal basis under Section 67.27.

4. FAILURE TO PUBLISH REQUESTS ON NEXTREQUEST PORTAL

HSH has left completed requests unpublished and unavailable to be view by the public, including 25-134, the controlling request of this complaint. Upon notice, I sent a formal demand for all publications to be added to the communication threads of the unpublished requests. This can be found in attached Request 26-105, also unpublished. Not only were these demands ignored, she again stated she considered Hsh's obligation complete and will take no further action. She then proceeded to say that if I had any further issues with the file, to take it up with SOTF. This statement is made far in advance of the OOD, signaling contempt and disregard for SOTF's authority and the letter of governing laws and ordinances. These request, the records included, and the correspondence attached remain unpublished, and unavailable to the public.

For the reasons above, I respectfully request that this matter be referred to a compliance hearing so that HSH may be required to demonstrate full compliance with the Order of Determination as approved on April 1, 2026.

Thank you.

Minh Luong Cantarutti
Petitioner, pro se
(415) 888-7101
mcantarutti26@gmail.com

Attached are copies of the unpublished request

SECTION [X]: AUDIT OF HSH PUBLIC RECORDS REQUESTS — OUTSTANDING RECORDS

The following is a complete audit of public records requests submitted to HSH (Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing / HOM), the records produced, and the records that remain outstanding. This audit is submitted as part of the compliance record in File No. 25134.

REQUEST 1: NextRequest #25-10128

Subject: Records Regarding Mobile Device (415) 260-9173 — January 17–18, 2024

Submitted: December 9, 2025 | Status: CLOSED (disputed)

WHAT WAS REQUESTED:

1. Mobile Device Assignment Records — documentation confirming assignment of device

(415) 260-9173, MDM enrollment, and assigned user identity.

2. Call Logs & Text Message Logs — metadata showing time, duration, and recipient/sender phone numbers for all calls; logs of all SMS/MMS messages sent or received on this device during January 17–18, 2024.

3. Operational Activity Logs — daily activity reports, field logs, or "Touchpoint" records created by the device user or assigned unit (SF HEART team) for January 17–18, 2024.

RECORDS PRODUCED:

- 1_17-18_2024 Call Log - (415) 260-9173_Redacted.pdf (uploaded 12/26/2025)
- TXT Log 1_17-18_2024 - (415) 260-9173_Redacted.pdf (uploaded 12/26/2025)
- Arielle MDM Screenshot 2025-12-22 152925.jpg (uploaded 12/26/2025)
- 02.2026 REDACTIONS AND LOG_TXT Log 1_17-18_2024 - (415) 260-9173.pdf (uploaded 02/20/2026)
- 02.2026 REDACTIONS AND LOG_1_17-18_2024 Call Log - (415) 260-9173.pdf (uploaded 02/20/2026)

RECORDS STILL OUTSTANDING:

1. UNREDACTED PHONE NUMBERS in call logs (ARIELLE PIASTUNOVICH device) — The call logs for Arielle Piastunovich's City-issued device (415) 260-9173 were produced with all recipient/sender phone numbers redacted. HSH cited Cal. Govt. Code §7927.700 and 24 CFR §578.103(b)(1), but neither exemption applies to City employee phone numbers or inter-agency contact numbers used in official operations. Arielle Piastunovich's phone logs must be produced unredacted. Phone numbers of public officials and contractors acting in official capacity must be disclosed.

2. UNREDACTED SMS/MMS CONTENT — The text message log was produced with all content redacted. The actual content of text messages between City employees conducting official HSOC business is a public record under *City of San Jose v. Superior Court* (2017) 2 Cal.5th 608.

3. FULL MMS LOG — MMS records were designated "non-responsive" despite being explicitly included in the request scope ("all SMS/MMS messages sent or received"). This designation is improper.

4. OPERATIONAL ACTIVITY LOGS / TOUCHPOINT RECORDS — No daily activity reports, field logs, or SF HEART Touchpoint records for January 17–18, 2024 have been produced.

5. EXEMPTION-BY-EXEMPTION PRIVILEGE LOG — No proper §67.26 justification identifying each withheld portion, the specific exemption, and its factual basis has been provided.

REQUEST 2: NextRequest #26-105

Subject: Communications/Records of PEDRO RINCON (December 2023 – January 2024)

Submitted: January 6, 2026 | Status: CLOSED

BE ADVISED - PEDRO RINCON IS CONTRACTED BY HSH THRU HELUNA HEALTH. HSH IS BELIEVED TO HOLD CONSTRUCTIVE POSSESSION OF RECORDS

WHAT WAS REQUESTED:

All records, documents, and communications from December 1, 2023 through January 31, 2024, created by, sent to, or involving PEDRO RINCON regarding:

1. San Bruno Avenue Encampments — communications, meeting minutes, or directives

concerning camp sweeps, encampment resolutions, outreach, or site stabilization on or near San Bruno Avenue.

2. Field Reports & Logs — electronic or handwritten logs, Encampment Master Log entries, or service assessments authored or reviewed by Arielle Piastunovich for this location.

3. Inter-Agency Coordination — all communications (including email, text messages, and instant messages) between Arielle Piastunovich and any employee/contractor/agent of DPW, SFPD, HSH, or any other City department, regarding the scheduling or execution of resolutions on San Bruno Avenue.

4. Personal Documentation — field notes, observation logs, site assessment forms, photographs, or other documentation created by PEDRO RINCON during site visits.

5. Work Schedules and Assignments — calendars, work schedules, duty rosters, assignment sheets, or tasking documents showing PEDRO RINCON's scheduled activities and site assignments.

NOTE: "Communications" was defined to include email, SMS, instant messages (Signal, WhatsApp, Slack, Teams), phone call logs and recordings (mobile and desk phones), voicemail recordings and transcripts, and any other electronic communication method.

RECORDS PRODUCED (55 documents, uploaded 01/20/2026):

- HSOC Joint Field Operation Notes (multiple dates: Dec 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 11, 29, Jan 5 — PDFs and .docx)
- HSOC Notes (multiple dates: 12/01/23, 12/04/23, 12/05/23, 12/06/23, 12/08/23, 12/11/23, 12/23/29, 01/04/24, 01/05/24 — .docx and PDFs, one redacted)
- HSOC Encampment Resolution documents (English and Spanish, 12/14/23)
- HSOC notice revised (English and Spanish versions)
- Shelter/Housing Flyers (Auburn, Camelot, Empress, Le Nain, Minna Lee, PBI, Star, Windsor — various years)
- Secure/DISH notification templates and emails (Dec 2023 – Feb 2024)
- CM referrals_Redacted.pdf
- Putting folks in the grid.pdf
- Template documents (.docx) for December 2023 – February 2024

RECORDS STILL OUTSTANDING:

1. PHONE RECORDS FOR PEDRO RINCON — No call logs, SMS logs, or MMS logs for any device assigned to or used by Pedro Rincon have been produced. The request explicitly included phone call logs, voicemail recordings, and all electronic communications.

2. TEXT MESSAGES AND INSTANT MESSAGES — No SMS, MMS, Signal, WhatsApp, Slack, Teams, or other instant message records involving Pedro Rincon during the request period have been produced.

3. INTER-AGENCY COMMUNICATIONS BETWEEN PIASTUNOVICH AND DPW/SFPD/OTHER AGENCIES — No inter-agency email, text, or coordination communications between Arielle Piastunovich and DPW, SFPD, or other agencies specifically related to San Bruno Avenue operations during this period have been produced.

4. PEDRO RINCON PERSONAL DOCUMENTATION — No field notes, observation logs, site assessment forms, or photographs personally created by Pedro Rincon during San Bruno Avenue site visits have been produced.

5. PEDRO RINCON WORK SCHEDULES/DUTY ROSTERS — No calendars, duty rosters, assignment sheets, or tasking documents for Pedro Rincon for this period have been produced.

6. ENCAMPMENT MASTER LOG ENTRIES — No Encampment Master Log entries authored or reviewed by Arielle Piastunovich for San Bruno Avenue during this period have been produced.

REQUEST 3: NextRequest #26-134

Subject: Supplemental Request — Text Message Content and Call Details (January 17–19, 2024)

Re: Original Request #25-10128 (Mobile Device 415-260-9173)

Submitted: January 6, 2026 | Status: CLOSED (disputed)

WHAT WAS REQUESTED:

1. Full text message content — all texts sent from/received by (415) 260-9173 during January 17–19, 2024, including full content, sender/recipient numbers, timestamps, attachments, and metadata.
2. Voicemail content — audio recordings or transcriptions of all voicemails on device (415) 260-9173 during January 17–19, 2024, including caller numbers, timestamps, and duration.
3. Archived/backup communications — any archived text/voicemail data from iCloud, MDM backup systems, email-to-SMS gateways, or communication platforms (Slack, Teams).
4. Related communications referencing texts/calls — any emails, memos, or notes that reference, summarize, or discuss the content of phone calls or text messages during January 17–19, 2024.

NOTE: The call and text logs produced under #25-10128 document 15+ phone calls on January 17, 30+ text messages across January 17–18 (with 20+ texts between 11:20am–12:50pm on January 18 alone), demonstrating intensive official coordination activity on a City-issued device.

RECORDS PRODUCED:

- Voicemail log_Redacted.pdf (uploaded 01/21/2026 — listed in timeline but not in documents tab; content redacted) not related to incident.

RECORDS STILL OUTSTANDING:

1. FULL TEXT MESSAGE CONTENT — No actual text message content has been produced for the January 17–19, 2024 period, despite 30+ texts being documented in the previously produced logs. The request for full content, sender/recipient numbers, timestamps, and attachments has not been satisfied.
2. VOICEMAIL AUDIO/TRANSCRIPTS — Only a redacted voicemail log has been produced. Actual voicemail audio recordings or official transcripts have not been produced.
3. UNREDACTED VOICEMAIL LOG — The voicemail log was produced with personal information redacted; however, redactions of City employee/contractor phone numbers are improper and the unredacted version must be produced.
4. ARCHIVED/BACKUP COMMUNICATION DATA — No response has been given regarding the existence or production of archived text/voicemail data from iCloud, MDM, or other backup systems.
5. RELATED COMMUNICATIONS REFERENCING TEXTS/CALLS — No emails, memos, or meeting notes referencing the content of January 17–19, 2024 communications have been produced.
6. RETENTION POLICY DOCUMENTATION — HSH has not provided its text message or voicemail retention policies for City-issued devices, as requested.
7. EXEMPTION-BY-EXEMPTION PRIVILEGE LOG — No proper §67.26 justification has been provided for the redactions in the voicemail log or for the withholding of text message content.

REQUEST 4: Call and Text Logs — Consolidated Outstanding Records
Subject: Unredacted Call Logs, Full SMS/MMS Content, and Voicemail Records
Relevant Requests: #25-10128, #26-105, #26-134

WHAT WAS REQUESTED:

1. Unredacted call logs — complete call logs for device (415) 260-9173 (January 17–18, 2024), including unredacted sender/recipient phone numbers for all City employees and contractors.
2. Full SMS/MMS content — complete text message content for all SMS and MMS messages sent or received on device (415) 260-9173 during January 17–19, 2024, including sender/recipient numbers, timestamps, and attachments.
3. Call and text logs for Pedro Rincon — all call logs and text message logs for any device assigned to or used by Pedro Rincon during December 2023 – January 2024.
4. MMS/photo/video messages — MMS attachments and photo/video messages within the January 17–18, 2024 logs, improperly designated as non-responsive.
5. Voicemail records — audio recordings or official transcripts of all voicemails on device (415) 260-9173 during January 17–19, 2024, plus the unredacted voicemail log.

RECORDS PRODUCED:

- 1_17-18_2024 Call Log - (415) 260-9173_Redacted.pdf (uploaded 12/26/2025)
- TXT Log 1_17-18_2024 - (415) 260-9173_Redacted.pdf (uploaded 12/26/2025)
- 02.2026 REDACTIONS AND LOG_TXT Log 1_17-18_2024 - (415) 260-9173.pdf (uploaded 02/20/2026)
- 02.2026_REDACTIONS AND LOG_1_17-18_2024 Call Log - (415) 260-9173.pdf (uploaded 02/20/2026)
- Voicemail log (redacted) — date of production unconfirmed

RECORDS STILL OUTSTANDING:

1. UNREDACTED CALL LOG (ARIELLE PIASTUNOVICH) — All recipient/sender phone numbers in the call logs for Arielle Piastunovich's City-issued device (415) 260-9173 (Jan 17–18, 2024) have been redacted. Arielle Piastunovich's phone logs must be produced unredacted. Redactions of City employee and contractor phone numbers are improper under the Sunshine Ordinance.
2. FULL SMS/MMS CONTENT — 30+ text messages are documented in the produced logs, but no actual message content has been produced. Full content, sender/recipient numbers, timestamps, and attachment data remain withheld.
3. MMS/PHOTO/VIDEO MESSAGES — Photo and video messages within the January 17–18, 2024 logs were improperly designated non-responsive. These fall squarely within the scope of the original request.
4. CALL AND TEXT LOGS FOR PEDRO RINCON — No call logs or text message logs for any device assigned to or used by Pedro Rincon during December 2023 – January 2024 have been produced (#26-105).
5. VOICEMAIL AUDIO/TRANSCRIPTS — Actual voicemail audio recordings or official transcripts have not been produced. Only a redacted voicemail log was provided.
6. UNREDACTED VOICEMAIL LOG — The voicemail log was produced with phone numbers redacted; unredacted version must be produced.

7. EXEMPTION-BY-EXEMPTION PRIVILEGE LOG — No §67.26 justification has been provided for any redaction in the call logs, text logs, or voicemail log.

SUMMARY OF OUTSTANDING RECORDS — ALL REQUESTS

The following categories of records remain unproduced or improperly redacted across HSH's responses to the above requests:

A. Phone Records (Calls):

- Unredacted call log for Arielle Piastunovich's device (415) 260-9173 (Jan 17–18, 2024) — Arielle Piastunovich's phone logs must be produced unredacted; phone numbers of City employees and contractors must be disclosed (#25-10128)
- Call records for Pedro Rincon's device(s) for Dec 2023 – Jan 2024 (#26-105)

B. Text Message / SMS / MMS Records:

- Full SMS/MMS content for device (415) 260-9173 (Jan 17–19, 2024) — 30+ texts documented in logs but content withheld (#25-10128, #26-134)
- MMS log for device (415) 260-9173 — improperly designated non-responsive (#25-10128)
- Text messages involving Pedro Rincon (Dec 2023 – Jan 2024) (#26-105)

C. Voicemail Records:

- Voicemail audio or transcripts for device (415) 260-9173 (Jan 17–19, 2024) (#26-134)
- Unredacted voicemail log (#26-134)

D. Inter-Agency / Coordination Communications:

- Communications between Arielle Piastunovich and DPW, SFPD, and other agencies re: San Bruno Avenue operations (Dec 2023 – Jan 2024) (#26-105)
- Emails/memos referencing the content of Jan 17–19, 2024 calls and texts (#26-134)

E. Field Documentation / Operational Records:

- Pedro Rincon field notes, observation logs, site assessments, photographs from San Bruno Avenue site visits (#26-105)
- Pedro Rincon work schedules, duty rosters, assignment documents (Dec 2023 – Jan 2024) (#26-105)
- Encampment Master Log entries for San Bruno Avenue (#26-105)
- SF HEART Touchpoint/activity records for Jan 17–18, 2024 (#25-10128)

F. Procedural / Privilege Log Deficiencies:

- No exemption-by-exemption §67.26 privilege log has been provided for any redacted document across all three requests
- HSH's retention policy for text messages and voicemails on City-issued devices has not been disclosed (#26-134)

HSH's unilateral declarations of closure on these requests do not satisfy its obligations under the Sunshine Ordinance or the California Public Records Act. The outstanding records identified above are the subject of ongoing compliance proceedings before the SOTF in File No. 25134.

From: [Minh Cantarutti](#)
To: [SOTF \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Re: Petitioner Compliance Response and Audit of Responsive Records — File No. 25134 — Compliance Hearing Requested
Date: Wednesday, April 8, 2026 6:02:27 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)



25134 Reconsideration Request.pd...

Please see attached request for reconsideration. The fact that no order was included in this OOD is absurd. What is the point of having a sunshine ordinance or SOTF board if it will not address non compliance with the tools it has. Court actions should be reserved for cases where compliance orders are not followed, not to replace the burden of the SOTF's purpose and duty.

On Tue, Apr 7, 2026 at 2:02 PM SOTF (BOS) <sotf@sfgov.org> wrote:

Hello, Mr. Cantarutti –

The finding of the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force (SOTF) in **File 25134** did not include an order to the Respondent, nor did it include a referral to a committee for compliance purposes. With the approval of the Order of Determination on 4/1/2026, the administrative review process has reached its conclusion and the file is closed.

Per SOTF [Complaint Procedure D\(3\)](#), you have the independent right to pursue the issue in court. Please refer to the enforcement mechanisms outlined in Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), [Section 67.35](#).

Thank you.

Patricia Petersen (she/her)

Assistant Clerk

Board of Supervisors

[1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244](#)

Telephone 415-554-7724 | Fax 415-554-5163

sotf@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

I am not in on Wednesdays.



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The [Legislative Research Center](#) provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation, and archived matters since August 1998.

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: Minh Cantarutti <mcantarutti26@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, April 6, 2026 8:06 AM

To: SOTF (BOS) <sotf@sfgov.org>

Cc: Schneider, Dylan (HOM) <dylan.schneider@sfgov.org>; HSHSunshine <HSHSunshine@sfgov.org>; Robinson, Davares (HOM) <davares.robinson@sfgov.org>

Subject: Petitioner Compliance Response and Audit of Responsive Records — File No. 25134 — Compliance Hearing Requested

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

To the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force Administrator,

I write as Petitioner in File No. 25134 (Cantarutti v. HSH) to submit my compliance response following the Task Force's April 1, 2026 approval of the Order of Determination, and to formally request a compliance hearing. I have performed a complete audit of past, improperly redacted, and outstanding records.

I have include copies of Dylan Schnieders stated refusals to comply, as well as failure to publish/make visible records to the next request portal. including 25-134, the controlling request of this complaint. The following issues remain unresolved:

Any records not attached are available on request. All claims are supported by documentary evidence.

1. UNILATERAL PRE-ODD DECLARATION OF COMPLETION

On February 20, 2026 — before the Order of Determination was formally approved — HSH's Manager of Legislative Affairs Dylan Schneider sent an email stating: "With this email we consider HSH's commitments related to File No. 25134 completed." This declaration was premature and without legal effect. The OOD was not approved until April 1, 2026. HSH's self-certification of compliance before the OOD existed is not a basis for closure, and any compliance assessment must be measured against the now-approved Order.

2. CONTINUED APPLICATION OF INVERTED REDACTION STANDARD (Sections 67.26 and 67.27)

In the same February 20 email, HSH maintained the following redaction standard: "As this employee worked directly with clients, we must assume that phone numbers included in this log could belong to clients and should be protected unless we can otherwise verify the identity of that phone number."

This is the burden of proof inverted. The Sunshine Ordinance places the burden on the agency to justify each withholding — not on the petitioner to prove information is public. This standard was identified as the violation at the January 27 hearing and is the basis for the Section 67.26 and 67.27 findings. HSH's February 20 production maintained this framework, applying presumptive redaction to phone numbers that may belong to City employees or contractors operating in their official capacity. That is not compliance with the OOD.

3. PHOTO AND VIDEO MESSAGES INCORRECTLY CLAIMED UNRESPONSIVE

HSH's production treated photo and video messages within the January 17–18, 2024 call and text logs as unresponsive. These messages fall squarely within the timeframe and subject matter of the original request. Classifying them as unresponsive without justification is a withholding requiring specific legal basis under Section 67.27.

4. FAILURE TO PUBLISH REQUESTS ON NEXTREQUEST PORTAL

HSH has left completed requests unpublished and unavailable to be view by the public, including 25-134, the controlling request of this complaint. Upon notice, I sent a formal demand for all publications to be added to the communication threads of the unpublished requests. This can be found in attached Request 26-105, also unpublished. Not only were these demands ignored, she again stated she considered Hsh's obligation complete and will take no further action. She then proceeded to say that if I had any further issues with the file,

to take it up with SOTF. This statement is made far in advance of the OOD, signaling contempt and disregard for SOTF's authority and the letter of governing laws and ordinances. These request, the records included, and the correspondence attached remain unpublished, and unavailable to the public.

For the reasons above, I respectfully request that this matter be referred to a compliance hearing so that HSH may be required to demonstrate full compliance with the Order of Determination as approved on April 1, 2026.

Thank you.

Minh Luong Cantarutti
Petitioner, pro se
(415) 888-7101
mcantarutti26@gmail.com

Attached are copies of the unpublished request

SECTION [X]: AUDIT OF HSH PUBLIC RECORDS REQUESTS — OUTSTANDING RECORDS

The following is a complete audit of public records requests submitted to HSH (Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing / HOM), the records produced, and the records that remain outstanding. This audit is submitted as part of the compliance record in File No. 25134.

REQUEST 1: NextRequest #25-10128

Subject: Records Regarding Mobile Device (415) 260-9173 — January 17–18, 2024

Submitted: December 9, 2025 | Status: CLOSED (disputed)

WHAT WAS REQUESTED:

1. Mobile Device Assignment Records — documentation confirming assignment of device (415) 260-9173, MDM enrollment, and assigned user identity.
2. Call Logs & Text Message Logs — metadata showing time, duration, and recipient/sender phone numbers for all calls; logs of all SMS/MMS messages sent or received on this device during January 17–18, 2024.
3. Operational Activity Logs — daily activity reports, field logs, or "Touchpoint" records created by the device user or assigned unit (SF HEART team) for January 17–18, 2024.

RECORDS PRODUCED:

- 1_17-18_2024 Call Log - (415) 260-9173_Redacted.pdf (uploaded 12/26/2025)
- TXT Log 1_17-18_2024 - (415) 260-9173_Redacted.pdf (uploaded 12/26/2025)
- Arielle MDM Screenshot 2025-12-22 152925.jpg (uploaded 12/26/2025)
- 02.2026 REDACTIONS AND LOG_TXT Log 1_17-18_2024 - (415) 260-9173.pdf (uploaded 02/20/2026)
- 02.2026_REDACTIONS AND LOG_1_17-18_2024 Call Log - (415) 260-9173.pdf (uploaded 02/20/2026)

RECORDS STILL OUTSTANDING:

1. UNREDACTED PHONE NUMBERS in call logs (ARIELLE PIASTUNOVICH device) — The call logs for Arielle Piastunovich's City-issued device (415) 260-9173 were produced with all recipient/sender phone numbers redacted. HSH cited Cal. Govt. Code §7927.700 and 24 CFR §578.103(b)(1), but neither exemption applies to City employee phone numbers or inter-agency contact numbers used in official operations. Arielle Piastunovich's phone logs must be produced unredacted. Phone numbers of public officials and contractors acting in official capacity must be disclosed.
2. UNREDACTED SMS/MMS CONTENT — The text message log was produced with all content redacted. The actual content of text messages between City employees conducting official HSOC business is a public record under City of San Jose v. Superior Court (2017) 2 Cal.5th 608.
3. FULL MMS LOG — MMS records were designated "non-responsive" despite being explicitly included in the request scope ("all SMS/MMS messages sent or received"). This designation is improper.
4. OPERATIONAL ACTIVITY LOGS / TOUCHPOINT RECORDS — No daily activity reports, field logs, or SF HEART Touchpoint records for January 17–18, 2024 have been produced.
5. EXEMPTION-BY-EXEMPTION PRIVILEGE LOG — No proper §67.26 justification

identifying each withheld portion, the specific exemption, and its factual basis has been provided.

REQUEST 2: NextRequest #26-105

Subject: Communications/Records of PEDRO RINCON (December 2023 – January 2024)

Submitted: January 6, 2026 | Status: CLOSED

BE ADVISED - PEDRO RINCON IS CONTRACTED BY HSH THRU HELUNA HEALTH. HSH IS BELIEVED TO HOLD CONSTRUCTIVE POSSESSION OF RECORDS

WHAT WAS REQUESTED:

All records, documents, and communications from December 1, 2023 through January 31, 2024, created by, sent to, or involving PEDRO RINCON regarding:

1. [San Bruno Avenue](#) Encampments — communications, meeting minutes, or directives concerning camp sweeps, encampment resolutions, outreach, or site stabilization on or near San Bruno Avenue.
2. Field Reports & Logs — electronic or handwritten logs, Encampment Master Log entries, or service assessments authored or reviewed by Arielle Piastunovich for this location.
3. Inter-Agency Coordination — all communications (including email, text messages, and instant messages) between Arielle Piastunovich and any employee/contractor/agent of DPW, SFPD, HSH, or any other City department, regarding the scheduling or execution of resolutions on San Bruno Avenue.
4. Personal Documentation — field notes, observation logs, site assessment forms, photographs, or other documentation created by PEDRO RINCON during site visits.
5. Work Schedules and Assignments — calendars, work schedules, duty rosters, assignment sheets, or tasking documents showing PEDRO RINCON's scheduled activities and site assignments.

NOTE: "Communications" was defined to include email, SMS, instant messages (Signal, WhatsApp, Slack, Teams), phone call logs and recordings (mobile and desk phones), voicemail recordings and transcripts, and any other electronic communication method.

RECORDS PRODUCED (55 documents, uploaded 01/20/2026):

- HSOC Joint Field Operation Notes (multiple dates: Dec 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 11, 29, Jan 5 — PDFs and .docx)
- HSOC Notes (multiple dates: 12/01/23, 12/04/23, 12/05/23, 12/06/23, 12/08/23, 12/11/23, 12/23/29, 01/04/24, 01/05/24 — .docx and PDFs, one redacted)
- HSOC Encampment Resolution documents (English and Spanish, 12/14/23)
- HSOC notice revised (English and Spanish versions)
- Shelter/Housing Flyers (Auburn, Camelot, Empress, Le Nain, Minna Lee, PBI, Star, Windsor — various years)
- Secure/DISH notification templates and emails (Dec 2023 – Feb 2024)
- CM referrals_Redacted.pdf
- Putting folks in the grid.pdf
- Template documents (.docx) for December 2023 – February 2024

RECORDS STILL OUTSTANDING:

1. PHONE RECORDS FOR PEDRO RINCON — No call logs, SMS logs, or MMS logs for any device assigned to or used by Pedro Rincon have been produced. The request explicitly included phone call logs, voicemail recordings, and all electronic communications.
2. TEXT MESSAGES AND INSTANT MESSAGES — No SMS, MMS, Signal, WhatsApp, Slack, Teams, or other instant message records involving Pedro Rincon during the request period have been produced.
3. INTER-AGENCY COMMUNICATIONS BETWEEN PIASTUNOVICH AND DPW/SFPD/OTHER AGENCIES — No inter-agency email, text, or coordination communications between Arielle Piastunovich and DPW, SFPD, or other agencies specifically related to San Bruno Avenue operations during this period have been produced.
4. PEDRO RINCON PERSONAL DOCUMENTATION — No field notes, observation logs, site assessment forms, or photographs personally created by Pedro Rincon during San Bruno Avenue site visits have been produced.
5. PEDRO RINCON WORK SCHEDULES/DUTY ROSTERS — No calendars, duty rosters, assignment sheets, or tasking documents for Pedro Rincon for this period have been produced.
6. ENCAMPMENT MASTER LOG ENTRIES — No Encampment Master Log entries authored or reviewed by Arielle Piastunovich for San Bruno Avenue during this period have been produced.

REQUEST 3: NextRequest #26-134

Subject: Supplemental Request — Text Message Content and Call Details (January 17–19, 2024)

Re: Original Request #25-10128 (Mobile Device 415-260-9173)

Submitted: January 6, 2026 | Status: CLOSED (disputed)

WHAT WAS REQUESTED:

1. Full text message content — all texts sent from/received by (415) 260-9173 during January 17–19, 2024, including full content, sender/recipient numbers, timestamps, attachments, and metadata.
2. Voicemail content — audio recordings or transcriptions of all voicemails on device (415) 260-9173 during January 17–19, 2024, including caller numbers, timestamps, and duration.
3. Archived/backup communications — any archived text/voicemail data from iCloud, MDM backup systems, email-to-SMS gateways, or communication platforms (Slack, Teams).
4. Related communications referencing texts/calls — any emails, memos, or notes that reference, summarize, or discuss the content of phone calls or text messages during January 17–19, 2024.

NOTE: The call and text logs produced under #25-10128 document 15+ phone calls on January 17, 30+ text messages across January 17–18 (with 20+ texts between 11:20am–12:50pm on January 18 alone), demonstrating intensive official coordination activity on a City-issued device.

RECORDS PRODUCED:

- Voicemail log_Redacted.pdf (uploaded 01/21/2026 — listed in timeline but not in documents tab; content redacted) not related to incident.

RECORDS STILL OUTSTANDING:

1. FULL TEXT MESSAGE CONTENT — No actual text message content has been produced for the January 17–19, 2024 period, despite 30+ texts being documented in the previously produced logs. The request for full content, sender/recipient numbers, timestamps, and attachments has not been satisfied.

2. VOICEMAIL AUDIO/TRANSCRIPTS — Only a redacted voicemail log has been produced. Actual voicemail audio recordings or official transcripts have not been produced.
3. UNREDACTED VOICEMAIL LOG — The voicemail log was produced with personal information redacted; however, redactions of City employee/contractor phone numbers are improper and the unredacted version must be produced.
4. ARCHIVED/BACKUP COMMUNICATION DATA — No response has been given regarding the existence or production of archived text/voicemail data from iCloud, MDM, or other backup systems.
5. RELATED COMMUNICATIONS REFERENCING TEXTS/CALLS — No emails, memos, or meeting notes referencing the content of January 17–19, 2024 communications have been produced.
6. RETENTION POLICY DOCUMENTATION — HSH has not provided its text message or voicemail retention policies for City-issued devices, as requested.
7. EXEMPTION-BY-EXEMPTION PRIVILEGE LOG — No proper §67.26 justification has been provided for the redactions in the voicemail log or for the withholding of text message content.

REQUEST 4: Call and Text Logs — Consolidated Outstanding Records

Subject: Unredacted Call Logs, Full SMS/MMS Content, and Voicemail Records

Relevant Requests: #25-10128, #26-105, #26-134

WHAT WAS REQUESTED:

1. Unredacted call logs — complete call logs for device (415) 260-9173 (January 17–18, 2024), including unredacted sender/recipient phone numbers for all City employees and contractors.
2. Full SMS/MMS content — complete text message content for all SMS and MMS messages sent or received on device (415) 260-9173 during January 17–19, 2024, including sender/recipient numbers, timestamps, and attachments.
3. Call and text logs for Pedro Rincon — all call logs and text message logs for any device assigned to or used by Pedro Rincon during December 2023 – January 2024.
4. MMS/photo/video messages — MMS attachments and photo/video messages within the January 17–18, 2024 logs, improperly designated as non-responsive.

5. Voicemail records — audio recordings or official transcripts of all voicemails on device (415) 260-9173 during January 17–19, 2024, plus the unredacted voicemail log.

RECORDS PRODUCED:

- 1_17-18_2024 Call Log - (415) 260-9173_Redacted.pdf (uploaded 12/26/2025)
- TXT Log 1_17-18_2024 - (415) 260-9173_Redacted.pdf (uploaded 12/26/2025)
- 02.2026 REDACTIONS AND LOG_TXT Log 1_17-18_2024 - (415) 260-9173.pdf (uploaded 02/20/2026)
- 02.2026_REDACTIONS AND LOG_1_17-18_2024 Call Log - (415) 260-9173.pdf (uploaded 02/20/2026)
- Voicemail log (redacted) — date of production unconfirmed

RECORDS STILL OUTSTANDING:

1. UNREDACTED CALL LOG (ARIELLE PIASTUNOVICH) — All recipient/sender phone numbers in the call logs for Arielle Piastunovich's City-issued device (415) 260-9173 (Jan 17–18, 2024) have been redacted. Arielle Piastunovich's phone logs must be produced unredacted. Redactions of City employee and contractor phone numbers are improper under the Sunshine Ordinance.
2. FULL SMS/MMS CONTENT — 30+ text messages are documented in the produced logs, but no actual message content has been produced. Full content, sender/recipient numbers, timestamps, and attachment data remain withheld.
3. MMS/PHOTO/VIDEO MESSAGES — Photo and video messages within the January 17–18, 2024 logs were improperly designated non-responsive. These fall squarely within the scope of the original request.
4. CALL AND TEXT LOGS FOR PEDRO RINCON — No call logs or text message logs for any device assigned to or used by Pedro Rincon during December 2023 – January 2024 have been produced (#26-105).
5. VOICEMAIL AUDIO/TRANSCRIPTS — Actual voicemail audio recordings or official transcripts have not been produced. Only a redacted voicemail log was provided.
6. UNREDACTED VOICEMAIL LOG — The voicemail log was produced with phone numbers redacted; unredacted version must be produced.
7. EXEMPTION-BY-EXEMPTION PRIVILEGE LOG — No §67.26 justification has been

provided for any redaction in the call logs, text logs, or voicemail log.

SUMMARY OF OUTSTANDING RECORDS — ALL REQUESTS

The following categories of records remain unproduced or improperly redacted across HSH's responses to the above requests:

A. Phone Records (Calls):

- Unredacted call log for Arielle Piastunovich's device (415) 260-9173 (Jan 17–18, 2024) — Arielle Piastunovich's phone logs must be produced unredacted; phone numbers of City employees and contractors must be disclosed (#25-10128)
- Call records for Pedro Rincon's device(s) for Dec 2023 – Jan 2024 (#26-105)

B. Text Message / SMS / MMS Records:

- Full SMS/MMS content for device (415) 260-9173 (Jan 17–19, 2024) — 30+ texts documented in logs but content withheld (#25-10128, #26-134)
- MMS log for device (415) 260-9173 — improperly designated non-responsive (#25-10128)
- Text messages involving Pedro Rincon (Dec 2023 – Jan 2024) (#26-105)

C. Voicemail Records:

- Voicemail audio or transcripts for device (415) 260-9173 (Jan 17–19, 2024) (#26-134)
- Unredacted voicemail log (#26-134)

D. Inter-Agency / Coordination Communications:

- Communications between Arielle Piastunovich and DPW, SFPD, and other agencies re: San Bruno Avenue operations (Dec 2023 – Jan 2024) (#26-105)

- Emails/memos referencing the content of Jan 17–19, 2024 calls and texts (#26-134)

E. Field Documentation / Operational Records:

- Pedro Rincon field notes, observation logs, site assessments, photographs from San Bruno Avenue site visits (#26-105)
- Pedro Rincon work schedules, duty rosters, assignment documents (Dec 2023 – Jan 2024) (#26-105)
- Encampment Master Log entries for San Bruno Avenue (#26-105)
- SF HEART Touchpoint/activity records for Jan 17–18, 2024 (#25-10128)

F. Procedural / Privilege Log Deficiencies:

- No exemption-by-exemption §67.26 privilege log has been provided for any redacted document across all three requests
- HSH's retention policy for text messages and voicemails on City-issued devices has not been disclosed (#26-134)

HSH's unilateral declarations of closure on these requests do not satisfy its obligations under the Sunshine Ordinance or the California Public Records Act. The outstanding records identified above are the subject of ongoing compliance proceedings before the SOTF in File No. 25134.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

File No. 25134 — Cantarutti v. Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing

Submitted Pursuant to SOTF Complaint Procedure, Section E

To: Sunshine Ordinance Task Force Administrator

From: Minh Luong Cantarutti, Petitioner (pro se)

Date: April ____, 2026

Re: Request for Reconsideration — File No. 25134 — New Information: Post-Hearing Agency Conduct Demonstrating Continued Non-Compliance with the Violation Standard Found by the Task Force

CC:

- Supervisor Matt Dorsey, District 6 — DorseyStaff@sfgov.org
- Supervisor Jackie Fielder, District 9 — Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org
- Supervisor Shamann Walton, District 10 — Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org
- President Rafael Mandelman, District 8 — MandelmanStaff@sfgov.org
- Board of Supervisors (full board) — Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

Copies of this request are being provided to members of the Board of Supervisors in their capacity as the appointing authority over the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force. Board of Supervisors members are not members of the Task Force and play no adjudicative role in this proceeding. This communication is therefore not ex parte contact. The Board is copied pursuant to its oversight authority over City department compliance with the Sunshine Ordinance.

I. TIMELINESS

The Order of Determination in File No. 25134 was approved on April 1, 2026. This request is submitted within the 30-day reconsideration window and is therefore timely under SOTF Complaint Procedure Section E.

II. BASIS FOR RECONSIDERATION

Reconsideration is warranted where new information exists that was not available at the time of the hearing and may change the Task Force's determination. The hearing on File No. 25134 was held January 27, 2026. The new information identified below postdates that hearing and bears directly on the remedy — specifically, whether the Order of Determination should be amended to include a production order and referral to the Compliance & Amendments Committee.

III. NEW INFORMATION

A. HSH Declared Compliance Complete 39 Days Before the OOD Existed

On **February 20, 2026** — 39 days before the Order of Determination was approved — HSH Manager of Legislative Affairs Dylan Schneider sent written correspondence to Petitioner stating:

“With this email we consider HSH's commitments related to File No. 25134 completed.”

This declaration was made without legal basis. The Order of Determination did not exist on February 20, 2026. HSH cannot have complied with an order that had not yet been issued. This statement — made on the record in NextRequest — constitutes a unilateral pre-emptive closure that was not before the Task Force at the January 27 hearing and could not have been.

This is new information. It postdates the hearing by 24 days and directly bears on whether HSH will comply voluntarily with the OOD absent an enforceable order and compliance referral.

B. HSH Maintained the Inverted Redaction Standard After the Hearing Finding

In the same February 20, 2026 correspondence, HSH explicitly maintained the following redaction standard:

“As this employee worked directly with clients, we must assume that phone numbers included in this log could belong to clients and should be protected unless we can otherwise verify the identity of that phone number.”

The Task Force found at the January 27 hearing that HSH's redaction approach violated Sections 67.26 and 67.27 of the Sunshine Ordinance. The burden to justify each withholding rests on the agency — not on the petitioner to prove information is public. HSH's February 20 production was made *after* the hearing and *after* the violation finding, yet applied the identical inverted burden the Task Force already rejected.

This is new information. HSH's post-hearing conduct — maintaining a redaction standard the Task Force found unlawful — was not before the Task Force on January 27 and goes directly to whether a bare violation finding without a production order provides any meaningful remedy.

C. HSH Failed to Publish Responsive Records to the NextRequest Portal

Following the January 27 hearing, HSH left completed requests — including Request #25-134, the controlling request in this complaint, and Request #26-105 — unpublished and invisible to the public on the NextRequest portal. Petitioner issued a formal demand for publication. HSH did not comply. Dylan Schneider responded that HSH considered its obligations complete and would take no further action, directing Petitioner to raise any remaining issues with SOTF.

This conduct postdates the hearing and was not part of the January 27 record.

IV. HOW THIS NEW INFORMATION SHOULD CHANGE THE DETERMINATION

The Task Force found a 9-1 violation. The Order of Determination, as approved April 1, 2026, does not include a production order or a referral to the Compliance & Amendments Committee.

The new information above establishes that:

1. HSH will not voluntarily comply — it declared compliance before the OOD existed;

2. HSH has continued to apply the exact redaction standard the Task Force found unlawful; and

3. HSH has affirmatively refused post-hearing demands for publication and further production.

A bare violation finding without an attached production order and compliance referral provides no remedy. The Task Force has authority under the Sunshine Ordinance to issue orders directing production of records and to refer matters to the Compliance & Amendments Committee for monitoring. That authority should be exercised here.

The Task Force's Own Authority Must Be Exercised — Not Deferred to the Courts

The Sunshine Ordinance exists because the people of San Francisco decided that government transparency should be enforceable — not aspirational. The Task Force was created as the mechanism to enforce it. A violation finding without a production order is not enforcement. It is a declaration that a wrong occurred, followed by an instruction to the wronged party to go fight it out in court at their own expense.

Court action under §67.35 is a remedy of last resort — reserved for cases where a compliance order has been issued and ignored. It was not designed to substitute for the Task Force's own enforcement authority, nor to relieve the Task Force of the obligation to use the tools the Ordinance provides. Directing a petitioner to court in lieu of issuing a production order does not fulfill the Task Force's mandate. It transfers the burden of enforcement onto the public and away from the agency that violated the law.

HSH was found to have violated the Sunshine Ordinance by a 9-1 margin. It then declared compliance with a non-existent order, maintained the redaction standard the Task Force rejected, and refused to publish records to the public portal. The Task Force has direct authority to order production and refer this matter to the Compliance Committee. That authority should be exercised now — before Petitioner is forced into litigation that the Task Force's own order could have made unnecessary.

Petitioner respectfully requests that the Task Force:

1. Grant reconsideration of the Order of Determination in File No. 25134;
2. Amend the Order to include a production order directing HSH to produce:
 - a. Unredacted call and text logs for device (415) 260-9173 (January 17–18, 2024), with phone numbers of City employees and contractors disclosed;
 - b. Full SMS/MMS content for the same device and period;
 - c. An exemption-by-exemption privilege log under §67.27 for any remaining redactions; and
 - d. All unpublished records and correspondence currently withheld from the NextRequest portal; and

3. Refer the matter to the Compliance & Amendments Committee for monitoring of HSH's compliance with the amended Order.

V. EXHIBITS

Exhibit A: February 20, 2026 email from Dylan Schneider, HSH Manager of Legislative Affairs, to Petitioner via NextRequest, stating: "With this email we consider HSH's commitments related to File No. 25134 completed." This email predates the Order of Determination by 39 days and constitutes HSH's unilateral pre-emptive declaration of compliance before any enforceable order existed.

Exhibit B: February 20, 2026 HSH document production uploaded to NextRequest (#25-10128), including redaction log maintaining the standard: "we must assume that phone numbers included in this log could belong to clients and should be protected unless we can otherwise verify the identity of that phone number." This production was made after the January 27 hearing and after the Task Force's violation finding, yet applies the identical inverted redaction burden the Task Force rejected.

Exhibit C: NextRequest portal screenshots documenting that Request #25-134 (the controlling request in this complaint) and Request #26-105 remain unpublished and invisible to the public, notwithstanding their closed status and the production of responsive records. Screenshots show the public-facing view confirming inaccessibility.

Exhibit D: Petitioner's written demand for publication of unpublished requests, submitted via NextRequest following the January 27 hearing, together with HSH's non-response and Dylan Schneider's written statement that HSH considers its obligations complete and will take no further action, directing Petitioner to SOTF for any remaining issues.

All exhibits are available upon request to the Task Force Administrator. Petitioner will provide copies promptly upon notice.

Respectfully submitted,

Minh Luong Cantarutti

Petitioner, pro se

(415) 888-7101

mcantarutti26@gmail.com

Date: April _____, 2026

From: [Minh Cantarutti](#)
To: [SOTF \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [HSHSunshine](#)
Subject: Request for Reconsideration — File No. 25134 — Cantarutti v. HSH
Date: Wednesday, April 8, 2026 9:33:58 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

To the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force Administrator,

Please find attached Petitioner's Request for Reconsideration in File No. 25134 (Cantarutti v. Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing), submitted pursuant to SOTF Complaint Procedure Section E within the 30-day reconsideration window following the April 1, 2026 Order of Determination.

The request identifies three categories of new information postdating the January 27, 2026 hearing:

1. HSH's unilateral declaration of compliance on February 20, 2026 — 39 days before the Order of Determination existed;
2. HSH's continued application of the inverted redaction standard the Task Force found unlawful, in a production made after the hearing; and
3. HSH's failure to publish responsive records to the NextRequest portal and refusal to cure upon demand.

Petitioner requests that the Task Force grant reconsideration, amend the Order of Determination to include a production order and referral to the Compliance & Amendments Committee.

Copies of this request are provided to members of the Board of Supervisors in their capacity as the appointing authority over the Task Force. Board of Supervisors members are not members of the Task Force and play no adjudicative role in this proceeding. This communication is not ex parte

Respectfully submitted,

Minh Luong Cantarutti
Petitioner, pro se
(415) 888-7101
mcantarutti26@gmail.com

From: [Minh Cantarutti](#)
To: [SOTF \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [HSHSunshine](#); [Schneider, Dylan \(HOM\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Matthew Yankee \(myankee.sotf@gmail.com\)](#)
Subject: Re: Accepted - Request for Reconsideration of Minh Cantarutti against Homelessness and Supportive Housing (File 25134)
Date: Thursday, April 16, 2026 8:02:19 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[25134 Reconsideration Request.pdf \(revised\).pdf](#)

I believe this is the right document. There should have been a copy attached to my last email also. Let me know if there is a problem with this one.

On Mon, Apr 13, 2026 at 1:31 PM SOTF (BOS) <sotf@sfgov.org> wrote:

Hello, Mr. Cantarutti –

Petitioner's Request for Reconsideration of **File No. 25134** has been accepted.

The Request for Reconsideration is scheduled to be heard at the 5/6/2026 Regular Meeting of the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force.

- The parties *will not* have the ability to present their position on 5/6/2026.
- The parties may offer Public Comment when the matter is called.
- If the matter is reopened, the parties will be able to present their position at a future meeting.
- If the matter is not reopened, the matter is Closed.

The matter was heard on 4/1/2026 and the submission of this Request for Reconsideration (received 4/8/2026 is timely per Section E(1) of the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force [Complaint Procedures](#)).

Lastly, I do not believe we received the attached Request for Consideration referenced in your 4/8/2026 email [below]. Please resend it.

Thank you.

Patricia Petersen (she/her)

Assistant Clerk

Board of Supervisors

[1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244](#)

Telephone 415-554-7724 | Fax 415-554-5163

sotf@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

I am not in on Wednesdays.



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The [Legislative Research Center](#) provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation, and archived matters since August 1998.

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: Minh Cantarutti <mcantarutti26@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, April 8, 2026 9:33 AM

To: SOTF (BOS) <sotf@sfgov.org>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>

Cc: DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; Fielder, Jackie (BOS) <Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff (BOS) <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; HSHSunshine <HSHSunshine@sfgov.org>

Subject: Request for Reconsideration — File No. 25134 — Cantarutti v. HSH

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

To the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force Administrator,

Please find attached Petitioner's Request for Reconsideration in File No. 25134 (Cantarutti v. Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing), submitted pursuant to SOTF Complaint Procedure Section E within the 30-day reconsideration window following the April 1, 2026 Order of Determination.

The request identifies three categories of new information postdating the January 27, 2026 hearing:

1. HSH's unilateral declaration of compliance on February 20, 2026 — 39 days before the Order of Determination existed;
2. HSH's continued application of the inverted redaction standard the Task Force found unlawful, in a production made after the hearing; and
3. HSH's failure to publish responsive records to the NextRequest portal and refusal to cure upon demand.

Petitioner requests that the Task Force grant reconsideration, amend the Order of Determination to include a production order and referral to the Compliance & Amendments Committee.

Copies of this request are provided to members of the Board of Supervisors in their capacity as the appointing authority over the Task Force. Board of Supervisors members are not members of the Task Force and play no adjudicative role in this proceeding. This communication is not ex parte

Respectfully submitted,

Minh Luong Cantarutti
Petitioner, pro se
(415) 888-7101
mcantarutti26@gmail.com

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

File No. 25134 — Cantarutti v. Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing

Submitted Pursuant to SOTF Complaint Procedure, Section E

To: Sunshine Ordinance Task Force Administrator

From: Minh Luong Cantarutti, Petitioner (pro se)

Date: April _____, 2026

Re: Request for Reconsideration — File No. 25134 — New Information: Post-Hearing Agency Conduct Demonstrating Continued Non-Compliance with the Violation Standard Found by the Task Force

CC:

- Supervisor Matt Dorsey, District 6 — DorseyStaff@sfgov.org
- Supervisor Jackie Fielder, District 9 — Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org
- Supervisor Shamann Walton, District 10 — Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org
- President Rafael Mandelman, District 8 — MandelmanStaff@sfgov.org
- Board of Supervisors (full board) — Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

Copies of this request are being provided to members of the Board of Supervisors in their capacity as the appointing authority over the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force. Board of Supervisors members are not members of the Task Force and play no adjudicative role in this proceeding. This communication is therefore not ex parte contact. The Board is copied pursuant to its oversight authority over City department compliance with the Sunshine Ordinance.

I. TIMELINESS

The Order of Determination in File No. 25134 was approved on April 1, 2026. This request is submitted within the 30-day reconsideration window and is therefore timely under SOTF Complaint Procedure Section E.

II. BASIS FOR RECONSIDERATION

Reconsideration is warranted where new information exists that was not available at the time of the hearing and may change the Task Force's determination. The hearing on File No. 25134 was held January 27, 2026. The new information identified below postdates that hearing and bears directly on the remedy — specifically, whether the Order of Determination should be amended to include a production order and referral to the Compliance & Amendments Committee.

III. NEW INFORMATION

A. HSH Declared Compliance Complete 39 Days Before the OOD Existed

On **February 20, 2026** — 39 days before the Order of Determination was approved — HSH Manager of Legislative Affairs Dylan Schneider sent written correspondence to Petitioner stating:

“With this email we consider HSH's commitments related to File No. 25134 completed.”

This declaration was made without legal basis. The Order of Determination did not exist on February 20, 2026. HSH cannot have complied with an order that had not yet been issued. This statement — made on the record in NextRequest — constitutes a unilateral pre-emptive closure that was not before the Task Force at the January 27 hearing and could not have been.

This is new information. It postdates the hearing by 24 days and directly bears on whether HSH will comply voluntarily with the OOD absent an enforceable order and compliance referral.

B. HSH Maintained the Inverted Redaction Standard After the Hearing Finding

In the same February 20, 2026 correspondence, HSH explicitly maintained the following redaction standard:

“As this employee worked directly with clients, we must assume that phone numbers included in this log could belong to clients and should be protected unless we can otherwise verify the identity of that phone number.”

The Task Force found at the January 27 hearing that HSH's redaction approach violated Sections 67.26 and 67.27 of the Sunshine Ordinance. The burden to justify each withholding rests on the agency — not on the petitioner to prove information is public. HSH's February 20 production was made *after* the hearing and *after* the violation finding, yet applied the identical inverted burden the Task Force already rejected.

This is new information. HSH's post-hearing conduct — maintaining a redaction standard the Task Force found unlawful — was not before the Task Force on January 27 and goes directly to whether a bare violation finding without a production order provides any meaningful remedy.

C. HSH Failed to Publish Responsive Records to the NextRequest Portal

Following the January 27 hearing, HSH left completed requests — including Request #25-134, the controlling request in this complaint, and Request #26-105 — unpublished and invisible to the public on the NextRequest portal. Petitioner issued a formal demand for publication. HSH did not comply. Dylan Schneider responded that HSH considered its obligations complete and would take no further action, directing Petitioner to raise any remaining issues with SOTF.

This conduct postdates the hearing and was not part of the January 27 record.

IV. HOW THIS NEW INFORMATION SHOULD CHANGE THE DETERMINATION

The Task Force found a 9-1 violation. The Order of Determination, as approved April 1, 2026, does not include a production order or a referral to the Compliance & Amendments Committee.

The new information above establishes that:

1. HSH will not voluntarily comply — it declared compliance before the OOD existed;

2. HSH has continued to apply the exact redaction standard the Task Force found unlawful; and

3. HSH has affirmatively refused post-hearing demands for publication and further production.

A bare violation finding without an attached production order and compliance referral provides no remedy. The Task Force has authority under the Sunshine Ordinance to issue orders directing production of records and to refer matters to the Compliance & Amendments Committee for monitoring. That authority should be exercised here.

The Task Force's Own Authority Must Be Exercised — Not Deferred to the Courts

The Sunshine Ordinance exists because the people of San Francisco decided that government transparency should be enforceable — not aspirational. The Task Force was created as the mechanism to enforce it. A violation finding without a production order is not enforcement. It is a declaration that a wrong occurred, followed by an instruction to the wronged party to go fight it out in court at their own expense.

Court action under §67.35 is a remedy of last resort — reserved for cases where a compliance order has been issued and ignored. It was not designed to substitute for the Task Force's own enforcement authority, nor to relieve the Task Force of the obligation to use the tools the Ordinance provides. Directing a petitioner to court in lieu of issuing a production order does not fulfill the Task Force's mandate. It transfers the burden of enforcement onto the public and away from the agency that violated the law.

HSH was found to have violated the Sunshine Ordinance by a 9-1 margin. It then declared compliance with a non-existent order, maintained the redaction standard the Task Force rejected, and refused to publish records to the public portal. The Task Force has direct authority to order production and refer this matter to the Compliance Committee. That authority should be exercised now — before Petitioner is forced into litigation that the Task Force's own order could have made unnecessary.

Petitioner respectfully requests that the Task Force:

1. Grant reconsideration of the Order of Determination in File No. 25134;
2. Amend the Order to include a production order directing HSH to produce:
 - a. Unredacted call and text logs for device (415) 260-9173 (January 17–18, 2024), with phone numbers of City employees and contractors disclosed;
 - b. Full SMS/MMS content for the same device and period;
 - c. An exemption-by-exemption privilege log under §67.27 for any remaining redactions; and
 - d. All unpublished records and correspondence currently withheld from the NextRequest portal; and

3. Refer the matter to the Compliance & Amendments Committee for monitoring of HSH's compliance with the amended Order.

V. EXHIBITS

Exhibit A: February 20, 2026 email from Dylan Schneider, HSH Manager of Legislative Affairs, to Petitioner via NextRequest, stating: "With this email we consider HSH's commitments related to File No. 25134 completed." This email predates the Order of Determination by 39 days and constitutes HSH's unilateral pre-emptive declaration of compliance before any enforceable order existed.

Exhibit B: February 20, 2026 HSH document production uploaded to NextRequest (#25-10128), including redaction log maintaining the standard: "we must assume that phone numbers included in this log could belong to clients and should be protected unless we can otherwise verify the identity of that phone number." This production was made after the January 27 hearing and after the Task Force's violation finding, yet applies the identical inverted redaction burden the Task Force rejected.

Exhibit C: NextRequest portal screenshots documenting that Request #25-134 (the controlling request in this complaint) and Request #26-105 remain unpublished and invisible to the public, notwithstanding their closed status and the production of responsive records. Screenshots show the public-facing view confirming inaccessibility.

Exhibit D: Petitioner's written demand for publication of unpublished requests, submitted via NextRequest following the January 27 hearing, together with HSH's non-response and Dylan Schneider's written statement that HSH considers its obligations complete and will take no further action, directing Petitioner to SOTF for any remaining issues.

All exhibits are available upon request to the Task Force Administrator. Petitioner will provide copies promptly upon notice.

Respectfully submitted,

Minh Luong Cantarutti

Petitioner, pro se

(415) 888-7101

mcantarutti26@gmail.com

Date: April _____, 2026

From: [Minh Cantarutti](#)
To: [SOTF \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [HSHSunshine](#); [Schneider, Dylan \(HOM\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Matthew Yankee \(myankee.sotf@gmail.com\)](#)
Subject: Re: Accepted - Request for Reconsideration of Minh Cantarutti against Homelessness and Supportive Housing (File 25134)
Date: Thursday, April 16, 2026 8:02:19 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[25134 Reconsideration Request.pdf \(revised\).pdf](#)

I believe this is the right document. There should have been a copy attached to my last email also. Let me know if there is a problem with this one.

On Mon, Apr 13, 2026 at 1:31 PM SOTF (BOS) <sotf@sfgov.org> wrote:

Hello, Mr. Cantarutti –

Petitioner's Request for Reconsideration of **File No. 25134** has been accepted.

The Request for Reconsideration is scheduled to be heard at the 5/6/2026 Regular Meeting of the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force.

- The parties *will not* have the ability to present their position on 5/6/2026.
- The parties may offer Public Comment when the matter is called.
- If the matter is reopened, the parties will be able to present their position at a future meeting.
- If the matter is not reopened, the matter is Closed.

The matter was heard on 4/1/2026 and the submission of this Request for Reconsideration (received 4/8/2026 is timely per Section E(1) of the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force [Complaint Procedures](#)).

Lastly, I do not believe we received the attached Request for Consideration referenced in your 4/8/2026 email [below]. Please resend it.

Thank you.

Patricia Petersen (she/her)

Assistant Clerk

Board of Supervisors

[1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244](#)

Telephone 415-554-7724 | Fax 415-554-5163

sotf@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

I am not in on Wednesdays.



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The [Legislative Research Center](#) provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation, and archived matters since August 1998.

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: Minh Cantarutti <mcantarutti26@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, April 8, 2026 9:33 AM

To: SOTF (BOS) <sotf@sfgov.org>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>

Cc: DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; Fielder, Jackie (BOS) <Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff (BOS) <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; HSHSunshine <HSHSunshine@sfgov.org>

Subject: Request for Reconsideration — File No. 25134 — Cantarutti v. HSH

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

To the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force Administrator,

Please find attached Petitioner's Request for Reconsideration in File No. 25134 (Cantarutti v. Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing), submitted pursuant to SOTF Complaint Procedure Section E within the 30-day reconsideration window following the April 1, 2026 Order of Determination.

The request identifies three categories of new information postdating the January 27, 2026 hearing:

1. HSH's unilateral declaration of compliance on February 20, 2026 — 39 days before the Order of Determination existed;
2. HSH's continued application of the inverted redaction standard the Task Force found unlawful, in a production made after the hearing; and
3. HSH's failure to publish responsive records to the NextRequest portal and refusal to cure upon demand.

Petitioner requests that the Task Force grant reconsideration, amend the Order of Determination to include a production order and referral to the Compliance & Amendments Committee.

Copies of this request are provided to members of the Board of Supervisors in their capacity as the appointing authority over the Task Force. Board of Supervisors members are not members of the Task Force and play no adjudicative role in this proceeding. This communication is not ex parte

Respectfully submitted,

Minh Luong Cantarutti
Petitioner, pro se
(415) 888-7101
mcantarutti26@gmail.com

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

File No. 25134 — Cantarutti v. Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing

Submitted Pursuant to SOTF Complaint Procedure, Section E

To: Sunshine Ordinance Task Force Administrator

From: Minh Luong Cantarutti, Petitioner (pro se)

Date: April _____, 2026

Re: Request for Reconsideration — File No. 25134 — New Information: Post-Hearing Agency Conduct Demonstrating Continued Non-Compliance with the Violation Standard Found by the Task Force

CC:

- Supervisor Matt Dorsey, District 6 — DorseyStaff@sfgov.org
- Supervisor Jackie Fielder, District 9 — Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org
- Supervisor Shamann Walton, District 10 — Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org
- President Rafael Mandelman, District 8 — MandelmanStaff@sfgov.org
- Board of Supervisors (full board) — Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

Copies of this request are being provided to members of the Board of Supervisors in their capacity as the appointing authority over the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force. Board of Supervisors members are not members of the Task Force and play no adjudicative role in this proceeding. This communication is therefore not ex parte contact. The Board is copied pursuant to its oversight authority over City department compliance with the Sunshine Ordinance.

I. TIMELINESS

The Order of Determination in File No. 25134 was approved on April 1, 2026. This request is submitted within the 30-day reconsideration window and is therefore timely under SOTF Complaint Procedure Section E.

II. BASIS FOR RECONSIDERATION

Reconsideration is warranted where new information exists that was not available at the time of the hearing and may change the Task Force's determination. The hearing on File No. 25134 was held January 27, 2026. The new information identified below postdates that hearing and bears directly on the remedy — specifically, whether the Order of Determination should be amended to include a production order and referral to the Compliance & Amendments Committee.

III. NEW INFORMATION

A. HSH Declared Compliance Complete 39 Days Before the OOD Existed

On **February 20, 2026** — 39 days before the Order of Determination was approved — HSH Manager of Legislative Affairs Dylan Schneider sent written correspondence to Petitioner stating:

“With this email we consider HSH's commitments related to File No. 25134 completed.”

This declaration was made without legal basis. The Order of Determination did not exist on February 20, 2026. HSH cannot have complied with an order that had not yet been issued. This statement — made on the record in NextRequest — constitutes a unilateral pre-emptive closure that was not before the Task Force at the January 27 hearing and could not have been.

This is new information. It postdates the hearing by 24 days and directly bears on whether HSH will comply voluntarily with the OOD absent an enforceable order and compliance referral.

B. HSH Maintained the Inverted Redaction Standard After the Hearing Finding

In the same February 20, 2026 correspondence, HSH explicitly maintained the following redaction standard:

“As this employee worked directly with clients, we must assume that phone numbers included in this log could belong to clients and should be protected unless we can otherwise verify the identity of that phone number.”

The Task Force found at the January 27 hearing that HSH's redaction approach violated Sections 67.26 and 67.27 of the Sunshine Ordinance. The burden to justify each withholding rests on the agency — not on the petitioner to prove information is public. HSH's February 20 production was made *after* the hearing and *after* the violation finding, yet applied the identical inverted burden the Task Force already rejected.

This is new information. HSH's post-hearing conduct — maintaining a redaction standard the Task Force found unlawful — was not before the Task Force on January 27 and goes directly to whether a bare violation finding without a production order provides any meaningful remedy.

C. HSH Failed to Publish Responsive Records to the NextRequest Portal

Following the January 27 hearing, HSH left completed requests — including Request #25-134, the controlling request in this complaint, and Request #26-105 — unpublished and invisible to the public on the NextRequest portal. Petitioner issued a formal demand for publication. HSH did not comply. Dylan Schneider responded that HSH considered its obligations complete and would take no further action, directing Petitioner to raise any remaining issues with SOTF.

This conduct postdates the hearing and was not part of the January 27 record.

IV. HOW THIS NEW INFORMATION SHOULD CHANGE THE DETERMINATION

The Task Force found a 9-1 violation. The Order of Determination, as approved April 1, 2026, does not include a production order or a referral to the Compliance & Amendments Committee.

The new information above establishes that:

1. HSH will not voluntarily comply — it declared compliance before the OOD existed;

2. HSH has continued to apply the exact redaction standard the Task Force found unlawful; and

3. HSH has affirmatively refused post-hearing demands for publication and further production.

A bare violation finding without an attached production order and compliance referral provides no remedy. The Task Force has authority under the Sunshine Ordinance to issue orders directing production of records and to refer matters to the Compliance & Amendments Committee for monitoring. That authority should be exercised here.

The Task Force's Own Authority Must Be Exercised — Not Deferred to the Courts

The Sunshine Ordinance exists because the people of San Francisco decided that government transparency should be enforceable — not aspirational. The Task Force was created as the mechanism to enforce it. A violation finding without a production order is not enforcement. It is a declaration that a wrong occurred, followed by an instruction to the wronged party to go fight it out in court at their own expense.

Court action under §67.35 is a remedy of last resort — reserved for cases where a compliance order has been issued and ignored. It was not designed to substitute for the Task Force's own enforcement authority, nor to relieve the Task Force of the obligation to use the tools the Ordinance provides. Directing a petitioner to court in lieu of issuing a production order does not fulfill the Task Force's mandate. It transfers the burden of enforcement onto the public and away from the agency that violated the law.

HSH was found to have violated the Sunshine Ordinance by a 9-1 margin. It then declared compliance with a non-existent order, maintained the redaction standard the Task Force rejected, and refused to publish records to the public portal. The Task Force has direct authority to order production and refer this matter to the Compliance Committee. That authority should be exercised now — before Petitioner is forced into litigation that the Task Force's own order could have made unnecessary.

Petitioner respectfully requests that the Task Force:

1. Grant reconsideration of the Order of Determination in File No. 25134;
2. Amend the Order to include a production order directing HSH to produce:
 - a. Unredacted call and text logs for device (415) 260-9173 (January 17–18, 2024), with phone numbers of City employees and contractors disclosed;
 - b. Full SMS/MMS content for the same device and period;
 - c. An exemption-by-exemption privilege log under §67.27 for any remaining redactions; and
 - d. All unpublished records and correspondence currently withheld from the NextRequest portal; and

3. Refer the matter to the Compliance & Amendments Committee for monitoring of HSH's compliance with the amended Order.

V. EXHIBITS

Exhibit A: February 20, 2026 email from Dylan Schneider, HSH Manager of Legislative Affairs, to Petitioner via NextRequest, stating: "With this email we consider HSH's commitments related to File No. 25134 completed." This email predates the Order of Determination by 39 days and constitutes HSH's unilateral pre-emptive declaration of compliance before any enforceable order existed.

Exhibit B: February 20, 2026 HSH document production uploaded to NextRequest (#25-10128), including redaction log maintaining the standard: "we must assume that phone numbers included in this log could belong to clients and should be protected unless we can otherwise verify the identity of that phone number." This production was made after the January 27 hearing and after the Task Force's violation finding, yet applies the identical inverted redaction burden the Task Force rejected.

Exhibit C: NextRequest portal screenshots documenting that Request #25-134 (the controlling request in this complaint) and Request #26-105 remain unpublished and invisible to the public, notwithstanding their closed status and the production of responsive records. Screenshots show the public-facing view confirming inaccessibility.

Exhibit D: Petitioner's written demand for publication of unpublished requests, submitted via NextRequest following the January 27 hearing, together with HSH's non-response and Dylan Schneider's written statement that HSH considers its obligations complete and will take no further action, directing Petitioner to SOTF for any remaining issues.

All exhibits are available upon request to the Task Force Administrator. Petitioner will provide copies promptly upon notice.

Respectfully submitted,

Minh Luong Cantarutti

Petitioner, pro se

(415) 888-7101

mcantarutti26@gmail.com

Date: April _____, 2026

From: [Minh Cantarutti](#)
To: [SOTF \(BOS\)](#); [Petersen, Patricia \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Supplemental Submission — File No. 25134 — Cantarutti v. HSH — Proposed Consent and Compliance Order
Date: Thursday, May 28, 2026 6:52:08 PM
Attachments: [25134_Supplemental_Submission_v2.pdf](#)

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

To the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force Administrator,

This email confirms my attendance and includes Petitioner's Supplemental Submission in File No. 25134 (Cantarutti v. Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing), filed in advance of the reconsideration hearing granted by the Task Force on May 6, 2026.

This submission contains two components:

1. A Statement of New Information — cataloging all post-hearing agency conduct since the January 27, 2026 hearing, including HSH's pre-OOD compliance declaration (February 20, 2026), continued application of the inverted redaction standard after the violation finding, refusal to publish records to the NextRequest portal, and 57+ days of post-OOD silence; and

2. A Proposed Consent and Compliance Order — modeled on the enforcement structure approved by the Task Force in File No. 26019 (Cantarutti v. DEM) on May 6, 2026, with the following additions:

- A legal determination that §7927.700 and 24 C.F.R. §578.103(b)(1) are inapplicable as a matter of law to the records at issue, including a per se finding that the disclosure of a phone number — a numerical identifier — cannot constitute disclosure of a protected record under either statute;
- A sworn affidavit requirement under penalty of perjury for any withholding or redaction, with entry-specific justification;
- A personnel disclosure requirement identifying all individuals involved in redaction and compliance decisions by name, title, supervisor, and contact information;
- Production and compliance certification due simultaneously within 5 days, consistent with SOTF's own post-OOD production standard; and
- Escalation triggers for non-compliance including City Attorney referral and Board of Supervisors notification.

ATTACHMENT: [25134_Supplemental_Submission_v2.pdf](#)

Respectfully submitted,

Minh Luong Cantarutti
(415) 888-7101
mcantarutti26@gmail.com

Date: May 28, 2026

SUPPLEMENTAL SUBMISSION
PROPOSED CONSENT AND COMPLIANCE ORDER

File No. 25134 — Minh Cantarutti v. Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing
Reconsideration Hearing — Submitted Pursuant to SOTF Complaint Procedure, Section E

Submitted by: Minh Cantarutti, Petitioner (Pro Se)
Date: May 28, 2026
To: Sunshine Ordinance Task Force Administrator
Re: Post-Reconsideration Supplemental — Proposed Order and New Facts Statement

I. PURPOSE OF THIS SUBMISSION

This supplemental submission is filed in connection with the reconsideration hearing granted by the Task Force on May 6, 2026. It serves two purposes: (1) it catalogs all post-hearing agency conduct constituting new information that was not before the Task Force at the January 27, 2026 hearing; and (2) it proposes a Consent and Compliance Order for the Task Force to adopt on reconsideration, modeled on the enforcement structure approved in File No. 26019 (Cantarutti v. DEM) on May 6, 2026.

The reconsideration standard requires new information that was not available at the time of the hearing. Everything cataloged below postdates January 27, 2026. Petitioner submits this record to ensure that no procedural gap exists and that all post-hearing conduct is formally before the Task Force prior to the reconsideration hearing.

II. NEW INFORMATION SINCE JANUARY 27, 2026 HEARING

The following events and agency conduct postdate the January 27, 2026 hearing and were not part of the record considered by the Task Force at that time.

A. HSH Declared Compliance Complete 39 Days Before the OOD Existed

On February 20, 2026 — 39 days before the Order of Determination was formally approved — HSH Manager of Legislative Affairs Dylan Schneider transmitted written correspondence stating:

"With this email we consider HSH's commitments related to File No. 25134 completed."

The Order of Determination did not exist on February 20, 2026. HSH cannot have complied with an order that had not yet been issued. This is new information postdating the hearing by 24 days.

B. HSH Maintained the Inverted Redaction Standard After the Hearing

In the same February 20, 2026 correspondence, HSH maintained the following redaction standard:

"As this employee worked directly with clients, we must assume that phone numbers included in this log could belong to clients and should be protected unless we can otherwise verify the identity of that phone number."

The Task Force found at the January 27 hearing that this approach violated Sections 67.26 and 67.27. HSH's February 20 production — made after the hearing and after the violation finding — applied the identical inverted burden the Task Force already rejected. This is new information.

C. Photo and Video Messages Improperly Designated Non-Responsive (Post-Hearing)

HSH's post-hearing production designated MMS photo and video messages within the January 17–18, 2024 logs as 'non-responsive.' These records fall squarely within the scope of the original request. This designation was not before the Task Force on January 27.

D. HSH Refused to Publish Records to the NextRequest Portal

Following the January 27 hearing, HSH left Request #25-10128 (the controlling request in this complaint) and Request #26-105 unpublished and invisible to the public on the NextRequest portal. Petitioner issued a formal demand for publication. HSH did not comply. Dylan Schneider stated HSH's obligations were complete and directed Petitioner to SOTF for any remaining issues — a response that predated the OOD and signals institutional contempt for the Task Force's authority.

E. April 1, 2026 — OOD Issued Without Production Order or CAC Referral

On April 1, 2026, the Task Force approved the Order of Determination in File No. 25134 finding violations of §§67.21, 67.26, and 67.27. The OOD contained no production order and no referral to the Compliance and Amendments Committee. Patricia Petersen (SOTF Administrator) confirmed in writing on April 7, 2026 that the file was closed and directed Petitioner to §67.35 court action as the sole remedy.

F. April 6, 2026 — Petitioner Filed Complete Records Audit

On April 6, 2026, Petitioner filed a comprehensive audit of all outstanding records across Requests #25-10128, #26-105, and #26-134, identifying specific categories of records produced, improperly redacted, and wholly withheld. That audit is incorporated by reference and is part of the official record in this file.

G. May 6, 2026 — Task Force Granted Reconsideration and Approved File 26019 OOD

On May 6, 2026, the Task Force granted reconsideration of File No. 25134, establishing that the new-facts threshold has been met as a matter of the Task Force's own determination. On the same date, the Task Force approved the Order of Determination in File No. 26019 (*Cantarutti v. DEM*), which — for a single-violation matter — included an express production order, a constructive possession obligation, and a referral to the Compliance and Amendments Committee. File No. 26019 is the controlling comparator for the relief requested here.

H. Post-ODD Silence — 57+ Days Without Voluntary Compliance

From April 1, 2026 (OOD approval) through the date of this submission, HSH has made no voluntary production, filed no compliance certification, submitted no exemption log, and taken no action to cure the violations found by the Task Force. This period of deliberate inaction is itself new information bearing on whether any meaningful remedy is achievable without an enforceable production order.

III. PROPOSED CONSENT AND COMPLIANCE ORDER

Petitioner proposes the following order for the Task Force's adoption on reconsideration. The structure mirrors the enforcement framework approved in File No. 26019 (*DEM*), with additions

reflecting the specific redaction and custodian issues presented here.

CONSENT AND COMPLIANCE ORDER

In the Matter of: Minh Cantarutti v. Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing
SOTF File No. 25134

Section 1. Findings Incorporated

The Task Force incorporates its findings from the Order of Determination approved April 1, 2026, establishing that HSH violated Administrative Code §§67.21, 67.26, and 67.27.

Section 2. Determination: Cited Privacy Exemptions Inapplicable as a Matter of Law

The Task Force finds that HSH's reliance on California Government Code §7927.700 and 24 C.F.R. §578.103(b)(1) to redact phone numbers and communications from the call and text logs of device (415) 260-9173 was legally improper. These exemptions were inapplicable to the records at issue for the following reasons:

(a) Government Code §7927.700 protects personal information in personnel, medical, or similar files where disclosure would constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy. Call logs and text message logs generated on a City-issued device during the performance of official government operations — HSOC encampment resolution activities — are not personnel files, medical files, or similar files within the meaning of this statute. The phone numbers of City employees and contractors appearing in operational logs reflect official coordination activity, not personal or intimate information of the type the statute was designed to protect.

(b) 24 C.F.R. §578.103(b)(1) governs the confidentiality of Continuum of Care program participant records. This regulation protects the identities and personal information of homeless individuals receiving services — not the operational communications of government employees and contractors administering those services. A call log on a City-issued device assigned to a government liaison does not constitute a program participant record and cannot reasonably be expected to contain information protected under §578.103(b)(1). Application of this regulation to shield the phone numbers of City employees and contractors from disclosure inverts the regulation's protective purpose.

(c) A telephone number is a numerical identifier — a sequence of digits. The disclosure of a phone number cannot, by its nature, constitute the disclosure of a protected record under either §7927.700 or §578.103(b)(1). A phone number contains no medical information, no program participant identity, no intimate personal detail, and no content of any communication. It identifies only that a contact occurred. Neither statute protects the fact of contact between parties. HSH's redaction of phone numbers from operational call logs on the basis of these statutes is therefore a per se misapplication: the statutes do not reach the information withheld, and no factual analysis of the specific entries could change that conclusion.

(d) The records at issue — call logs and text logs for a City-issued device (415) 260-9173 assigned to Arielle Piastunovich, HSH-HSOC Liaison, for January 17–18, 2024 — document official coordination activity during active HSOC sweep operations. These records cannot reasonably be expected to contain program participant information within the meaning of §578.103(b)(1), nor personal or intimate information within the meaning of §7927.700. HSH's

presumptive application of these exemptions to the entire log, without entry-specific analysis, confirms that the exemptions were applied categorically rather than on any factual basis tied to the specific records.

(e) The burden of establishing that an exemption applies rests on the agency. HSH has not provided — and cannot provide — a factual basis establishing that the disclosure of a phone number — a numeric identifier — constitutes disclosure of a protected record under either statute. Mere possibility that a caller might have been a program participant does not satisfy the agency's affirmative burden, does not convert a phone number into a protected record, and does not justify presumptive redaction of operational log data.

This determination does not preclude HSH from asserting a properly supported exemption claim for any specific, identified entry in the sworn affidavit required under Section 5 below. It forecloses blanket or categorical reliance on §7927.700 and §578.103(b)(1) as a basis for withholding operational phone log data from a City-issued device.

(f) Professional Fitness and Institutional Accountability

The application of client privacy statutes to shield City-owned device logs from disclosure reflects either a fundamental misunderstanding of what constitutes a public record under California law and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance, or a deliberate misapplication of those statutes to obstruct disclosure. Neither explanation is acceptable from an individual operating in a public records compliance role.

A City-issued device assigned to a government employee conducting official operations generates records that are public by definition under Government Code §7920.530 and San Francisco Administrative Code §67.21. The statutes invoked by HSH — §7927.700 and 24 C.F.R. §578.103(b)(1) — exist to protect vulnerable individuals receiving government services, not to insulate the government employees and contractors administering those services from accountability. The inversion of these statutes to shield the operational logs of a government liaison is not a reasonable legal interpretation. It is an error so fundamental that it calls into question whether the individual responsible for this redaction decision possesses the basic legal literacy required to perform that function.

The Task Force finds that the redaction decisions at issue were not the product of a good-faith legal analysis. The reliance on client confidentiality frameworks to redact City employee phone numbers from City-owned operational logs demonstrates a failure to understand the distinction between program participants and program administrators — a distinction that is foundational to both the CPRA and the Sunshine Ordinance. This failure, whether the result of inadequate training, inadequate supervision, or institutional indifference to transparency obligations, reflects a decision-making process that is itself a compliance deficiency.

The Task Force respectfully refers HSH leadership to the need to evaluate: (1) whether the individual responsible for these redaction decisions has received adequate training in California public records law and the Sunshine Ordinance; (2) whether the internal review process for redaction decisions includes any substantive legal analysis; and (3) whether HSH's records compliance function is structured to produce legally defensible determinations or to produce obstruction. The pattern of conduct in this matter — blanket redaction, inverted burden, pre-ODD

compliance declaration, and refusal to publish — is not consistent with a department operating in good faith under the law.

Section 3. Custodian Identification and Personnel Disclosure

HSH shall, within 5 calendar days of the date of this Order, designate in writing the name, title, and direct contact information of the responsible custodian of records for all records responsive to Requests #25-10128, #26-105, and #26-134. The designated custodian shall be the signatory on all compliance submissions required under this Order.

HSH shall additionally provide, within the same 5-day window, a written disclosure identifying by full name, title, department, direct supervisor name and title, and City email address each individual who: (a) reviewed the records at issue for responsiveness or exemption; (b) made or approved any redaction decision applied to the records produced under Requests #25-10128, #26-105, and #26-134; (c) authored, approved, or transmitted any correspondence to Petitioner or to the Task Force regarding the status or closure of those requests; and (d) had supervisory authority over the records compliance function at HSH at the time the redaction decisions were made.

This disclosure is required to preserve Petitioner's ability to identify responsible parties for purposes of any future individual complaint, ethics referral, or civil action should HSH fail to comply with this Order. Failure to provide a complete and accurate personnel disclosure shall itself constitute a basis for referral to the City Attorney under Administrative Code §67.35.

Section 4. Production Order

Within 5 calendar days of the date of this Order — consistent with the production deadline established by the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force's own procedures following an Order of Determination — HSH shall produce:

- (a) Unredacted call logs and text message logs for device (415) 260-9173 for January 17 and 18, 2024, including all metadata fields (timestamp, duration, contact identifier, direction of communication);
- (b) Full SMS/MMS content for device (415) 260-9173 for January 17–19, 2024, including sender/recipient numbers, timestamps, and attachments;
- (c) MMS photo and video messages within the January 17–18, 2024 logs, which were improperly designated non-responsive;
- (d) Call logs, text logs, and communications for PEDRO RINCON for December 2023 – January 2024, under HSH's constructive possession obligation per *Community Youth Action Center v. National City*, 220 Cal.App.4th 1385 (2013), as expressly recognized in the File No. 26019 OOD;
- (e) All records responsive to Request #26-134 not yet produced; and
- (f) Publication of all responsive records to the NextRequest portal for public access.

Section 5. Sworn Affidavit Requirement for Any Withholding or Redaction

If HSH maintains that any portion of the records ordered produced in Section 3 is exempt from disclosure, HSH must, within the same 5-day production window, submit a sworn affidavit executed under penalty of perjury by the designated custodian of records identified under Section 2. The

affidavit must:

- (a) Identify each withheld or redacted entry by document, page, row, field, or line;
- (b) State the specific statutory exemption claimed, with full citation;
- (c) Provide a factual basis specific to that entry — not a category-level or blanket assertion — establishing why the exemption applies to that particular piece of information;
- (d) Demonstrate, with respect to any claim under 24 C.F.R. §578.103(b)(1), that the withheld information constitutes program participant records as defined by that regulation and that it cannot be disaggregated from government employee or contractor operational communications; and
- (e) Confirm that all reasonably segregable non-exempt portions have been disclosed.

Blanket citation to §7927.700 or §578.103(b)(1) without entry-specific factual justification does not satisfy this requirement and shall constitute a failure to comply with this Order.

The sworn affidavit requirement is grounded in the Task Force's finding that HSH applied an inverted redaction burden — presuming information exempt rather than carrying its affirmative obligation to justify each withholding. Personal attestation under penalty of perjury is necessary to ensure that the agency's redaction decisions are made by an accountable individual with personal knowledge of the basis for each claim, and not merely asserted by institutional category.

Section 6. Compliance Certification

Simultaneously with production, the designated custodian shall file with the Task Force a written compliance certification, signed under penalty of perjury, stating: (a) that all records ordered produced have been transmitted to Petitioner; (b) the date and method of transmission; (c) a description of any records withheld and the sworn affidavit provided; and (d) that no responsive records have been destroyed, withheld, or removed from HSH's custody since the date of the original complaint.

Section 7. Referral to Compliance and Amendments Committee

This matter is hereby referred to the Compliance and Amendments Committee for monitoring. The CAC shall schedule a compliance review no later than the next regularly scheduled CAC meeting following expiration of the 5-day production window, receive HSH's compliance certification and any response from Petitioner, and report findings to the full Task Force.

Section 8. Escalation Triggers

If HSH fails to produce records, file a compliant sworn affidavit, or submit the compliance certification within the 5-day production deadline set forth in this Order, the Task Force shall:

- (a) Issue a finding of non-compliance;
- (b) Refer the matter to the San Francisco City Attorney pursuant to Administrative Code §67.35; and
- (c) Transmit the record of non-compliance to the Board of Supervisors.

Section 9. Reservation of Rights

This Order does not preclude Petitioner from pursuing all available legal remedies, including court enforcement under Government Code §7923.000 et seq. and claims under 42 U.S.C. §1983 based

on the facts and agency conduct documented in this proceeding.

IV. THE FILE 26019 OOD IS THE CONTROLLING STANDARD

On May 6, 2026, the same Task Force that found violations in File No. 25134 approved an Order of Determination in File No. 26019 (Cantarutti v. DEM) that: (1) found a single timeliness violation; (2) ordered production of remaining records; (3) expressly incorporated the constructive possession doctrine from Community Youth Action Center v. National City; and (4) referred the matter to the Compliance and Amendments Committee.

File No. 25134 involves three violations — §§67.21, 67.26, and 67.27 — a longer pattern of non-compliance, a pre-OD compliance declaration, and post-hearing continuation of unlawful redaction practices. If the single-violation DEM matter warrants a production order and CAC referral, the multi-violation HSH matter warrants no less. Equal application of the Task Force's own enforcement standards requires the same structure here.

V. RELIEF REQUESTED

Petitioner respectfully requests that the Task Force:

1. Reopen File No. 25134 on reconsideration;
2. Adopt the Proposed Consent and Compliance Order set forth in Section III above;
3. Require designation of a named custodian of records within 5 days;
4. Order production or sworn affidavit within 5 days;
5. Refer the matter to the Compliance and Amendments Committee for monitoring beginning at the next available CAC meeting; and
6. Retain jurisdiction to enforce this Order and refer non-compliance to the City Attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Minh Cantarutti

Pro Se Petitioner

1321 Mission Street, San Francisco, CA 94103

(415) 888-7101 | mcantarutti26@gmail.com

Date: May 28, 2026

Other Documents

(Notice of Hearing, Communications, etc.)

From: [SOTF \(BOS\)](#)
To: [mcantarutti26@gmail.com](#); [HSHSunshine](#); [Schneider, Dylan \(HOM\)](#); [SOTF \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Matthew Yankee \(myankee.sotf@gmail.com\)](#)
Subject: Notice of Hearing: Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, Approval of Order of Determination, 4/1/2026 Convenes at 4:00 p.m., Hearings on Complaints at 5:00 p.m. (File 25134)
Date: Friday, March 20, 2026 3:20:51 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
Sensitivity: Confidential

Hello:

The following Sunshine Ordinance Task Force Orders of Determination have been scheduled for discussion and action as follows:

Date: Wednesday, 4/1/2026 (Hybrid Meeting in-person/remote)
Location: Hearing Room 408, City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102
Time: Meeting Convenes – 4:00 p.m.

Information regarding how to participate via telephone or via teleconference (Webex) will be listed on the Agenda. Agendas are available [online](#) and at the [San Francisco Public Library](#) at least 72 hours before the meeting.

Approval of Order of Determination - The Sunshine Ordinance Task Force shall discuss and take action on the Orders of Determination for **File Nos. 25087, 25134, 26002, 26011, 26015, 26016, and 26017. The Complainant and Respondent are not required to attend** the April 1, 2026, Sunshine Task Force meeting but may attend to provide testimony during the public comment period for this item related to the above-listed determinations.

File No. 25087: Complaint filed by Anonymous (GRA) against Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Section(s) 67.21, by failing to respond to a public records request in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 25134: Complaint filed by Minh Cantarutti against Homeless and Supportive Housing for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Section(s) 67.21, by failing to respond to a public records request in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 26002: Complaint filed by Charles Denny against San Francisco Police Department for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Section(s) 67.21, by failing to respond to a public records request in a timely and/or complete manner, 67.26, by failing to keep withholdings to a minimum, and 67.27, by failing to provide written justification of withholdings.

File No. 26011: Complaint filed by HVSafe against San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Section(s) 67.21, by failing to respond to a public records request in a timely and/or complete manner and 67.25, by failing to respond to an immediate disclosure request in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 26015: Complaint filed by Jason Gibbs against the San Francisco Library Commission for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Section(s) 67.15, by failing to allow public comment for up to three minutes.

File No. 26016 (26-69): Complaint filed by Paul Kniha against the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Section(s) 67.21, by failing to respond to a public records request in a timely and/or complete manner.

File No. 26017: Complaint filed by Michael Petrelis against the Office of the Mayor for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Section(s) 67.29-5, by failing to respond to a request for Proposition G calendar in a complete manner.

Please let us know if there are any questions.

Thank you.

Patricia Petersen (she/her)

Assistant Clerk

Board of Supervisors

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

Telephone 415-554-7724 | Fax 415-554-5163

sotf@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

I am not in on Wednesdays.



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The [Legislative Research Center](#) provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation, and archived matters since August 1998.

Disclosures: *Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: [SOTF \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Minh Cantarutti](#); [SOTF \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Schneider, Dylan \(HOM\)](#); [HSHSunshine](#); [Robinson, Davares \(HOM\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: RE: Petitioner Compliance Response and Audit of Responsive Records — File No. 25134 — Compliance Hearing Requested
Date: Tuesday, April 7, 2026 2:00:25 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Hello, Mr. Cantarutti –

The finding of the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force (SOTF) in **File 25134** did not include an order to the Respondent, nor did it include a referral to a committee for compliance purposes. With the approval of the Order of Determination on 4/1/2026, the administrative review process has reached its conclusion and the file is closed.

Per SOTF [Complaint Procedure D\(3\)](#), you have the independent right to pursue the issue in court. Please refer to the enforcement mechanisms outlined in Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), [Section 67.35](#).

Thank you.

Patricia Petersen (she/her)

Assistant Clerk

Board of Supervisors

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

Telephone 415-554-7724 | Fax 415-554-5163

sotf@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

I am not in on Wednesdays.



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The [Legislative Research Center](#) provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation, and archived matters since August 1998.

Disclosures: *Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: Minh Cantarutti <mcantarutti26@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, April 6, 2026 8:06 AM

To: SOTF (BOS) <sotf@sfgov.org>

Cc: Schneider, Dylan (HOM) <dylan.schneider@sfgov.org>; HSHSunshine <HSHSunshine@sfgov.org>; Robinson, Davares (HOM) <davares.robinson@sfgov.org>

Subject: Petitioner Compliance Response and Audit of Responsive Records — File No. 25134 — Compliance Hearing Requested

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

To the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force Administrator,

I write as Petitioner in File No. 25134 (Cantarutti v. HSH) to submit my compliance response following the Task Force's April 1, 2026 approval of the Order of Determination, and to formally request a compliance hearing. I have performed a complete audit of past, improperly redacted, and outstanding records.

I have include copies of Dylan Schnieders stated refusals to comply, as well as failure to publish/make visible records to the next request portal. including 25-134, the controlling request of this complaint. The following issues remain unresolved:

Any records not attached are available on request. All claims are supported by documentary evidence.

1. UNILATERAL PRE-OOD DECLARATION OF COMPLETION

On February 20, 2026 — before the Order of Determination was formally approved — HSH's Manager of Legislative Affairs Dylan Schneider sent an email stating: "With this email we consider HSH's commitments related to File No. 25134 completed." This declaration was premature and without legal effect. The OOD was not approved until April 1, 2026. HSH's self-certification of compliance before the OOD existed is not a basis for closure, and any compliance assessment must be measured against the now-approved Order.

2. CONTINUED APPLICATION OF INVERTED REDACTION STANDARD (Sections 67.26 and 67.27)

In the same February 20 email, HSH maintained the following redaction standard: "As this employee worked directly with clients, we must assume that phone numbers included in this log could belong to clients and should be protected unless we can otherwise verify the identity of that phone number."

This is the burden of proof inverted. The Sunshine Ordinance places the burden on the agency to justify each withholding — not on the petitioner to prove information is public. This standard was identified as the violation at the January 27 hearing and is the basis for the Section 67.26 and 67.27 findings. HSH's February 20 production maintained this framework, applying presumptive redaction to phone numbers that may belong to City employees or contractors operating in their official capacity. That is not compliance with the OOD.

3. PHOTO AND VIDEO MESSAGES INCORRECTLY CLAIMED UNRESPONSIVE

HSH's production treated photo and video messages within the January 17–18, 2024 call and text logs as unresponsive. These messages fall squarely within the timeframe and subject matter of the original request. Classifying them as unresponsive without justification is a withholding requiring specific legal basis under Section 67.27.

4. FAILURE TO PUBLISH REQUESTS ON NEXTREQUEST PORTAL

HSH has left completed requests unpublished and unavailable to be view by the public, including 25-134, the controlling request of this complaint. Upon notice, I sent a formal demand for all publications to be added to the communication threads of the unpublished requests. This can be found in attached Request 26-105, also unpublished. Not only were these demands ignored, she again stated she considered Hsh's obligation complete and will take no further action. She then proceeded to say that if I had any further issues with the file, to take it up with SOTF. This statement is made far in advance of the OOD, signaling contempt and disregard for SOTF's authority and the letter of governing laws and ordinances. These request, the records included, and the correspondence attached remain unpublished, and unavailable to the public.

For the reasons above, I respectfully request that this matter be referred to a compliance hearing so that HSH may be required to demonstrate full compliance with the Order of Determination as approved on April 1, 2026.

Thank you.

Minh Luong Cantarutti
Petitioner, pro se
(415) 888-7101
mcantarutti26@gmail.com

Attached are copies of the unpublished request

SECTION [X]: AUDIT OF HSH PUBLIC RECORDS REQUESTS — OUTSTANDING RECORDS

The following is a complete audit of public records requests submitted to HSH (Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing / HOM), the records produced, and the records that remain outstanding. This audit is submitted as part of the compliance record in File No. 25134.

REQUEST 1: NextRequest #25-10128

Subject: Records Regarding Mobile Device (415) 260-9173 — January 17–18, 2024

Submitted: December 9, 2025 | Status: CLOSED (disputed)

WHAT WAS REQUESTED:

1. Mobile Device Assignment Records — documentation confirming assignment of device (415) 260-9173, MDM enrollment, and assigned user identity.
2. Call Logs & Text Message Logs — metadata showing time, duration, and recipient/sender phone numbers for all calls; logs of all SMS/MMS messages sent or received on this device during January 17–18, 2024.
3. Operational Activity Logs — daily activity reports, field logs, or "Touchpoint" records created by the device user or assigned unit (SF HEART team) for January 17–18, 2024.

RECORDS PRODUCED:

- 1_17-18_2024 Call Log - (415) 260-9173_Redacted.pdf (uploaded 12/26/2025)
- TXT Log 1_17-18_2024 - (415) 260-9173_Redacted.pdf (uploaded 12/26/2025)
- Arielle MDM Screenshot 2025-12-22 152925.jpg (uploaded 12/26/2025)
- 02.2026 REDACTIONS AND LOG_TXT Log 1_17-18_2024 - (415) 260-9173.pdf (uploaded 02/20/2026)
- 02.2026_REDACTIONS AND LOG_1_17-18_2024 Call Log - (415) 260-9173.pdf (uploaded 02/20/2026)

RECORDS STILL OUTSTANDING:

1. UNREDACTED PHONE NUMBERS in call logs (ARIELLE PIASTUNOVICH device) — The call logs for Arielle Piastunovich's City-issued device (415) 260-9173 were produced with all recipient/sender phone numbers redacted. HSH cited Cal. Govt. Code §7927.700 and 24 CFR §578.103(b)(1), but neither exemption applies to City employee phone numbers or inter-agency contact numbers used in official operations. Arielle Piastunovich's phone logs must be produced unredacted. Phone numbers of public officials and contractors acting in official capacity must be disclosed.
2. UNREDACTED SMS/MMS CONTENT — The text message log was produced with all content redacted. The actual content of text messages between City employees conducting official HSOC business is a public record under *City of San Jose v. Superior Court* (2017) 2 Cal.5th 608.
3. FULL MMS LOG — MMS records were designated "non-responsive" despite being explicitly included in the request scope ("all SMS/MMS messages sent or received"). This designation is improper.
4. OPERATIONAL ACTIVITY LOGS / TOUCHPOINT RECORDS — No daily activity reports, field logs, or SF HEART Touchpoint records for January 17–18, 2024 have been produced.
5. EXEMPTION-BY-EXEMPTION PRIVILEGE LOG — No proper §67.26 justification identifying each withheld portion, the specific exemption, and its factual basis has been provided.

REQUEST 2: NextRequest #26-105

Subject: Communications/Records of PEDRO RINCON (December 2023 – January 2024)

Submitted: January 6, 2026 | Status: CLOSED

BE ADVISED - PEDRO RINCON IS CONTRACTED BY HSH THRU HELUNA HEALTH. HSH IS BELIEVED TO HOLD CONSTRUCTIVE POSSESSION OF RECORDS

WHAT WAS REQUESTED:

All records, documents, and communications from December 1, 2023 through January 31, 2024, created by, sent to, or involving PEDRO RINCON regarding:

1. San Bruno Avenue Encampments — communications, meeting minutes, or directives concerning camp sweeps, encampment resolutions, outreach, or site stabilization on or near San Bruno Avenue.
2. Field Reports & Logs — electronic or handwritten logs, Encampment Master Log entries, or service assessments authored or reviewed by Arielle Piastunovich for this location.

3. Inter-Agency Coordination — all communications (including email, text messages, and instant messages) between Arielle Piastunovich and any employee/contractor/agent of DPW, SFPD, HSH, or any other City department, regarding the scheduling or execution of resolutions on San Bruno Avenue.

4. Personal Documentation — field notes, observation logs, site assessment forms, photographs, or other documentation created by PEDRO RINCON during site visits.

5. Work Schedules and Assignments — calendars, work schedules, duty rosters, assignment sheets, or tasking documents showing PEDRO RINCON's scheduled activities and site assignments.

NOTE: "Communications" was defined to include email, SMS, instant messages (Signal, WhatsApp, Slack, Teams), phone call logs and recordings (mobile and desk phones), voicemail recordings and transcripts, and any other electronic communication method.

RECORDS PRODUCED (55 documents, uploaded 01/20/2026):

- HSOC Joint Field Operation Notes (multiple dates: Dec 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 11, 29, Jan 5 — PDFs and .docx)
- HSOC Notes (multiple dates: 12/01/23, 12/04/23, 12/05/23, 12/06/23, 12/08/23, 12/11/23, 12/23/29, 01/04/24, 01/05/24 — .docx and PDFs, one redacted)
- HSOC Encampment Resolution documents (English and Spanish, 12/14/23)
- HSOC notice revised (English and Spanish versions)
- Shelter/Housing Flyers (Auburn, Camelot, Empress, Le Nain, Minna Lee, PBI, Star, Windsor — various years)
- Secure/DISH notification templates and emails (Dec 2023 – Feb 2024)
- CM referrals_Redacted.pdf
- Putting folks in the grid.pdf
- Template documents (.docx) for December 2023 – February 2024

RECORDS STILL OUTSTANDING:

1. PHONE RECORDS FOR PEDRO RINCON — No call logs, SMS logs, or MMS logs for any device assigned to or used by Pedro Rincon have been produced. The request explicitly included phone call logs, voicemail recordings, and all electronic communications.

2. TEXT MESSAGES AND INSTANT MESSAGES — No SMS, MMS, Signal, WhatsApp, Slack, Teams, or other instant message records involving Pedro Rincon during the request period have been produced.

3. INTER-AGENCY COMMUNICATIONS BETWEEN PIASTUNOVICH AND DPW/SFPD/OTHER AGENCIES — No inter-agency email, text, or coordination communications between Arielle Piastunovich and DPW, SFPD, or other agencies specifically related to San Bruno Avenue operations during this period have been produced.

4. PEDRO RINCON PERSONAL DOCUMENTATION — No field notes, observation logs, site assessment forms, or photographs personally created by Pedro Rincon during San Bruno Avenue site visits have been produced.
5. PEDRO RINCON WORK SCHEDULES/DUTY ROSTERS — No calendars, duty rosters, assignment sheets, or tasking documents for Pedro Rincon for this period have been produced.
6. ENCAMPMENT MASTER LOG ENTRIES — No Encampment Master Log entries authored or reviewed by Arielle Piastunovich for San Bruno Avenue during this period have been produced.

REQUEST 3: NextRequest #26-134

Subject: Supplemental Request — Text Message Content and Call Details (January 17–19, 2024)

Re: Original Request #25-10128 (Mobile Device 415-260-9173)

Submitted: January 6, 2026 | Status: CLOSED (disputed)

WHAT WAS REQUESTED:

1. Full text message content — all texts sent from/received by (415) 260-9173 during January 17–19, 2024, including full content, sender/recipient numbers, timestamps, attachments, and metadata.
2. Voicemail content — audio recordings or transcriptions of all voicemails on device (415) 260-9173 during January 17–19, 2024, including caller numbers, timestamps, and duration.
3. Archived/backup communications — any archived text/voicemail data from iCloud, MDM backup systems, email-to-SMS gateways, or communication platforms (Slack, Teams).
4. Related communications referencing texts/calls — any emails, memos, or notes that reference, summarize, or discuss the content of phone calls or text messages during January 17–19, 2024.

NOTE: The call and text logs produced under #25-10128 document 15+ phone calls on January 17, 30+ text messages across January 17–18 (with 20+ texts between 11:20am–12:50pm on January 18 alone), demonstrating intensive official coordination activity on a City-issued device.

RECORDS PRODUCED:

- Voicemail log_Redacted.pdf (uploaded 01/21/2026 — listed in timeline but not in documents tab; content redacted) not related to incident.

RECORDS STILL OUTSTANDING:

1. FULL TEXT MESSAGE CONTENT — No actual text message content has been produced for the January 17–19, 2024 period, despite 30+ texts being documented in the previously produced logs. The request for full content, sender/recipient numbers, timestamps, and attachments has not been satisfied.
2. VOICEMAIL AUDIO/TRANSCRIPTS — Only a redacted voicemail log has been produced. Actual voicemail audio recordings or official transcripts have not been produced.
3. UNREDACTED VOICEMAIL LOG — The voicemail log was produced with personal information redacted; however, redactions of City employee/contractor phone numbers are improper and the unredacted version must be produced.
4. ARCHIVED/BACKUP COMMUNICATION DATA — No response has been given regarding the existence or production of archived text/voicemail data from iCloud, MDM, or other backup systems.
5. RELATED COMMUNICATIONS REFERENCING TEXTS/CALLS — No emails, memos, or meeting notes referencing the content of January 17–19, 2024 communications have been produced.
6. RETENTION POLICY DOCUMENTATION — HSH has not provided its text message or voicemail retention policies for City-issued devices, as requested.
7. EXEMPTION-BY-EXEMPTION PRIVILEGE LOG — No proper §67.26 justification has been provided for the redactions in the voicemail log or for the withholding of text message content.

REQUEST 4: Call and Text Logs — Consolidated Outstanding Records

Subject: Unredacted Call Logs, Full SMS/MMS Content, and Voicemail Records

Relevant Requests: #25-10128, #26-105, #26-134

WHAT WAS REQUESTED:

1. Unredacted call logs — complete call logs for device (415) 260-9173 (January 17–18, 2024), including unredacted sender/recipient phone numbers for all City employees and contractors.
2. Full SMS/MMS content — complete text message content for all SMS and MMS messages sent or received on device (415) 260-9173 during January 17–19, 2024, including sender/recipient numbers, timestamps, and attachments.
3. Call and text logs for Pedro Rincon — all call logs and text message logs for any device assigned to or used by Pedro Rincon during December 2023 – January 2024.

4. MMS/photo/video messages — MMS attachments and photo/video messages within the January 17–18, 2024 logs, improperly designated as non-responsive.
5. Voicemail records — audio recordings or official transcripts of all voicemails on device (415) 260-9173 during January 17–19, 2024, plus the unredacted voicemail log.

RECORDS PRODUCED:

- 1_17-18_2024 Call Log - (415) 260-9173_Redacted.pdf (uploaded 12/26/2025)
- TXT Log 1_17-18_2024 - (415) 260-9173_Redacted.pdf (uploaded 12/26/2025)
- 02.2026 REDACTIONS AND LOG_TXT Log 1_17-18_2024 - (415) 260-9173.pdf (uploaded 02/20/2026)
- 02.2026_RED ACTIONS AND LOG_1_17-18_2024 Call Log - (415) 260-9173.pdf (uploaded 02/20/2026)
- Voicemail log (redacted) — date of production unconfirmed

RECORDS STILL OUTSTANDING:

1. UNREDACTED CALL LOG (ARIELLE PIASTUNOVICH) — All recipient/sender phone numbers in the call logs for Arielle Piastunovich's City-issued device (415) 260-9173 (Jan 17–18, 2024) have been redacted. Arielle Piastunovich's phone logs must be produced unredacted. Redactions of City employee and contractor phone numbers are improper under the Sunshine Ordinance.
2. FULL SMS/MMS CONTENT — 30+ text messages are documented in the produced logs, but no actual message content has been produced. Full content, sender/recipient numbers, timestamps, and attachment data remain withheld.
3. MMS/PHOTO/VIDEO MESSAGES — Photo and video messages within the January 17–18, 2024 logs were improperly designated non-responsive. These fall squarely within the scope of the original request.
4. CALL AND TEXT LOGS FOR PEDRO RINCON — No call logs or text message logs for any device assigned to or used by Pedro Rincon during December 2023 – January 2024 have been produced (#26-105).
5. VOICEMAIL AUDIO/TRANSCRIPTS — Actual voicemail audio recordings or official transcripts have not been produced. Only a redacted voicemail log was provided.
6. UNREDACTED VOICEMAIL LOG — The voicemail log was produced with phone numbers redacted; unredacted version must be produced.
7. EXEMPTION-BY-EXEMPTION PRIVILEGE LOG — No §67.26 justification has been provided for any redaction in the call logs, text logs, or voicemail log.

SUMMARY OF OUTSTANDING RECORDS — ALL REQUESTS

The following categories of records remain unproduced or improperly redacted across HSH's responses to the above requests:

A. Phone Records (Calls):

- Unredacted call log for Arielle Piastunovich's device (415) 260-9173 (Jan 17–18, 2024) — Arielle Piastunovich's phone logs must be produced unredacted; phone numbers of City employees and contractors must be disclosed (#25-10128)
- Call records for Pedro Rincon's device(s) for Dec 2023 – Jan 2024 (#26-105)

B. Text Message / SMS / MMS Records:

- Full SMS/MMS content for device (415) 260-9173 (Jan 17–19, 2024) — 30+ texts documented in logs but content withheld (#25-10128, #26-134)
- MMS log for device (415) 260-9173 — improperly designated non-responsive (#25-10128)
- Text messages involving Pedro Rincon (Dec 2023 – Jan 2024) (#26-105)

C. Voicemail Records:

- Voicemail audio or transcripts for device (415) 260-9173 (Jan 17–19, 2024) (#26-134)
- Unredacted voicemail log (#26-134)

D. Inter-Agency / Coordination Communications:

- Communications between Arielle Piastunovich and DPW, SFPD, and other agencies re: San Bruno Avenue operations (Dec 2023 – Jan 2024) (#26-105)
- Emails/memos referencing the content of Jan 17–19, 2024 calls and texts (#26-134)

E. Field Documentation / Operational Records:

- Pedro Rincon field notes, observation logs, site assessments, photographs from San Bruno Avenue site visits (#26-105)
- Pedro Rincon work schedules, duty rosters, assignment documents (Dec 2023 – Jan 2024) (#26-105)
- Encampment Master Log entries for San Bruno Avenue (#26-105)
- SF HEART Touchpoint/activity records for Jan 17–18, 2024 (#25-10128)

F. Procedural / Privilege Log Deficiencies:

- No exemption-by-exemption §67.26 privilege log has been provided for any redacted

document across all three requests

- HSH's retention policy for text messages and voicemails on City-issued devices has not been disclosed (#26-134)

HSH's unilateral declarations of closure on these requests do not satisfy its obligations under the Sunshine Ordinance or the California Public Records Act. The outstanding records identified above are the subject of ongoing compliance proceedings before the SOTF in File No. 25134.

From: [SOTF \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Minh Cantarutti](#); [HSHSunshine](#); [Schneider, Dylan \(HOM\)](#); [SOTF \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Matthew Yankee \(myankee.sotf@gmail.com\)](#)
Subject: Accepted - Request for Reconsideration of Minh Cantarutti against Homelessness and Supportive Housing (File 25134)
Date: Monday, April 13, 2026 1:30:38 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Hello, Mr. Cantarutti –

Petitioner's Request for Reconsideration of **File No. 25134** has been accepted.

The Request for Reconsideration is scheduled to be heard at the 5/6/2026 Regular Meeting of the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force.

- The parties *will not* have the ability to present their position on 5/6/2026.
- The parties may offer Public Comment when the matter is called.
- If the matter is reopened, the parties will be able to present their position at a future meeting.
- If the matter is not reopened, the matter is Closed.

The matter was heard on 4/1/2026 and the submission of this Request for Reconsideration (received 4/8/2026 is timely per Section E(1) of the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force [Complaint Procedures](#).

Lastly, I do not believe we received the attached Request for Consideration referenced in your 4/8/2026 email [below]. Please resend it.

Thank you.

Patricia Petersen (she/her)

Assistant Clerk

Board of Supervisors

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

Telephone 415-554-7724 | Fax 415-554-5163

sotf@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

I am not in on Wednesdays.



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The [Legislative Research Center](#) provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation, and archived matters since August 1998.

Disclosures: *Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not*

required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.

From: Minh Cantarutti <mcantarutti26@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, April 8, 2026 9:33 AM

To: SOTF (BOS) <sotf@sfgov.org>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>

Cc: DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; Fielder, Jackie (BOS) <Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff (BOS) <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; HSHSunshine <HSHSunshine@sfgov.org>

Subject: Request for Reconsideration — File No. 25134 — Cantarutti v. HSH

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

To the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force Administrator,

Please find attached Petitioner's Request for Reconsideration in File No. 25134 (Cantarutti v. Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing), submitted pursuant to SOTF Complaint Procedure Section E within the 30-day reconsideration window following the April 1, 2026 Order of Determination.

The request identifies three categories of new information postdating the January 27, 2026 hearing:

1. HSH's unilateral declaration of compliance on February 20, 2026 — 39 days before the Order of Determination existed;
2. HSH's continued application of the inverted redaction standard the Task Force found unlawful, in a production made after the hearing; and
3. HSH's failure to publish responsive records to the NextRequest portal and refusal to cure upon demand.

Petitioner requests that the Task Force grant reconsideration, amend the Order of

Determination to include a production order and referral to the Compliance & Amendments Committee.

Copies of this request are provided to members of the Board of Supervisors in their capacity as the appointing authority over the Task Force. Board of Supervisors members are not members of the Task Force and play no adjudicative role in this proceeding. This communication is not ex parte

Respectfully submitted,

Minh Luong Cantarutti

Petitioner, pro se

(415) 888-7101

mcantarutti26@gmail.com

From: [SOTF \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Minh Cantarutti](#); [SOTF \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [HSHSunshine](#); [Schneider, Dylan \(HOM\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Matthew Yankee \(myankee.sotf@gmail.com\)](#)
Subject: Notice of Hearing, Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, Reconsideration Agenda, 5/6/2026, Convenes at 4:00 p.m., Hearings on Complaints at 5:00 p.m. (File 25134)
Date: Friday, April 24, 2026 4:28:27 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Hello, Mr. Cantarutti –

Thank you for providing the Request for Consideration referenced in your 4/8/2026 email.

This communication is to confirm that **File 25134** is agendized on the Reconsideration Calendar at the 5/6/2026 Regular Meeting of the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force. The Agenda for the meeting will be published on Friday, 5/1/2026.

Thank you.

-Pat

From: Minh Cantarutti <mcantarutti26@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 16, 2026 8:00 AM
To: SOTF (BOS) <sotf@sfgov.org>
Cc: HSHSunshine <HSHSunshine@sfgov.org>; Schneider, Dylan (HOM) <dylan.schneider@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; Fielder, Jackie (BOS) <Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff (BOS) <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>; Matthew Yankee (myankee.sotf@gmail.com) <myankee.sotf@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: Accepted - Request for Reconsideration of Minh Cantarutti against Homelessness and Supportive Housing (File 25134)

I believe this is the right document. There should have been a copy attached to my last email also. Let me know if there is a problem with this one.

On Mon, Apr 13, 2026 at 1:31 PM SOTF (BOS) <sotf@sfgov.org> wrote:

Hello, Mr. Cantarutti –

Petitioner's Request for Reconsideration of **File No. 25134** has been accepted.

The Request for Reconsideration is scheduled to be heard at the 5/6/2026 Regular Meeting of the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force.

- The parties *will not* have the ability to present their position on 5/6/2026.
- The parties may offer Public Comment when the matter is called.
- If the matter is reopened, the parties will be able to present their position at a future meeting.
- If the matter is not reopened, the matter is Closed.

The matter was heard on 4/1/2026 and the submission of this Request for Reconsideration (received 4/8/2026 is timely per Section E(1) of the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force [Complaint Procedures](#).

Lastly, I do not believe we received the attached Request for Consideration referenced in your 4/8/2026 email [below]. Please resend it.

Thank you.

Patricia Petersen (she/her)

Assistant Clerk

Board of Supervisors

[1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244](#)

Telephone 415-554-7724 | Fax 415-554-5163

sotf@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

I am not in on Wednesdays.



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The [Legislative Research Center](#) provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation, and archived matters since August 1998.

Disclosures: *Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: Minh Cantarutti <mcantarutti26@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, April 8, 2026 9:33 AM

To: SOTF (BOS) <sotf@sfgov.org>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>

Cc: DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; Fielder, Jackie (BOS) <Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff (BOS) <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; HSHSunshine <HSHSunshine@sfgov.org>

Subject: Request for Reconsideration — File No. 25134 — Cantarutti v. HSH

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

To the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force Administrator,

Please find attached Petitioner's Request for Reconsideration in File No. 25134 (Cantarutti v. Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing), submitted pursuant to SOTF Complaint Procedure Section E within the 30-day reconsideration window following the April 1, 2026 Order of Determination.

The request identifies three categories of new information postdating the January 27, 2026 hearing:

1. HSH's unilateral declaration of compliance on February 20, 2026 — 39 days before the Order of Determination existed;
2. HSH's continued application of the inverted redaction standard the Task Force found unlawful, in a production made after the hearing; and
3. HSH's failure to publish responsive records to the NextRequest portal and refusal to cure upon demand.

Petitioner requests that the Task Force grant reconsideration, amend the Order of Determination to include a production order and referral to the Compliance & Amendments Committee.

Copies of this request are provided to members of the Board of Supervisors in their capacity as the appointing authority over the Task Force. Board of Supervisors members are not members of the Task Force and play no adjudicative role in this proceeding. This communication is not ex parte

Respectfully submitted,

Minh Luong Cantarutti

Petitioner, pro se

(415) 888-7101

mcantarutti26@gmail.com

From: [SOTF \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Minh Cantarutti](#); [SOTF \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [HSHSunshine](#); [Schneider, Dylan \(HOM\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Matthew Yankee \(myankee.sotf@gmail.com\)](#)
Subject: Notice of Hearing, Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, Reconsideration Agenda, 5/6/2026, Convenes at 4:00 p.m., Hearings on Complaints at 5:00 p.m. (File 25134)
Date: Friday, April 24, 2026 4:28:27 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Hello, Mr. Cantarutti –

Thank you for providing the Request for Consideration referenced in your 4/8/2026 email.

This communication is to confirm that **File 25134** is agendized on the Reconsideration Calendar at the 5/6/2026 Regular Meeting of the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force. The Agenda for the meeting will be published on Friday, 5/1/2026.

Thank you.

-Pat

From: Minh Cantarutti <mcantarutti26@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 16, 2026 8:00 AM
To: SOTF (BOS) <sotf@sfgov.org>
Cc: HSHSunshine <HSHSunshine@sfgov.org>; Schneider, Dylan (HOM) <dylan.schneider@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; Fielder, Jackie (BOS) <Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff (BOS) <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>; Matthew Yankee (myankee.sotf@gmail.com) <myankee.sotf@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: Accepted - Request for Reconsideration of Minh Cantarutti against Homelessness and Supportive Housing (File 25134)

I believe this is the right document. There should have been a copy attached to my last email also. Let me know if there is a problem with this one.

On Mon, Apr 13, 2026 at 1:31 PM SOTF (BOS) <sotf@sfgov.org> wrote:

Hello, Mr. Cantarutti –

Petitioner's Request for Reconsideration of **File No. 25134** has been accepted.

The Request for Reconsideration is scheduled to be heard at the 5/6/2026 Regular Meeting of the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force.

- The parties *will not* have the ability to present their position on 5/6/2026.
- The parties may offer Public Comment when the matter is called.
- If the matter is reopened, the parties will be able to present their position at a future meeting.
- If the matter is not reopened, the matter is Closed.

The matter was heard on 4/1/2026 and the submission of this Request for Reconsideration (received 4/8/2026 is timely per Section E(1) of the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force [Complaint Procedures](#).

Lastly, I do not believe we received the attached Request for Consideration referenced in your 4/8/2026 email [below]. Please resend it.

Thank you.

Patricia Petersen (she/her)

Assistant Clerk

Board of Supervisors

[1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244](#)

Telephone 415-554-7724 | Fax 415-554-5163

sotf@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

I am not in on Wednesdays.



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The [Legislative Research Center](#) provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation, and archived matters since August 1998.

Disclosures: *Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: Minh Cantarutti <mcantarutti26@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, April 8, 2026 9:33 AM

To: SOTF (BOS) <sotf@sfgov.org>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>

Cc: DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; Fielder, Jackie (BOS) <Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff (BOS) <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; HSHSunshine <HSHSunshine@sfgov.org>

Subject: Request for Reconsideration — File No. 25134 — Cantarutti v. HSH

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

To the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force Administrator,

Please find attached Petitioner's Request for Reconsideration in File No. 25134 (Cantarutti v. Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing), submitted pursuant to SOTF Complaint Procedure Section E within the 30-day reconsideration window following the April 1, 2026 Order of Determination.

The request identifies three categories of new information postdating the January 27, 2026 hearing:

1. HSH's unilateral declaration of compliance on February 20, 2026 — 39 days before the Order of Determination existed;
2. HSH's continued application of the inverted redaction standard the Task Force found unlawful, in a production made after the hearing; and
3. HSH's failure to publish responsive records to the NextRequest portal and refusal to cure upon demand.

Petitioner requests that the Task Force grant reconsideration, amend the Order of Determination to include a production order and referral to the Compliance & Amendments Committee.

Copies of this request are provided to members of the Board of Supervisors in their capacity as the appointing authority over the Task Force. Board of Supervisors members are not members of the Task Force and play no adjudicative role in this proceeding. This communication is not ex parte

Respectfully submitted,

Minh Luong Cantarutti

Petitioner, pro se

(415) 888-7101

mcantarutti26@gmail.com

From: [SOTF \(BOS\)](#)
To: [mcantarutti26@gmail.com](#); [HSHSUnshine](#); [Schneider, Dylan \(HOM\)](#); [SOTF \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Notice of Hearing: Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, 6/3/2026, Convenes at 4:00 p.m., Hearings on Complaints at 5:00 p.m. (File No. 25134)
Date: Friday, May 22, 2026 4:34:59 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
Sensitivity: Confidential

Hello –

The following Sunshine Ordinance Task Force matters have been scheduled for hearing as follows:

Date: Wednesday, June 3, 2026 (Hybrid Meeting in-person/remote)

Location: Hearing Room 408, City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102

Time: Meeting Convenes – 4:00 p.m.

Public Comment, Consent Agenda, and Hearings on Complaints – begin 5:00 p.m. or as soon thereafter as possible

Information regarding how to participate via telephone or via teleconference (Webex) will be listed on the Agenda. Agendas are available [online](#) and at the [San Francisco Public Library](#) at least 72 hours before the meeting.

Why Am I Receiving This Notice?

You are receiving this notice because you are named as a Complainant or Respondent in one of the following complaints scheduled for hearing to: 1) hear the merits of the complaint; 2) issue a determination; and/or 3) consider referrals from a Task Force Committee,

or

You are receiving this notice because you are named as a Complainant or Respondent in one of the following complaints for a hearing to: 1) determine if the Task Force has jurisdiction; 2) review the merits of the complaints; and/or 3) issue a report and/or recommendation to the SOTF.

Must I Attend?

Complainants: Your attendance is required for this meeting/hearing.

Respondents/Departments: Pursuant to Section 67.21 (e) of the Ordinance the custodian of records, or a representative of your department who can speak to the matter, is required at the meeting/hearing.

IMPORTANT - CONFIRM YOUR ATTENDANCE

■ Petitioner's Failure to Appear at the meeting without prior notice will result in the file being **Closed**.

■ Respondent's Failure to Appear will result in additional violations of the Sunshine Ordinance.

Confirm your attendance and submit any additional supplemental/support documents for inclusion into the agenda packet by **5:00 p.m., Thursday, May 28, 2026**.

Which Matters Will be Heard?

Reconsideration:

- File No. 25033: Complaint filed by Joudere Gaines against San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Section(s) 67.21, by failing to respond to a public records request in a timely and/or complete manner.
- File No. 25134: Complaint filed by Minh Cantarutti against Homeless and Supportive Housing for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Section(s) 67.21, by failing to respond to a public records request in a timely and/or complete manner.

Follow-Up Compliance:

- File No. 24015: Complaint filed by Paul Kniha against the Municipal Transportation Agency for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Section(s); 67.21 by failing to respond to a records request in a complete and/or timely manner.

Hearing Following Committee:

- File No. 25127: Complaint filed by Elias Georgopoulos against the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Section(s) 67.21, by failing to respond to a public records request in a timely and/or complete manner, 67.25, by failing to respond to an immediate disclosure request in a timely and/or complete manner, and Government Code Sec. 6253(c).

- File No. 26021 (25-10755): Complaint filed by Grant Ingram against San Francisco Recreation and Park Department for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Section(s) 67.21, by failing to respond to a public records request in a timely and/or complete manner.

New Hearing:

- File No. 26059: Complaint filed by Gabriel Greschler against the Office of the Mayor for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Section(s) 67.21, by failing to respond to a public records request in a timely and/or complete manner.

Click [here](#) for the Complaint Procedures.

Thank you.

Patricia Petersen (she/her)

Assistant Clerk

Board of Supervisors

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

Telephone 415-554-7724 | Fax 415-554-5163

sotf@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

I am not in on Wednesdays.



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The [Legislative Research Center](#) provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation, and archived matters since August 1998.

Disclosures: *Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*