

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. 554-5184
Fax No. 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. 554-5227

MEMORANDUM

GOVERNMENT AUDIT AND OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

SAN FRANCISCO BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

TO: Supervisor Norman Yee, Chair
Government Audit and Oversight Committee

FROM: Erica Major, Assistant Committee Clerk

DATE: September 8, 2015

SUBJECT: **COMMITTEE REPORT, BOARD MEETING**
Tuesday, September 8, 2015

The following file should be presented as a **COMMITTEE REPORT** at the Board meeting, Tuesday, September 8, 2015. This item was acted upon at the Government Audit and Oversight Committee Meeting on September 3, 2015, at 10:30 a.m., by the votes indicated.

Item No. 14 File No. 150603

Resolution responding to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court on the findings and recommendations contained in the 2014-2015 Civil Grand Jury Report, entitled "San Francisco's Whistleblower Protection Ordinance is in Need of Change," and urging the Mayor to cause the implementation of accepted findings and recommendations through his/her department heads and through the development of the annual budget.

AMENDED, AN AMENDMENT OF THE WHOLE BEARING THE SAME TITLE

Vote: Supervisor Norman Yee - Aye
Supervisor Julie Christensen - Aye
Supervisor London Breed - Aye

RECOMMENDED AS AMENDED AS A COMMITTEE REPORT

Vote: Supervisor Norman Yee - Aye
Supervisor Julie Christensen - Aye
Supervisor London Breed - Aye

Committee Report, Board Meeting
Tuesday, September 8, 2015
File No. 150603

cc: Board of Supervisors
Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Rick Caldeira, Legislative Deputy Director
Jon Givner, Deputy City Attorney

File No. 150603 Committee Item No. 5
 Board Item No. 14

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: Government Audit and Oversight Date September 3, 2015

Board of Supervisors Meeting Date SEPTEMBER 8, 2015

Cmte Board

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Motion |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Resolution |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Ordinance |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Legislative Digest |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Budget and Legislative Analyst Report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Youth Commission Report |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Introduction Form |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Department/Agency Cover Letter and/or Report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | MOU |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Grant Information Form |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Grant Budget |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Subcontract Budget |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Contract/Agreement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Form 126 – Ethics Commission |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Award Letter |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Application |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Public Correspondence |

OTHER (Use back side if additional space is needed)

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <u>Civil Grand Jury (CGJ) Transmittal Letter and Report - 06/03/2015</u> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <u>COB Memo to Board - 06/04/2015</u> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <u>COB Memo to Board - 06/08/2015</u> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <u>Ethics Memo - 08/04/2015</u> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <u>Mayor's Memo - 08/07/2015</u> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <u>COB Memo - 08/12/2015</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <u>COB Memo - 09/08/2015</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |

Completed by: Erica Major Date August 28, 2015
 Completed by: JM Date SEPTEMBER 8, 2015

1 [Board Response - Civil Grand Jury - San Francisco's Whistleblower Protection Ordinance is
2 in Need of Change]

3 **Resolution responding to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court on the findings**
4 **and recommendations contained in the 2014-2015 Civil Grand Jury Report, entitled**
5 **"San Francisco's Whistleblower Protection Ordinance is in Need of Change;" and**
6 **urging the Mayor to cause the implementation of accepted findings and**
7 **recommendations through his/her department heads and through the development of**
8 **the annual budget.**

9
10 WHEREAS, Under California Penal Code, Section 933 et seq., the Board of
11 Supervisors must respond, within 90 days of receipt, to the Presiding Judge of the Superior
12 Court on the findings and recommendations contained in Civil Grand Jury Reports; and

13 WHEREAS, In accordance with California Penal Code, Section 933.05(c), if a finding or
14 recommendation of the Civil Grand Jury addresses budgetary or personnel matters of a
15 county agency or a department headed by an elected officer, the agency or department head
16 and the Board of Supervisors shall respond if requested by the Civil Grand Jury, but the
17 response of the Board of Supervisors shall address only budgetary or personnel matters over
18 which it has some decision making authority; and

19 WHEREAS, Under San Francisco Administrative Code, Section 2.10(a), the Board of
20 Supervisors must conduct a public hearing by a committee to consider a final report of the
21 findings and recommendations submitted, and notify the current foreperson and immediate
22 past foreperson of the civil grand jury when such hearing is scheduled; and

23 WHEREAS, In accordance with San Francisco Administrative Code, Section 2.10(b),
24 the Controller must report to the Board of Supervisors on the implementation of
25

1 recommendations that pertain to fiscal matters that were considered at a public hearing held
2 by a Board of Supervisors Committee; and

3 WHEREAS, The 2014-2015 Civil Grand Jury Report, entitled "San Francisco's
4 Whistleblower Protection Ordinance is in Need of Change" (Report) is on file with the Clerk of
5 the Board of Supervisors in File No. 150603, which is hereby declared to be a part of this
6 Resolution as if set forth fully herein; and

7 WHEREAS, The Civil Grand Jury has requested that the Board of Supervisors respond
8 to Finding Nos. 1, 2, 3.1, 3.2, and 4, as well as Recommendation Nos. 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 3, and 4
9 contained in the subject Report; and

10 WHEREAS, Finding No. 1 states: "The [Whistleblower Protection Ordinance] (WPO)
11 does not fully "protect" City officers and employees from retaliation for filing a complaint as
12 required by the Charter mandate of Proposition C, because it covers only a limited range of
13 complaints, it provides no effective remedy for the victim, and its secrecy provisions limit its
14 deterrent effect;" and

15 WHEREAS, Finding No. 2 states: "The WPO also fails to fulfill the Charter mandate, in
16 that it does not cover all whistleblower disclosures specified in the Charter;" and

17 WHEREAS, Finding No. 3.1 states: "While other large California cities and counties
18 have relatively weak laws protecting their employees from retaliation for whistleblowing, this
19 does not relieve the Board of its responsibility under the Charter mandate, to enact an
20 ordinance that genuinely protects whistleblowers;" and

21 WHEREAS, Finding No. 3.2 states: "Whistleblower protection laws that cover
22 government employees at the state and Federal level can serve as a useful model for
23 improving the WPO;" and

24 WHEREAS, Finding No. 4 states: "The WPO creates an unwarranted obstacle to
25 administrative complaints of retaliation filed with the Ethics Commission, by imposing a

1 burden of proof on the complainant during preliminary review and investigation of such
2 complaints;" and

3 WHEREAS, Recommendation No. 1.2 states: "If the Ethics Commission fails to act
4 within a reasonable time, that the Board of Supervisors on its own amend the WPO to provide
5 real protection to whistleblowers, in conformity with the Charter mandate of Proposition C;"
6 and

7 WHEREAS, Recommendation No. 2.1 states: "That amendments to the WPO expand
8 the definition of whistleblowing to cover oral complaints to the complainant's department;
9 disclosures to a City department or commission other than the complainant's own; and
10 providing information to any of the recipients listed in the Charter mandate (hereafter "listed
11 recipients"), outside of the formal complaint or investigation process;" and

12 WHEREAS, Recommendation No. 2.2 states: "That these amendments further expand
13 the scope of covered disclosures to include "providing information" to any of the listed
14 recipients regarding improper government activities, whether or not such information is set
15 forth in a formal complaint, or provided during an official investigation;" and

16 WHEREAS, Recommendation No. 3 states: "That amendments to the WPO provide a
17 meaningful remedy for the effects of retaliation, by authorizing the Ethics Commission to order
18 cancellation of a retaliatory job action, and increasing the limit of the civil penalty available
19 under the WPO to an amount adequate to repay the financial losses that can result from such
20 an action;" and

21 WHEREAS, Recommendation No. 4 states: "That amendments to the WPO include a
22 revision of Subsection 4.115(b)(iii) providing that the burden of proof set forth therein does not
23 apply during preliminary review and investigation of administrative complaints to the
24 Commission;" and
25

1 WHEREAS, in accordance with California Penal Code, Section 933.05(c), the Board of
2 Supervisors must respond, within 90 days of receipt, to the Presiding Judge of the Superior
3 Court on Findings No. 1, 2, 3.1, 3.2, and 4 as well as Recommendations No. 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 3,
4 and 4 contained in the subject Report; now, therefore, be it

5 RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports to the Presiding Judge of the
6 Superior Court that they disagree partially with Finding No. 1 for reasons as follows: the
7 confidentiality provisions for investigations are important as they protect both the complainant
8 and the respondent during the period when accusations are proved or disproved, but the
9 WPO does have limitations that could potentially be enhanced based on future
10 recommendations from the Ethics Commission; and, be it

11 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that they disagree
12 partially with Finding No. 2 for reasons as follows: the WPO does fulfill the Charter mandate,
13 but could be improved; and, be it

14 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that they agree with
15 Finding No. 3.1; and, be it

16 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that they agree with
17 Finding No. 3.2; and, be it

18 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that they disagree with
19 Finding No. 4 for reasons as follows: there is no empirical data to support this finding and it
20 does not indicate the scope and nature of the problem nor the solution to deal with the
21 problem; and, be it

22 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that Recommendation
23 No. 1.2 will not be implemented for reasons as follows: the Board of Supervisors will work with
24 the Ethics Commission to improve the WPO; however, the Board of Supervisors cannot
25

1 predict the timing or outcome of the Ethics Commission's actions nor the approvals by the
2 legislative body; and, be it

3 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that Recommendation
4 No. 2.1 will not be implemented for reasons as follows: the Board of Supervisors will work with
5 the Ethics Commission to improve the WPO; however, the Board of Supervisors cannot
6 predict the timing or outcome of the Ethics Commission's actions nor the approvals by the
7 legislative body. The Board would also need a more specific definition of "oral complaints" in
8 order to warrant implementation of this recommendation; and, be it

9 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that Recommendation
10 No. 2.2 will not be implemented for reasons as follows: The Board of Supervisors will work
11 with the Ethics Commission to improve the WPO; however, the Board of Supervisors cannot
12 predict the timing or outcome of the Ethics Commission's actions nor the approvals by the
13 legislative body. The Board would also need a more specific definition of what "providing
14 information" entails in order to warrant implementation of this recommendation since there is
15 no clear data that defines the problem; and, be it

16 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that Recommendation
17 No. 3 will not be implemented for reasons as follows: the Board of Supervisors concurs with
18 the Mayor's Office, which states that "under the WPO, the Ethics Commission is provided with
19 punitive, not restorative, powers to respond to the finding of retaliatory job action. However,
20 there are a number of other avenues a complainant can pursue in such circumstances. As
21 the Civil Grand Jury notes, 'City officers and employees have successfully litigated complaints
22 of whistleblower retaliation in state court.' Contrary to the Jury's claim that this proves the
23 ineffectiveness of the WPO, it in fact demonstrates that there is an established process for
24 filing a civil action. In addition, if an employee believes that he or she has been disciplined
25 without just cause or has suffered adverse job impact in retaliation for blowing the whistle, the

1 employee can file a grievance through his or her union. A grievance of this nature may be
2 resolved at the department or Department of Human Resources level, or be escalated to
3 arbitration, in accordance with the negotiated rules of the employee's Memorandum of
4 Understanding. If the Ethics Committee had investigated and found that the job action was in
5 fact retaliation for activities protected by the Whistleblower Protection Ordinance, this ruling
6 would likely influence the independent arbitrator, who does have the power to reverse a
7 retaliatory job action. While the investigation and ruling of the Ethics Commission would be a
8 critical step in the process, as the Ethics Commission notes in their response, labor relations
9 are the responsibility of the Department of Human Resources;" and, be it

10 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that Recommendation
11 No. 4 will not be implemented for reasons as follows: there should be minimum evidence
12 requirement to justify a whistleblower complaint in order for the Ethics Commission to pursue
13 an investigation; and, be it

14 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors urges the Mayor to cause the
15 implementation of accepted findings and recommendations through his/her department heads
16 and through the development of the annual budget.

RECEIVED VIA EMAIL

9/8/2015

FILE NOS. 150602
150603

Patrick Monette-Shaw

975 Sutter Street, Apt. 6
San Francisco, CA 94109

Phone: (415) 292-6969 • e-mail: pmonette-shaw@earthlink.net

September 7, 2015

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

- The Honorable Eric Mar, Supervisor, San Francisco Board of Supervisors, District 1
- The Honorable Mark Farrell, Supervisor, San Francisco Board of Supervisors, District 2
- The Honorable Julie Christensen, Supervisor, San Francisco Board of Supervisors, District 3
- The Honorable Katy Tang, Supervisor, San Francisco Board of Supervisors, District 4
- The Honorable London Breed, Supervisor, San Francisco Board of Supervisors, District 5
- The Honorable Jane Kim, Supervisor, San Francisco Board of Supervisors, District 6
- The Honorable Norman Yee, Supervisor, San Francisco Board of Supervisors, District 7
- The Honorable Scott Wiener, Supervisor, San Francisco Board of Supervisors, District 8
- The Honorable David Campos, Supervisor, San Francisco Board of Supervisors, District 9
- The Honorable Malia Cohen, Supervisor, San Francisco Board of Supervisors, District 10
- The Honorable John Avalos, Supervisor, San Francisco Board of Supervisors, District 11
- Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board (for Petitions and Correspondence File)

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Response to Civil Grand Jury on Strengthening Whistleblower Protection Ordinance

Dear Board of Supervisors,

During last Thursday's Government Audit and Oversight Committee hearing to develop recommendations to the full Board of Supervisors on a response to the Civil Grand Jury's report on the Whistleblower Protection Ordinance, Supervisor Christensen comically claimed repeatedly that there is no "cause and effect" and you have no empirical data to support revisions to the WPO.

That's complete nonsense and indicative of why Christensen should be defeated in November in the election as District Three Supervisor.

First, as whistleblower Dr. Derek Kerr testified last Thursday, the Ethics Commission began assessing retaliation claims filed by City employees 20 years ago in 1995, and over those 20 years the Ethics Commission sustained none — zero — of 60 complaints filed, apparently deciding all 60 cases were spurious. That simply defies probability and provides empirical proof to counter Christensen, who appears to be wearing horse blinders.

Second, as I have previously provided you, there's plenty of data available from the City Attorney's Office to provide Christensen with substantial empirical data.

Response to Civil Grand Jury on Strengthening Whistleblower Protection Ordinance

Table 1: Prohibited Personnel Practice Lawsuits, 2007 – 2015, Filed by City Employees Against the City of San Francisco

Code	Alleged Cause	2007–2012 Settlements	2012–2015 Settlements	2012–2015 Cases Pending	Total
6075	Age Discrimination (Emp against City)	2	4	5	11
6015	Assault by another employee		1		1
6020	Compensation (Employee against City)	7	7	2	16
9925	Defamation			1	1
6080	Disability Discrimination (Emp v City)	25	15	5	45
6005	First Amendment Violation (Emp vs City)		1		1
6070	General Harassment (Emp against City)	4	5	6	15
4103	Grievance Arbitration/Labor Related Issue/PERB Me	10	8	3	21
9051	Lit-Breach of Contract		1		1
4099	Other (Employee Conduct)		2	1	3
2099	Other (Police)			1	1
4599	Other Malpractice			1	1
6099	Other-Actions by Employees against City	15	24	16	55
	Overtime Discrimination	1			1
4104	Prevailing Wage Enforcement			1	1
6035	Racial Discrimination (Emp agst. City)	18	16	11	45
6055	Racial Harassment (Emp against City)		2		2
4025	Racial Harassment (Employee Conduct)		1		1
4810	Retirement		1	1	2
6030	Sexual Discrimination (Emp against City)	2	5		7
6050	Sexual Harassment (Emp against City)	6	3	2	11
4020	Sexual Harassment (Employee Conduct)		1		1
4030	Sexual Orient. Harass. (Emp. Conduct)			1	1
6040	Sexual Orientation Discrim (Emp vs City)		1		1
	Unknown Issue	1			1
6010	Wrongful Termination (Emp agst. City)	14	23	9	46
Total		105	121	66	292

Of the 105 cases settled between 2007 and 2012, all of them — 100% — resulted in settlements being paid to the complainants. Of the 121 lawsuits filed between 2012 and 2015, 26 (21.5%) resulted in settlements that totaled \$3.6 million. Of the 121 cases, fully 116 (96%) involved City Attorney staff time and expenses totaling \$8.6 million.

Of the 226 lawsuits concluded in the eight years between 2007 and 2015, fully 131 resulted in settlements to the plaintiffs, representing 58% of the lawsuits filed.

The 292 civil court actions have been filed involving prohibited personnel practices has already cost the City \$32.6 million between settlement agreements and costs of the City Attorney’s staff time and expenses since 2007, but that only included Kelly O’Haire’s settlement. Adding \$754,000 in City Attorney time for O’Haire’s case, we’re up to \$33.35 million. By the time Joanne Hoepfer’s case against the City Attorney is settled, it will probably involve another \$750,000 settlement and another \$750,000 in City Attorney costs, pushing the total to \$35 million.

And as of June 3, 2015 there’s at least another 66 cases that have not yet been settled in court, with more likely pending by now. The sheer number of 292 lawsuits demonstrates that these cases are not “spurious,” as the Mayor falsely claimed in his response to the Grand Jury.

Prohibited personnel practice lawsuits have soared under Mayor Lee with 187 new cases, a 78% increase from 105 cases before his tenure. Wrongful termination lawsuits during Lee’s tenure have climbed from 14 to 32, a 128.6% increase.

This data illustrates that the Ethics Commission erred in finding zero retaliation complaints out of 60 filed during the past two decades.

How much more “empirical” data does Ms. Christensen need to see to be able to understand that there’s a clear problem demanding a quick solution?

September 7, 2015

Response to Civil Grand Jury on Strengthening Whistleblower Protection Ordinance

Page 3

Reject the GAO's "Will Not Be Implemented" Recommendations

The full Board should reject the "disagree partially" and "will not be implemented" recommended responses to the Grand Jury, precisely because Supervisor Breed acknowledges there is a problem with City employees not being protected, and indicated that the Board will work with the Ethics Commission to strengthen the WPO. Supervisor Breed said during Thursday's GAO hearing:

"I do think that we as a Board need to work with the Ethics Commission to try and figure out legislation specifically that will help strengthen the ordinance in order to make it more effective based on the recommendations of the [Grand Jury's] report and unfortunately with the way this process is designed it makes it difficult for us to basically make commitments to that other than to say we'll work on it. But I do think it is important to provide a response to the Civil Grand Jury in a timely manner because it has to go through the legislative process, but that we are consistent and saying that we will work with the Ethics Commission on strengthening the legislation and take it through the legislative process for approval because clearly there is a loophole *and individuals are not being protected appropriately.*"

The 39,122 employees on the City's payroll at the end of June 2015 expect this Board to revise the WPO immediately, since the current ordinance does not meet the mandates in the City Charter that you enact a meaningful WPO.

This should be a relatively simple matter to 1) Expand the types of processes that can be used to file whistleblower complaints, and 2) Expand the types of complaints that can be filed.

Of particular importance is that the Board should sponsor with the Ethics Commission legislation to amend the City Charter to update Section 4.115 of San Francisco's Campaign and Government Conduct Code which does *not* provide retaliation protections for employees who engage in using First Amendment free speech and subsequently face retaliation. You owe it to City employees to change San Francisco's Charter and the WPO to include basic First Amendment protections for City employees.

And you owe it to the Civil Grand Jury to respond saying "will be implemented" or "requires further analysis," rather than using the foolish "will not be implemented" recommendation, since Supervisor Breed appears to be saying that the WPO needs to be, and will be, amended.

Respectfully submitted,

Patrick Monette-Shaw
Columnist
Westside Observer Newspaper

cc: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Derek Kerr, MD, CNA, Whistleblower

Major, Erica (BOS)

From: Major, Erica (BOS)
Sent: Tuesday, September 08, 2015 9:47 AM
To: Gosiengfiao, Rachel (BOS)
Subject: RE: Response to Civil Grand Jury on Strengthening Whistleblower Protection Ordinance (Supervisor Christensen Comically Claimed You Have No Empirical Data — Here's the Data She Appears Not to Understand)

Hi Rachel,

Thank you for the forward, I will add this public correspondence to the official file nos. 150602 and 150603.

Erica Major

Assistant Committee Clerk

Board of Supervisors

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

Phone: (415) 554-4441 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

Erica.Major@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

 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: Gosiengfiao, Rachel (BOS)
Sent: Tuesday, September 08, 2015 9:36 AM
To: Major, Erica (BOS) <erica.major@sfgov.org>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>
Subject: FW: Response to Civil Grand Jury on Strengthening Whistleblower Protection Ordinance (Supervisor Christensen Comically Claimed You Have No Empirical Data — Here's the Data She Appears Not to Understand)

From: pmonette-shaw [<mailto:Pmonette-shaw@earthlink.net>]
Sent: Monday, September 07, 2015 4:19 PM
To: Mar, Eric (BOS) <eric.mar@sfgov.org>; Farrell, Mark (BOS) <mark.farrell@sfgov.org>; Christensen, Julie (BOS) <Julie.Christensen@sfgov.org>; Tang, Katy (BOS) <katy.tang@sfgov.org>; Breed, London (BOS) <london.breed@sfgov.org>; Kim, Jane (BOS) <jane.kim@sfgov.org>; Yee, Norman (BOS) <norman.yee@sfgov.org>; Wiener, Scott <scott.wiener@sfgov.org>; Campos, David (BOS) <david.campos@sfgov.org>; Cohen, Malia (BOS) <malia.cohen@sfgov.org>; Avalos, John (BOS) <john.avalos@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>
Cc: Derek Kerr, MD <DerekonVanNess@aol.com>
Subject: Response to Civil Grand Jury on Strengthening Whistleblower Protection Ordinance (Supervisor Christensen Comically Claimed You Have No Empirical Data — Here's the Data She Appears Not to Understand)

September 7, 2015

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

The Honorable Eric Mar, Supervisor, San Francisco Board of Supervisors, District 1
The Honorable Mark Farrell, Supervisor, San Francisco Board of Supervisors, District 2
The Honorable Julie Christensen, Supervisor, San Francisco Board of Supervisors, District 3
The Honorable Katy Tang, Supervisor, San Francisco Board of Supervisors, District 4
The Honorable London Breed, Supervisor, San Francisco Board of Supervisors, District 5
The Honorable Jane Kim, Supervisor, San Francisco Board of Supervisors, District 6
The Honorable Norman Yee, Supervisor, San Francisco Board of Supervisors, District 7
The Honorable Scott Wiener, Supervisor, San Francisco Board of Supervisors, District 8
The Honorable David Campos, Supervisor, San Francisco Board of Supervisors, District 9
The Honorable Malia Cohen, Supervisor, San Francisco Board of Supervisors, District 10
The Honorable John Avalos, Supervisor, San Francisco Board of Supervisors, District 11
Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board (for Petitions and Correspondence File)

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Response to Civil Grand Jury on Strengthening Whistleblower Protection Ordinance

Dear Board of Supervisors,

During last Thursday's Government Audit and Oversight Committee hearing to develop recommendations to the full Board of Supervisors on a response to the Civil Grand Jury's report on the Whistleblower Protection Ordinance, Supervisor Christensen comically claimed repeatedly that there is no "cause and effect" and you have no empirical data to support revisions to the WPO.

That's complete nonsense and indicative of why Christensen should be defeated in November in the election as District Three Supervisor.

First, as whistleblower Dr. Derek Kerr testified last Thursday, the Ethics Commission began assessing retaliation claims filed by City employees 20 years ago in 1995, and over those 20 years the Ethics Commission sustained none — zero — of 60 complaints filed, apparently deciding all 60 cases were spurious. That simply defies probability and provides empirical proof to counter Christensen, who appears to be wearing horse blinders.

Second, as I have previously provided you, there's plenty of data available from the City Attorney's Office to provide Christensen with substantial empirical data.

Table 1: Prohibited Personnel Practice Lawsuits, 2007 – 2015, Filed by City Employees Against the City of San Francisco

Code	Alleged Cause	2007–2012 Settlements	2012–2015 Settlements	2012–2015 Cases Pending
6075	Age Discrimination (Emp against City)	2	4	5
6015	Assault by another employee		1	
6020	Compensation (Employee against City)	7	7	2
9925	Defamation			1
6080	Disability Discrimination (Emp v City)	25	15	5
6005	First Amendment Violation (Emp vs City)		1	
6070	General Harassment (Emp against City)	4	5	6
4103	Grievance Arbitration/Labor Related Issue/PERB Me	10	8	3
9051	Lit-Breach of Contract		1	
4099	Other (Employee Conduct)		2	1
2099	Other (Police)			1
4599	Other Malpractice			1
6099	Other-Actions by Employees against City	15	24	16
	Overtime Discrimination	1		
4104	Prevailing Wage Enforcement			1
6035	Racial Discrimination (Emp agst. City)	18	16	11
6055	Racial Harassment (Emp against City)		2	
4025	Racial Harassment (Employee Conduct)		1	
4810	Retirement		1	1
6030	Sexual Discrimination (Emp against City)	2	5	
6050	Sexual Harassment (Emp against City)	6	3	2
4020	Sexual Harassment (Employee Conduct)		1	
4030	Sexual Orient. Harass. (Emp. Conduct)			1
6040	Sexual Orientation Discrim (Emp vs City)		1	
	Unknown Issue	1		
6010	Wrongful Termination (Emp agst. City)	14	23	9
	Total	105	121	66

Of the 105 cases settled between 2007 and 2012, all of them — 100% — resulted in settlements being paid to the complainants. Of the 121 lawsuits filed between 2012 and 2015, 26 (21.5%) resulted in settlements that totaled \$3.6 million. Of the 121 cases, fully 116 (96%) involved City Attorney staff time and expenses totaling \$8.6 million.

Of the 226 lawsuits concluded in the eight years between 2007 and 2015, fully 131 resulted in settlements to the plaintiffs, representing 58% of the lawsuits filed.

The 292 civil court actions have been filed involving prohibited personnel practices has already cost the City \$32.6 million between settlement agreements and costs of the City Attorney's staff time and expenses since 2007, but that

only included Kelly O'Haire's settlement. Adding \$754,000 in City Attorney time for O'Haire's case, we're up to \$33.35 million. By the time Joanne Hooper's case against the City Attorney is settled, it will probably involve another \$750,000 settlement and another \$750,000 in City Attorney costs, pushing the total to \$35 million.

And as of June 3, 2015 there's at least another 66 cases that have not yet been settled in court, with more likely pending by now. The sheer number of 292 lawsuits demonstrates that these cases are not "spurious," as the Mayor falsely claimed in his response to the Grand Jury.

Prohibited personnel practice lawsuits have soared under Mayor Lee with 187 new cases, a 78% increase from 105 cases before his tenure. Wrongful termination lawsuits during Lee's tenure have climbed from 14 to 32, a 128.6% increase.

This data illustrates that the Ethics Commission erred in finding zero retaliation complaints out of 60 filed during the past two decades.

How much more "empirical" data does Ms. Christensen need to see to be able to understand that there's a clear problem demanding a quick solution?

Reject the GAO's "Will Not Be Implemented" Recommendations

The full Board should reject the "disagree partially" and "will not be implemented" recommended responses to the Grand Jury, precisely because Supervisor Breed acknowledges there is a problem with City employees not being protected, and indicated that the Board will work with the Ethics Commission to strengthen the WPO. Supervisor Breed said during Thursday's GAO hearing:

"I do think that we as a Board need to work with the Ethics Commission to try and figure out legislation specifically that will help strengthen the ordinance in order to make it more effective based on the recommendations of the [Grand Jury's] report and unfortunately with the way this process is designed it makes it difficult for us to basically make commitments to that other than to say we'll work on it. But I do think it is important to provide a response to the Civil Grand Jury in a timely manner because it has to go through the legislative process, but that we are consistent and saying that we will work with the Ethics Commission on strengthening the legislation and take it through the legislative process for approval because clearly there is a loophole *and individuals are not being protected appropriately.*"

The 39,122 employees on the City's payroll at the end of June 2015 expect this Board to revise the WPO immediately, since the current ordinance does not meet the mandates in the City Charter that you enact a meaningful WPO.

This should be a relatively simple matter to 1) Expand the types of processes that can be used to file whistleblower complaints, and 2) Expand the types of complaints that can be filed.

Of particular importance is that the Board should sponsor with the Ethics Commission legislation to amend the City Charter to update Section 4.115 of San Francisco's Campaign and Government Conduct Code which does *not* provide retaliation protections for employees who engage in using First Amendment free speech and subsequently face retaliation. You owe it to City employees to change San Francisco's Charter and the WPO to include basic First Amendment protections for City employees.

And you owe it to the Civil Grand Jury to respond saying "will be implemented" or "requires further analysis," rather than using the foolish "will not be implemented" recommendation, since Supervisor Breed appears to be saying that the WPO needs to be, and will be, amended.

Respectfully submitted,

Patrick Monette-Shaw
Columnist
Westside Observer Newspaper

cc: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

Derek Kerr, MD, CNA, Whistleblower

046: CAB

GAO, Leg. Dep.

Member, Board of Supervisors
District 7



City and County of San Francisco

NORMAN YEE

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SANTA MONICA
SEP 1 11:28
AK

DATE: September 1, 2015

TO: Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

FROM: Supervisor Yee
Chairperson

RE: Government Audit and Oversight Committee
COMMITTEE REPORTS

Pursuant to Board Rule 4.20, as Chair of the Government Audit and Oversight Committee, I have deemed the following matters are as of an urgent nature and request them be considered by the full Board on September 8, 2015, as a Committee Report:

150601 Board Response - Civil Grand Jury - Office of the Assessor-Recorder: Despite Progress, Still the Lowest Rated in the State

Resolution responding to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court on the findings and recommendations contained in the 2014-2015 Civil Grand Jury Report, entitled "Office of the Assessor-Recorder: Despite Progress, Still the Lowest Rated in the State;" and urging the Mayor to cause the implementation of accepted findings and recommendations through his/her department heads and through the development of the annual budget.

150603 Board Response - Civil Grand Jury - San Francisco's Whistleblower Protection Ordinance is in Need of Change

Resolution responding to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court on the findings and recommendations contained in the 2014-2015 Civil Grand Jury Report, entitled "San Francisco's Whistleblower Protection Ordinance is in Need of Change;" and urging the Mayor to cause the implementation of accepted findings and recommendations through his/her department heads and through the development of the annual budget.

These matters will be heard in the Government Audit and Oversight Committee meeting on September 3, 2015, at 10:30 a.m.

Sincerely,

Supervisor Norman Yee
District 7

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. 554-5184
Fax No. 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. 544-5227

DATE: August 12, 2015

TO: Members of the Board of Supervisors

FROM: *AC* Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

SUBJECT: 2014-2015 Civil Grand Jury Report "San Francisco's Whistleblower Protection Ordinance is in Need of Change."

We are in receipt of the following required responses to the 2014-2015 San Francisco Civil Grand Jury Report released June 8, 2015, entitled: **San Francisco's Whistleblower Protection Ordinance is in Need of Change** (Report). Pursuant to California Penal Code, Sections 933 and 933.05, City Departments shall respond to the Report within 60 days of receipt, or no later than August 7, 2015.

For each finding, the Department response shall:

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

For each recommendation, the Department shall report that:

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

The Report requires the following City Departments to submit responses (attached):

- Ethics Commission Executive Director
Received August 3, 2015, for Findings 1, 2, 3.1, 3.2, and 4 and Recommendations 1.1, 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 3, and 4
- Ethics Commission
Received August 3, 2015, for Findings 1, 2, 3.1, 3.2, and 4 and Recommendations 1.1, 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 3, and 4
- Mayor's Office
Received August 6, 2015, for Findings 1, 2, 3.1, 3.2, 4 and Recommendations 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 3, and 4

These departmental responses are being provided for your information, as received, and may not conform to the parameters stated in California Penal Code, Section 933.05, et seq. The Government Audit and Oversight Committee will consider the Report, along with the responses, at an upcoming hearing and will prepare the Board's official response by Resolution for the full Board's consideration.

c:

Honorable John K. Stewart, Presiding Judge
Janice Pettey, Foreperson, 2014-2015 San Francisco Civil Grand Jury
Philip Reed, Foreperson Pro Tem, 2014-2015 San Francisco Civil Grand Jury
Kate Howard, Mayor's Office
Nicole Elliott, Mayor's Office
Chris Simi, Mayor's Office
Theodore Conrad, Mayor's Office
Ben Rosenfield, Office of the Controller
Asja Steeves, Office of the Controller
Jon Givner, Deputy City Attorney
Rick Caldeira, Legislative Deputy
Severin Campbell, Budget and Legislative Analyst
Debra Newman, Budget and Legislative Analyst
Jadie Wasilco, Budget and Legislative Analyst
Jesse Mainardi, Ethics Commission

Major, Erica (BOS)

From: Major, Erica (BOS)
Sent: Wednesday, August 12, 2015 2:21 PM
To: BOS-Supervisors
Cc: janice.sfgj@gmail.com; Philip Reed; Chu, Carmen (ASR); Mccaffrey, Edward; Howard, Kate (MYR); Simi, Chris (MYR); Wheaton, Nicole (MYR); Rosenfield, Ben (CON); Steeves, Asja (CON); Givner, Jon (CAT); Caldeira, Rick (BOS); Campbell, Severin (BUD); Newman, Debra (BUD); Wasilco, Jadie (BUD); Somera, Alisa (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Civil Grand Jury 60-Day Response Receipt - (150600/150601) Office of the Assessor-Recorder: Despite Progress, Still the Lowest in the State
Attachments: 60 Day Memo - Office of the Assessor-Recorder.pdf

Supervisors:

Please find the attached 60-day receipt from the Clerk of the Board documenting the required department responses for the Civil Grand Jury Report, "Office of the Assessor-Recorder: Despite Progress, Still the Lowest in the State." We will be working with Supervisor Yee's Office on a hearing date to be scheduled in the Government Audit and Oversight Committee. The responding departments for the report is as follows:

- ✓ Office of the Assessor-Recorder
- ✓ Mayor's Office

Best,

Erica Major
Assistant Committee Clerk
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-4441 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
Erica.Major@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org



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.

RECEIVED VIA EMAIL
8/11/2015

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO



EDWIN M. LEE

August 7, 2015

The Honorable John K. Stewart
Presiding Judge
Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco
400 McAllister Street
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Judge Stewart:

Pursuant to Penal Code sections 933 and 933.05, the following is in reply to the 2014-2015 Civil Grand Jury report, *San Francisco's Whistleblower Protection Ordinance Is In Need of Change*. I would like to thank the members of the Civil Grand Jury for their interest in the Whistleblower Protection Ordinance (WPO).

This is a policy area that I care deeply about—I first began working for the City and County of San Francisco in 1989 as the Investigator for the City's first Whistleblower Ordinance. I agree with the Jury's assertion that the City needs a strong and effective process for reporting complaints and protecting whistleblowers. These kinds of protections are a cornerstone of government accountability and transparency. I began my career in public service fighting for these protections, and I continue to care deeply about them.

Introduced in 2004, the Whistleblower Protection Ordinance provides an avenue for employees and government officers to report complaints without fear of reprisal. This program is one component of the City's efforts to protect City resources, deter fraudulent behavior, ensure confidentiality and protect complainants, and establish internal departmental controls. The result is a more efficient government.

The Jury concentrated on the Ethics Commission and its administration of the program, though the Controller's Office also plays a crucial role with respect to both internal and external whistleblower complaints, as does the Department of Human Resources. The Jury finds that as currently written, the WPO is too narrow in scope, more forms of disclosure should be covered, the burden of proof should be modified, and that more remedies for retaliation be provided.

Furthermore, in addition to the critical work of the Ethics Commission and the Controller's Office, existing Department of Human Resources processes negotiated directly with employee representatives provide additional mechanisms to respond to a situation of whistleblower retaliation.

A detailed response from the Mayor's Office to the Civil Grand Jury's findings and recommendations follows.

Findings:

Finding 1: The WPO does not fully “protect” City officers and employees from retaliation for filing a complaint as required by the Charter mandate of Proposition C, because it covers only a limited range of complaints, it provides no effective remedy for the victim, and its secrecy provisions limit its deterrent effect.

Disagree, partially. The WPO, like most laws, may have limitations, and is one element of a broader framework of whistleblower protections and interventions. However, the confidentiality provisions for investigations are important as they protect both the complainant and the respondent during the period when accusations are proved or disproved. As currently structured, the program provides a balance between confidentiality and transparency that is important to maintain.

Finding 2: The WPO also fails to fulfill the Charter mandate, in that it does not cover all whistleblower disclosures specified in the Charter.

Disagree, partially. The Civil Grand Jury is correct in noting that the language in the Charter mandate does not exactly match that of the WPO. However, the Mayor’s Office disagrees with the finding that the WPO fails to fulfill the Charter mandate. The difference in language is the outcome of a normal legislative process. An ordinance is the product of an iterative process, informed by a number of legal and practical considerations that arise as it is being drafted, reviewed, and input from a wide variety of stakeholders is taken into account.

Finding 3.1: While other large California cities and counties have relatively weak laws protecting their employees from retaliation for whistleblowing, this does not relieve the Board of its responsibility under the Charter mandate, to enact an ordinance that genuinely protects whistleblowers.

Agree.

Finding 3.2: Whistleblower protection laws that cover government employees at the state and Federal level can serve as a useful model for improving the WPO.

Agree.

Finding 4: The WPO creates an unwarranted obstacle to administrative complaints of retaliation filed with the Ethics Commission, by imposing a burden of proof on the complainant during preliminary review and investigation of such complaints.

Disagree. The Mayor’s Office agrees that robust anti-retaliation provisions must be in place for complainants to feel comfortable coming forward. However, the burden of proof requirement is there for a reason—it creates an important balance by disincentivizing spurious complaints. Without this provision, there is a real risk that poorly-defined or even false complaints will be filed, siphoning away important staff resources from real retaliation investigations. The WPO is consistent with other government provisions on this matter, notably that of the State of California. (see: http://spb.ca.gov/content/appeals/Appeals_Resource_Guide.pdf, bottom of page 18).

Recommendations:

Recommendation 1.4: If the Ethics Commission and the Board fail to act within a reasonable time, that the Mayor introduce legislation to the Board of Supervisors that would amend the WPO to provide real protection to whistleblowers, in conformity with the Charter mandate of Proposition C.

Recommendation will not be implemented. This sub-recommendation is part of a larger recommendation that first calls for the Ethics Commission to submit an amendment to the WPO to the Board of Supervisors. If the Ethics Commission fails to do so, the Board of Supervisors is to act on its own to amend the WPO. In the event that the Ethics Commission does not take action or the recommended amendment is not enacted by the Board of Supervisors, the Ethics Commission is to submit an amendment directly to the voters. In the event that none of these recommendations occur, Recommendation 1.4 calls for the Mayor to introduce legislation to the Board of Supervisors to amend the ordinance.

The amendment to the WPO recommended here is too vaguely-defined for the Mayor to take a position on it at this time. Further, the sequencing described in the recommendation is not consistent with the way the Mayor's Office approaches major changes to City law. If such changes were to be contemplated, a consensus-based approach would be adopted, with engagement from relevant City departments, stakeholders, legal and subject-matter experts, as well as other elected officials. This is a more effective method of enacting changes to City law.

Recommendation 2.1: That amendments to the WPO expand the definition of whistleblowing to cover oral complaints to the complainant's department; disclosures to a City department or commission other than the complainant's own; and providing information to any of the recipients listed in the Charter mandate (hereafter "listed recipients"), outside of the formal complaint or investigation process.

The recommendation requires further analysis.

Recommendation 2.2: That these amendments further expand the scope of covered disclosures to include "providing information" to any of the listed recipients regarding improper government activities, whether or not such information is set forth in a formal complaint, or provided during an official investigation.

The recommendation requires further analysis.

Recommendation 3: That amendments to the WPO provide a meaningful remedy for the effects of retaliation, by authorizing the Ethics Commission to order cancellation of a retaliatory job action, and increasing the limit of the civil penalty available under the WPO to an amount adequate to repay the financial losses that can result from such an action.

The recommendation will not be implemented. Under the WPO, the Ethics Commission is provided with punitive, not restorative, powers to respond to findings of retaliatory job action. However, there are a number of other avenues a complainant can pursue in such circumstances. As the Civil Grand Jury notes, "City officers and employees have successfully litigated complaints of whistleblower retaliation in state court." Contrary to the Jury's claim that this proves the ineffectiveness of the WPO, it in fact demonstrates that there is an established process for filing a civil action. In addition, if an employee believes that he or she has been disciplined without just cause or has suffered an adverse job impact in retaliation for blowing the

whistle, the employee can file a grievance through his or her union. A grievance of this nature may be resolved at the department or Department of Human Resources level, or be escalated to arbitration, in accordance with the negotiated rules of the employee's Memorandum of Understanding. If the Ethics Committee had investigated and found that a job action was in fact retaliation for activities protected by the Whistleblower Protection Ordinance, this ruling would likely influence the independent arbitrator, who does have the power to reverse a retaliatory job action. While the investigation and ruling of the Ethics Commission would be a critical step in the process, as the Ethics Commission notes in their response, labor relations are the responsibility of the Department of Human Resources.

Given the sufficient availability of existing options for complainants to pursue both civil penalties and reversal of the retaliatory job action, there is no need to amend the WPO in the manner recommended.

Recommendation 4: That amendments to the WPO include a revision of Subsection 4.115(b)(iii) providing that the burden of proof set forth therein does not apply during preliminary review and investigation of administrative complaints to the Commission.


The recommendation will not be implemented. As noted above, the burden of proof requirement provides critical balance to the WPO by eliminating the element of moral hazard that its removal would enable.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on this Civil Grand Jury report.

Sincerely,



Edwin M. Lee
Mayor



ETHICS COMMISSION CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

RECEIVED VIA EMAIL
8/3/2015

RECEIVED
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
OFFICE OF THE ETHICS COMMISSION

BENEDICT Y. HUR
CHAIRPERSON

PAUL A. RENNE
VICE-CHAIRPERSON

BRETT ANDREWS
COMMISSIONER

BEVERLY HAYON
COMMISSIONER

PETER KEANE
COMMISSIONER

JOHN ST. CROIX
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

August 4, 2014

The Honorable Presiding Judge John K. Stewart
400 McAllister Street, Room 008
San Francisco, CA 94102-4512

Re: Civil Grand Jury Report: San Francisco's Whistleblower Protection Ordinance is in
Need of Change

Dear Judge Stewart:

The 2015 Civil Grand Jury produced a report regarding the Whistleblower Ordinance
requiring responses from the Ethics Commission and the Director. My responses must
concur with those of my Commissioners. They are attached.

Sincerely,

John St. Croix
Executive Director

Cc: Board of Supervisors

Finding 1:

The WPO does not fully "protect" City officers and employees from retaliation for filing a complaint as required by the Charter mandate of Proposition C, because it covers only a limited range of complaints, it provides no effective remedy for the victim, and its secrecy provisions limit its deterrent effect.

Finding 1. Partially agree. The WPO does have some limitations that can be improved. However, the confidentiality provisions for investigations are important as they protect both the complainant and the respondent during the period when accusations are proved or disproved. There is a difference between "confidentiality" and "secrecy."

Recommendation 1.1:

That the Ethics Commission recommend to the Board of Supervisors an amendment to the WPO that provides real protection for whistleblowers, in conformity with the Charter mandate of Proposition C.

Recommendation 1.1. May be implemented. The Ethics Commission is willing to suggest amendments to the WPO to the Board of Supervisors but will need the assistance of the City Attorney's Office, the Department of Human Resources and the Controller's Office. Also, due to an already heavy planned workload for this year, and in addition the upcoming election cycle, the Commission anticipates that it will not be able to begin this project until 2016. Further, should the Board of Supervisors communicate in writing to the Commission that they wish to conduct the drafting of these amendments, the Commission will defer to the Board.

Recommendation 1.3:

If the Ethics Commission requests that the Board amend the WPO and the Board fails to act, that the Commission consider submitting such an amendment directly to the voters.

Recommendation 1.3. May be implemented. If the Commission recommends amendment(s) to the Board that are not considered or not adopted, the Commission will then consider sending the amendment(s) to the voters.

Finding 2:

The WPO also fails to fulfill the Charter mandate, in that it does not cover all whistleblower disclosures specified in the Charter.

Finding 2. Partially agree. The WPO may not reach all aspects of complaints provided in the Charter. However, defining "providing information" in terms of oral complaints may provide difficulties in that the record of the complaint is not memorialized as the person making the complaint and the person receiving the complaint could easily have different versions of the conversation.

Recommendation 2.1:

That amendments to the WPO expand the definition of whistleblowing to cover oral complaints to the complainant's department; disclosures to a City department or commission other than the complainant's own; and providing information to any of the recipients listed in the Charter mandate (hereafter "listed recipients"), outside of the formal complaint or investigation process.

Recommendation: 2.2:

That these amendments further expand the scope of covered disclosures to include "providing information" to any of the listed recipients regarding improper government activities, whether or not such information is set forth in a formal complaint, or provided during an official investigation.

Recommendations 2.1 and 2.2. May be implemented. If and when the Commission considers amending the WPO, it will take these recommendations into consideration. It may be advisable to expand the scope of the definition of "providing information" but there needs to be provision for the memorializing of these reports.

Finding 3.1:

While other large California cities and counties have relatively weak laws protecting their employees from retaliation for whistleblowing, this does not relieve the Board of its responsibility under the Charter mandate, to enact an ordinance that genuinely protects whistleblowers.

Finding 3.2:

Whistleblower protection laws that cover government employees at the state and Federal level can serve as a useful model for improving the WPO.

Finding 3.1 and 3.2. No disagreement.

Recommendation 3:

That amendments to the WPO provide a meaningful remedy for the effects of retaliation, by authorizing the Ethics Commission to order cancellation of a retaliatory job action, and increasing the limit of the civil penalty available under the WPO to an amount adequate to repay the financial losses that can result from such an action.

Recommendation 3. May be implemented. The Commission believes these recommendations may well improve the WPO and will also take them into consideration. The Commission notes that Employment Law is not part of our mandate and is normally handled by other departments. Many factors may come into consideration in this area such as MOU's and other labor agreements that are not properly part of the Ethics Commission mission. The Commission also notes that these proposals may create a large increase in staff workload.

Finding 4:

The WPO creates an unwarranted obstacle to administrative complaints of retaliation filed with the Ethics Commission, by imposing a burden of proof on the complainant during preliminary review and investigation of such complaints.

Finding 4. Partially agree. The Commission was not party to the creation of the WPO, and so is not aware of the intended scope by the creators of the ordinance.

Recommendation 4:

That amendments to the WPO include a revision of Subsection 4.115(b)(iii) providing that the burden of proof set forth therein does not apply during preliminary review and investigation of administrative complaints to the Commission.

Recommendation 4. May be implemented. As stated above, the Commission will carefully consider these recommendations when considering amending the ordinance. The Commission believes that there needs to be some demonstrable basis for a complaint in order to justify an investigation.

I'm Patrick Monette-Shaw here today on personal time.

Many of the 39,122 City employees on the City Controller's payroll at the end of FY 2014-2015 last June expect you to strengthen the Whistleblower Protection Ordinance, as the Civil Grand Jury recommended in its June 2015 report.

As Judge Claudia Wilken noted during proceedings in Dr. Derek Kerr's wrongful termination case, Section 4.115 of San Francisco's Campaign and Government Conduct Code does *not* provide retaliation protections for employees who engage in using First Amendment free speech and subsequently face retaliation. City employees demand that this Board of Supervisors change San Francisco's Charter and the WPO to include basic First Amendment protections for City employees.

Voters passed Proposition "C" in 2003 requiring that this Board *shall* enact a meaningful WPO. You have an opportunity today to correct the inaction of previous members of the Board of Supervisors during the past dozen years. After all, the Grand Jury's Recommendation 1.2 indicates this body should amend the WPO on your own.

In addition to providing First Amendment protections in Section 4.115, you should amend that section to change the burden of proof requirement so whistleblower complaints alleging retaliation occurred can proceed without the burden of having to prove retaliation during the preliminary review stage.

The Mayor's response to the Grand Jury is insulting to City employees. Mayor Lee says the WPO's burden-of-proof provision is there to "disincentivize spurious complaints" and to prevent false complaints. He wrongly asserts altering the burden-of-proof would eliminate the element of "moral hazard" that somehow provides balance to the WPO.

"Spurious complaints" and "moral hazards" are nonsense. Neither Dr. Kerr's and Kelly O'Haire's wrongful termination lawsuits, nor the Raskin and Jane Doe 9-1-1 dispatcher lawsuit were spurious complaints; after all, just these three cases resulted in a total of \$2.23 million in settlements and \$1.5 million in City Attorney time and expenses, for a total of \$3.75 million.

Table 1 in my July 2015 article, "Retaliators Keep Their City Jobs," shows 292 civil court actions have been filed involving prohibited personnel practices, which has cost the City \$32.6 million between settlement agreements and costs of the City Attorney's staff time and expenses in just eight years since 2007. Adding \$754,000 in City Attorney time for Kelly O'Haire's case, we're up to \$33.35 million.

There's at least 66 other cases that haven't been settled yet that will drive these costs higher. Anticipating Joanne Hooper's wrongful termination lawsuit against City Attorney Dennis Herrera may add another \$1.5 million to costs.

This nearly \$35 million could be better spent developing affordable housing.

As my letter to the editor in today's *San Francisco Examiner* reports, prohibited personnel practice lawsuits have soared under Mayor Lee with 187 new cases, a 78% increase from 105 cases before his tenure. Wrongful termination lawsuits during Lee's tenure have climbed from 14 to 32, a 128.6% increase. Mayor Lee's legacy may be as "The Retaliation Mayor."

You have a ministerial duty under the 2003 Prop C to enact a meaningful WPO. Do so today!

9/3/15 Received in Committee
from Patrick Monette-Shaw

not the same.

Dennis Vernak
San Mateo

► "A costly settlement," *The City*, Aug. 31
Shameful waste of money

Thanks to the Examiner for reporting The City spent \$1.5 million between settlement costs and defending Police Chief Greg Suhr in Kelly O'Haire's whistleblower case.

The City has laid out \$32.6 million since 2007 to settle 226 other prohibited personnel practice lawsuits, ~~not~~ including costs of City Attorney time, but only O'Haire's settlement.

Adding \$754,000 in City Attorney time for O'Haire's case, we're up to \$33.35 million.

There's 66 other cases that haven't been settled. This wasted money could be better directed to building affordable housing.

Prohibited personnel practice lawsuits soared under Mayor Ed Lee with 187 new cases, a 78 percent increase from 105 cases before his tenure. Wrongful termination lawsuits during Lee's tenure climbed from 14 to 32, a 128.6 percent increase.

No wonder the Civil Grand Jury just called on the mayor and Board of Supervisors to amend the Whistleblower Protection Ordinance for city employees. But will City Hall agree with the Grand Jury in a hearing today?

Patrick Monette-Shaw
San Francisco

Ceccarelli
VICE PRESIDENT

Aaron Barbero
VICE PRESIDENT OF OPERATIONS

ER.COM • SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER

11

1010 1010 1010 1010 1010 1010

Code	Alleged Cause	2007–2012 Settlements	2012–2015 Settlements	2012–2015 Cases Pending	Total	
6075	Age Discrimination (Emp against City)	2	4	5	11	
6015	Assault by another employee		1		1	
6020	Compensation (Employee against City)	7	7	2	16	
9925	Defamation			1	1	
6080	Disability Discrimination (Emp v City)	25	15	5	45	
6005	First Amendment Violation (Emp vs City)		1		1	
6070	General Harassment (Emp against City)	4	5	6	15	
4103	Grievance Arbitration/Labor Related Issue/PERB Me	10	8	3	21	
9051	Lit-Breach of Contract		1		1	
4099	Other (Employee Conduct)		2	1	3	
2099	Other (Police)			1	1	
4599	Other Malpractice			1	1	
6099	Other-Actions by Employees against City	15	24	16	55	
	Overtime Discrimination	1			1	
4104	Prevailing Wage Enforcement			1	1	
6035	Racial Discrimination (Emp agst. City)	18	16	11	45	
6055	Racial Harassment (Emp against City)		2		2	
4025	Racial Harassment (Employee Conduct)		1		1	
4810	Retirement		1	1	2	
6030	Sexual Discrimination (Emp against City)	2	5		7	
6050	Sexual Harassment (Emp against City)	6	3	2	11	
4020	Sexual Harassment (Employee Conduct)		1		1	
4030	Sexual Orient. Harass. (Emp. Conduct)			1	1	
6040	Sexual Orientation Discrim (Emp vs City)		1		1	
	Unknown Issue	1			1	
6010	Wrongful Termination (Emp agst. City)	14	23	9	46	
Source: San Francisco City Attorney's Office		Total	105	121	66	292

The increase in wrongful termination cases from 14 such cases between 2007 and 2012, to an additional 32 wrongful termination cases in the three years since 2012 is troubling, since it represents a 128.6% increase, pointing to a culture of increasing retaliation during Mayor Lee’s tenure.

While I reported in May 2013 that the 105 settlements between 2007 and 2012 cost the City \$12.1 million in settlements and an additional \$8.3 million in City Attorney costs for a total of \$20.4 million, the additional 121 cases settled between 2012 and 2015 have cost the City another \$12.2 million, including \$3.6 million in settlement awards and \$8.6 million in City Attorney costs involved during litigation, bringing the total to at least \$32.6 million since 2007, and that’s not counting settlement amounts and the City Attorney’s costs for time and expenses for the 66 pending cases that still haven’t been concluded at an unknown cost, or the underreporting by the City Attorney’s Office of actual costs when compared to the actual settlements approved by San Francisco’s Board of Supervisors.

At the same time, while the 14 wrongful termination cases between 2007 and 2012 cost the City \$1.4 million in settlement costs alone, the 23 wrongful termination cases between 2012 and 2015 involved \$1.2 million in settlement costs. And there’s nine outstanding wrongful termination settlements still not concluded, with an unknown amount of City Attorney expenses unreported, and settlement amounts still being negotiated.

Who Were the Actors?

Given the surge from 105 to 292 prohibited personnel practice lawsuits, you may wonder who and what were involved. While an exhaustive analysis would be too lengthy here, a sampling of the cases is illuminating.

One of the nine outstanding wrongful termination cases involves Joanne Hoepfer, a senior Deputy City Attorney who had uncovered a kickback scheme in the City Attorney’s Office and was subsequently terminated with City Attorney

The increase in wrongful termination cases from 14 such cases between 2007 and 2012, to an additional 32 wrongful termination cases in the three years since 2012 is troubling, since it represents a 128.6% increase, pointing to a culture of increasing retaliation during Mayor Lee’s tenure.

One of the nine outstanding wrongful termination cases involves Joanne Hoepfer, a senior Deputy City Attorney who had uncovered a kickback scheme in the City Attorney’s Office and was subsequently terminated with City Attorney Dennis Herrera’s help.

Major, Erica (BOS)

From: Major, Erica (BOS)
Sent: Wednesday, July 22, 2015 3:52 PM
To: St.Croix, John; Wheaton, Nicole (MYR)
Cc: Somera, Alisa (BOS); Simi, Chris (MYR); Kim, Roger (MYR)
Subject: TENTATIVE HEARING DATE - Civil Grand Jury Hearing - San Francisco's Whistleblower Protection Ordinance is in Need of Change
Attachments: REPORT - SF Whistleblower Protection.pdf
Importance: High

Greetings All:

I'm following up on the email sent below requesting a copy of your Civil Grand Jury response for "San Francisco's Whistleblower Protection Ordinance is in Need of Change." To date we haven't received a response for your department to be included with the Board's legislative file. *Please submit your required response by August 7, 2015, via email or hand deliver a copy to the Clerk of the Board (City Hall, Room 244), Attn: Government Audit and Oversight Clerk.*

The anticipated hearing date is tentatively scheduled for Thursday, September 3, 2015, at the Government Audit and Oversight Committee meeting in City Hall, Room 263 at 10:30 a.m. As a reminder, a representative from your department will be required to attend the Committee hearing to present your department's response and answer questions raised. *Please submit the name of the department representative who will be handling this matter and attending the hearing.*

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions. Thank you.

Erica Major
Assistant Committee Clerk
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-4441 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
Erica.Major@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org



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: Major, Erica (BOS)
Sent: Monday, June 08, 2015 3:22 PM
To: St.Croix, John; Wheaton, Nicole (MYR)
Cc: Mccaffrey, Edward; Rosenfield, Ben (CON); Jon Givner; Caldeira, Rick (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Newman, Debra (BUD); Campbell, Severin (BUD); Steeves, Asja (CON)
Subject: Response Reminder - Civil Grand Jury Report - San Francisco's Whistleblower Protection Ordinance Is In Need of

Change
Importance: High

Greetings,

Within 60 days your department is required to respond to the 2014-2015 Civil Grand Jury Report entitled, "San Francisco's Whistleblower Protection Ordinance Is In Need of Change" (attached). We anticipate a hearing in the Government Audit and Oversight Committee sometime in September. We will update you as the date approaches.

Please make sure to deliver a copy of your response to the Clerk of the Board, Attn: Government Audit and Oversight Committee, no later than August 7, 2015, and confirm the representative who will be handling this matter and attending the hearing.

If you have any questions, please don't hesitate to call or email me. Thank you.

Best,

Erica Major
Assistant Committee Clerk
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-4441 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
Erica.Major@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org



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.

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. 554-5184
Fax No. 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. 554-5227

MEMORANDUM

Date: June 8, 2015
To: John St. Croix, Executive Director, Ethics Commission
Nicole Elliott, Office of the Mayor
From:  Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Subject: 2014-2015 CIVIL GRAND JURY REPORT

We are in receipt of the San Francisco Civil Grand Jury (CGJ) report released today, Monday, June 8, 2015, entitled: **San Francisco's Whistleblower Protection Ordinance Is In Need Of Change** (attached).

Pursuant to California Penal Code, Sections 933 and 933.05, the responding Departments must:

1. Respond to the report within 60 days of receipt, or no later than August 7, 2015.
2. For each finding the Department shall:
 - agree with the finding; or
 - disagree with the finding, wholly or partially, and explain why.
3. For each recommendation the Department shall report that:
 - the recommendation has been implemented and a summary of how it was implemented;
 - the recommendation has not been, but will be, implemented in the future, with a timeframe for implementation;
 - the recommendation requires further analysis, with an explanation of the scope of the analysis and timeframe of no more than six months from the date of the release; or
 - the recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable, with an explanation.

Please make sure to deliver a copy of your department's response to the Clerk of the Board, Attn: Government Audit and Oversight Committee Clerk. Your response will be included in the Board of Supervisors legislative file for their consideration at the Government Audit and Oversight Committee hearing on this matter. A representative from your department will be required to attend the Committee hearing to present your department's response and answer questions raised.

If you have any questions, please contact Erica Major at (415) 554-4441.

Attachment

- c: Honorable John K. Stewart, Presiding Judge (w/o attachment)
- Edward McCaffrey, Office of the Assessor-Recorder
- Ben Rosenfield, Controller
- Jon Givner, Deputy City Attorney
- Rick Caldeira, Legislative Deputy Director
- Debra Newman, Office of the Budget and Legislative Analyst
- Severin Campbell, Office of the Budget and Legislative Analyst
- Asja Steeves, Civil Grand Jury Coordinator (w/o attachment)
- Janice Pettey, Foreperson, San Francisco Civil Grand Jury (w/o attachment)

Major, Erica (BOS)

From: Major, Erica (BOS)
Sent: Monday, June 08, 2015 3:22 PM
To: St.Croix, John; Wheaton, Nicole (MYR)
Cc: Mccaffrey, Edward; Rosenfield, Ben (CON); 'Jon Givner'; Caldeira, Rick (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Newman, Debra (BUD); Campbell, Severin (BUD); Steeves, Asja (CON)
Subject: Response Reminder - Civil Grand Jury Report - San Francisco's Whistleblower Protection Ordinance Is In Need of Change
Attachments: Public Release Memo - SF Whistleblower - 06.08.2015.pdf
Importance: High

Greetings,


Within 60 days your department is required to respond to the 2014-2015 Civil Grand Jury Report entitled, "San Francisco's Whistleblower Protection Ordinance Is In Need of Change" (attached). We anticipate a hearing in the Government Audit and Oversight Committee sometime in September. We will update you as the date approaches.

Please make sure to deliver a copy of your response to the Clerk of the Board, Attn: Government Audit and Oversight Committee, no later than August 7, 2015, and confirm the representative who will be handling this matter and attending the hearing.

If you have any questions, please don't hesitate to call or email me. Thank you.

Best,

Erica Major
Assistant Committee Clerk
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-4441 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
Erica.Major@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

 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.

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. 554-5184
Fax No. 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. 554-5227

MEMORANDUM

Date: June 4, 2015
To: Honorable Members, Board of Supervisors
From: *PN* for Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Subject: 2014-2015 CIVIL GRAND JURY REPORT

We are in receipt of the advanced confidential copy of the San Francisco Civil Grand Jury (CGJ) Report, entitled: **San Francisco's Whistleblower Protection Ordinance Is In Need Of Change** (attached). This report is to be kept confidential until the public release date scheduled on Monday, June 8, 2015.

Pursuant to California Penal Code, Sections 933 and 933.05, the Board must:

1. Respond to the report within 90 days of receipt, or no later than September 6, 2015.
2. For each finding the Department response shall:
 - agree with the finding; or
 - disagree with the finding, wholly or partially, and explain why.
3. For each recommendation the Department shall report that:
 - the recommendation has been implemented with a summary of how it was implemented;
 - the recommendation has not been, but will be, implemented in the future, with a timeframe for implementation;
 - the recommendation requires further analysis, with an explanation of the scope of the analysis and timeframe of no more than six months; or
 - the recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable, with an explanation.

Pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code, Section 2.10, in coordination with the Committee Chair, the Clerk will schedule a public hearing before the Government Audit and Oversight Committee to allow the Board the necessary time to review and formally respond to the findings and recommendations.

The Budget and Legislative Analyst will prepare a resolution, outlining the findings and recommendations for the Committee's consideration, to be heard at the same time as the hearing on the report.

Attachment

Major, Erica (BOS)

From: Major, Erica (BOS)
Sent: Friday, June 05, 2015 1:26 PM
To: Gosiengfiao, Rachel (BOS)
Cc: Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject: Please Distribute - CGJ Reports
Attachments: Assessor-Recorder - COB to BOS MemoReport 06.05.15.pdf; SF Whistle - COB to BOS MemoReport 06.05.15.pdf

Hi Rachel,

Please distribute the attached to all the Board members via email. There are two reports that are to be kept confidential until the public release date of Monday, June 8, 2015, as follows:

1. Office of the Assessor-Recorder: Despite Progress, Still the Lowest Rated in the State
2. San Francisco's Whistleblower Protection Ordinance Is In Need Of Change

Erica Major

Assistant Committee Clerk

Board of Supervisors

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

Phone: (415) 554-4441 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

Erica.Major@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org



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.

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
CIVIL GRAND JURY

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2015 JUN -3 PM 2:52



June 3, 2015

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

The 2014 – 2015 Civil Grand Jury will release its report entitled, "San Francisco's Whistleblower Protection Ordinance Is In Need Of Change" to the public on Monday, June 8, 2015. Enclosed is an advance copy of this report. Please note that by order of the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court, Hon. John K. Stewart, this report is to be kept confidential until the date of release (June 8th).

California Penal Code §933 (c) requires a response to be submitted to the Presiding Judge within 90 days. California Penal Code §933.5 states that for each finding in the report, the responding person or entity shall indicate one of the following: (1) agree with the finding; or (2) disagree with it, wholly or partially, and explain why.

Further, as to each recommendation, the Board's response must either indicate:

- 1) That the recommendation has been implemented, with a summary of how it was implemented;
- 2) That the recommendation has not been, but will be, implemented in the future, with a timeframe for implementation;
- 3) That the recommendation requires further analysis, with an explanation of the scope of that analysis and a timeframe for discussion, not more than six months from the release of the report; or
- 4) That the recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable, with an explanation.

Please provide the Board's response to Presiding Judge Stewart at the following address:

400 McAllister Street, Room 008
San Francisco, CA 94102-4512

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Janice Pettey".

Janice Gow Pettey, Foreperson
San Francisco Civil Grand Jury, 2014 – 2015

City Hall, Room 482
1 Dr Carlton B Goodlett Pl, San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: 415-554-6630

**SAN FRANCISCO'S WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION
ORDINANCE IS IN NEED OF CHANGE**

May 2015



City and County of San Francisco
Civil Grand Jury, 2014-2015

Members of the Civil Grand Jury

Janice Pettey, Foreperson

Philip Reed, Foreperson Pro Tem

Anne M. Turner, Recording Secretary

Leonard Brawn

Morris Bobrow

Daniel Chesir

Matthew Cohen

Jerry Dratler

Herbert Felsenfeld

Allegra Fortunati

Mildred Lee

Marion McGovern

Fred A. Rodriguez

Gary Thackeray

Jack Twomey

Ellen Zhou

THE CIVIL GRAND JURY

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

Reports of the Civil Grand Jury do not identify individuals by name.

Disclosure of information about individuals interviewed by the jury is prohibited.

California Penal Code, section 929

STATE LAW REQUIREMENT

California Penal Code, section 933.05

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

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

For each finding the response must:

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

As to each recommendation the responding party must report that:

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

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
BACKGROUND	6
1. <i>The Evolution of the WPO</i>	7
2. <i>Scope of This Report</i>	8
METHODOLOGY	9
DISCUSSION	9
1. <i>Whistleblower Retaliation Complaints before the Ethics Commission</i>	9
2. <i>The “Burden of Proof” in Whistleblower Retaliation Complaints</i>	12
3. <i>Remedies for Reprisal Under the WPO</i>	13
4. <i>So Where Do They Go?</i>	14
5. <i>The Charter Mandate: Protection for Whistleblowers</i>	15
6. <i>The Charter Mandate: Definition of “Whistleblowing”</i>	16
7. <i>Comparable Laws Protecting Government Employees In Other Jurisdictions</i>	17
8. <i>Role of the Ethics Commission and the Board Of Supervisors</i>	18
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	18
REQUEST FOR RESPONSES	20
RESPONSE MATRIX	22
APPENDIX A: FULL TEXT OF SF CAMPAIGN & GOV'T CONDUCT CODE, ARTICLE IV, CHAPTER 1, SECTION 4.115 (“PROTECTION FOR WHISTLEBLOWERS”)	26
APPENDIX B: THE WPO COMPARED WITH WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION LAWS APPLICABLE TO FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES	29
APPENDIX C: COMPARISON OF SELECTED CITY AND COUNTY WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION ORDINANCES AND POLICIES	35
APPENDIX D: CONTROLLER’S NOTICE OF WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTIONS	41
ENDNOTES	42

Executive Summary

When government employees “blow the whistle” on official wrongdoing they can suffer retaliation in the workplace. Sometimes their plight makes headlines. Occasionally they file whistleblower retaliation lawsuits that result in sizeable cash awards or settlements that are likewise newsworthy. However, when such a case arises in San Francisco it seldom sees the light of day.

Since 1989, San Francisco has enacted a series of ordinances intended to protect City officers and employees from retaliation for reporting improper government activity. Over the years the scope of these so-called “whistleblower protection” laws has narrowed, and the protections they provide are currently much weaker than those afforded government employees at the state and federal level.

In 2003 the voters of San Francisco enacted Proposition C, which added the following mandate to the City Charter: “The Board of Supervisors shall enact and maintain an ordinance... protecting City officers and employees from retaliation for filing a complaint with, or providing information to, the Controller, Ethics Commission, District Attorney, City Attorney or a City department or commission about improper government activity by City officers and employees.”

In this report, we conclude that the Board has failed to carry out this mandate because it has failed to enact and maintain an ordinance that genuinely protects those who make such reports.

If a City officer or employee suffers retaliation for disclosing improper activity, he or she may file a complaint with the Ethics Commission, which investigates such complaints as part of its wider mission of enforcing local laws pertaining to government ethics and political practices. In the fifteen-year history of the Commission, no complaint of whistleblower retaliation has ever resulted in a public accusation of wrongdoing, and all complaints have been investigated in secret and dismissed without any public proceeding.

The chief reason why whistleblower retaliation complaints have fared so poorly before the Commission is the narrow scope of the current law, known as the Whistleblower Protection Ordinance (WPO). The WPO protects only those who make disclosures “in house.” The whistleblower must make his or her report of government wrongdoing only to certain agencies within City government, in certain approved ways, or the WPO does not apply. It does not protect disclosures that are made by other means, or to persons or entities that are not listed in the ordinance: for example, to news media, to outside law enforcement agencies, or to elected officials outside City government. Thus, a City employee who discloses government wrongdoing or corruption to the San Francisco *Chronicle*, or to the California Attorney General, or to the F.B.I., or to Congress, is not a “whistleblower” entitled to

protection under the WPO. If retaliation ensues and the employee complains to the Commission, his/her complaint will be dismissed.

To qualify for protection, the whistleblower's disclosure must also concern a topic that is among those listed in the ordinance. The list is limited: disclosures of waste, fraud or abuse in general are not included, nor are those concerning violations of general law. Whistleblowers who disclose such information are not protected from retaliation under the WPO; again, the Commission will dismiss their complaints.

The scope of the WPO is also limited, in that it forbids only a few types of retaliatory action – termination, demotion, suspension, and similar job actions – and leaves untouched a wide variety of lesser reprisals and coercion that are nonetheless serious and potentially costly to an injured party.

Whistleblower retaliation complaints face an additional obstacle before the Commission, in that the WPO imposes on the complainant an extra “burden of proof” in such cases that does not apply to any other type of complaint. This further restricts access to the complaint procedure.

Finally – and most seriously – even if a complaint clears all of these hurdles and results in a finding of retaliation, the Commission is unable to provide relief for the whistleblower. If a job is lost due to retaliation the Commission cannot restore it. All it can do is punish the guilty party.

These shortcomings not only harm whistleblowers, they violate the Charter mandate of Proposition C: that the Board enact and maintain an ordinance protecting whistleblowers.

While there are protections against retaliation provided by Federal and California law to whistleblowers, the federal Whistleblower Protection Act applies only to federal employees and applicants for federal employment, and California law requires that in most cases the employee must take an action to court in order to obtain relief from retaliation. Civil actions are costly and time-consuming. For that reason, there is a need for the WPO. It does not require the filing of a civil suit to obtain enforcement. Yet the current version of The WPO, as enacted and administered, fails to provide a City employee with meaningful protection against retaliation for reporting improper government activity and, therefore, needs to be amended. This report identifies the shortcomings of the WPO and makes recommendations for its improvement.

Background

In July 2014 the 2013-14 San Francisco Civil Grand Jury issued a final report entitled *Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense*. In the course of that report that Jury found that San Francisco currently lacks “a strong whistleblower program with

protections against retaliation” and urged a future Civil Grand Jury to address the issue.¹

Based on this recommendation, the current Civil Grand Jury undertook an investigation of the anti-retaliation provisions of the San Francisco Whistleblower Protection Ordinance,² Section 4.115, the full text of which is attached as Appendix A.

As currently written, the ordinance is very narrow. It prohibits City officers or employees from retaliating against a whistleblower only in certain specified ways: by termination, demotion, suspension, or “other similar adverse employment action.”³ Lesser forms of retaliation such as non-promotion, or a reassignment without loss of grade or pay are not prohibited. Moreover, it applies only if the whistleblower has made a certain type of report alleging violation of certain laws. If a report is not one of those listed in the WPO, or if it concerns a violation that is not listed, then retaliation can occur and the victim will have no recourse under the WPO.

1. The Evolution of the WPO

It was not always this way.

San Francisco first addressed the question of whistleblower protection in 1989, when Mayor Art Agnos signed the Improper Government Activities Ordinance (IGAO).⁴ That law authorized the Mayor to investigate reports of official misconduct by City officers and officials that violated any City, state, or federal law whatsoever; or that otherwise involved gross misconduct or gross economic waste.⁵ The ordinance also forbade threats or retaliation of any kind against those who made such reports.⁶ If retaliation occurred, the law allowed the injured party to sue in court for up to \$5,000 in civil damages. Employees and applicants for employment were provided this right.⁷

In 1993 the voters passed Proposition K, a Charter amendment that created the Ethics Commission. Despite the breadth of the term “ethics,” the Commission was charged with enforcing a relatively small number of laws relating to political practices and government ethics. These included the IGAO.⁸ The IGAO itself remained unchanged.

In 2000 the Board of Supervisors repealed the IGAO and replaced it with the first version of the WPO.⁹ Approved by Mayor Willie L. Brown, Jr., the new law charged the Ethics Commission, rather than the Mayor’s office as required under the IGAO, with investigating whistleblower disclosures.¹⁰ Retaliation was still broadly prohibited¹¹ but the range of disclosures that would qualify for protection narrowed. Those revealing violations of general law, or gross misconduct or gross economic waste were no longer covered. Now, a covered disclosure had to allege violation of one of the laws enforced by the Ethics Commission, relating to political practices or government ethics. If it did not, then the whistleblower was not protected against retaliation.¹²

In 2002 the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Brown amended the WPO.¹³ Though entitled “Expanded Protections For Whistleblowers,” the amendments narrowed the definition of retaliation to include only serious job actions such as termination, demotion, or suspension. Lesser forms of retaliatory discipline such as an official reprimand that might prevent a promotion were no longer prohibited; nor were threats or coercion. Applicants for City employment who had been covered under the previous law were no longer protected.¹⁴ The range of covered disclosures was expanded somewhat, but remained quite restrictive.¹⁵ Again, complaints alleging violations of general law, or gross misconduct or gross economic waste were not covered.

It was against this background of shrinking protections that the voters passed Proposition C, a 2003 Charter amendment that created an additional way to file complaints of improper government activities, this time with a new unit within the Controller’s office known as the City Services Auditor (CSA).¹⁶ It also required the Controller to publicize and administer a whistleblower hotline to receive such complaints, and added a new mandate requiring the Board of Supervisors to enact an ordinance protecting whistleblowers from retaliation.¹⁷

Despite this mandate, the Board of Supervisors made no substantive changes to the anti-retaliation provision of the WPO.¹⁸ Thus, the law remains essentially as it was before the Charter mandate was enacted.

2. Scope of This Report

At present, two agencies – the CSA and the Ethics Commission – handle different aspects of the City’s whistleblower program.

Primary responsibility for receipt of whistleblower disclosures rests with the CSA. The unit receives disclosures from employees and others, and investigates them as part of the Controller’s general audit function.¹⁹ This process was examined in a report by the 2010-11 San Francisco Civil Grand Jury report issued in July 2011.²⁰

If a whistleblower believes that he or she has suffered retaliation for making a disclosure to the Controller, or various other agencies within City government, he or she may file a complaint with the Ethics Commission. The Commission is an independent agency that investigates such complaints as part of its law enforcement function.²¹ No recent Civil Grand Jury report has examined this program.

When this Jury was empaneled, the 2010-11 Civil Grand Jury’s report on the CSA was just three years old. In light of that fact, we chose not to repeat their inquiry. Instead, we limited our investigation to the Ethics Commission, and the anti-retaliation provisions of the WPO, which the Commission is charged to enforce.

Methodology

Members of the Jury conducted legal research using materials from the Government Information Center of the San Francisco Public Library, the online compilation of local ordinances provided by the Board of Supervisors, and other online resources provided by the City and other government entities.

We also relied on reports and other materials provided online by the Ethics Commission and the Office of the Controller. We interviewed members and staff of the Ethics Commission, the Office of the Controller, the City Attorney, the Board of Supervisors, as well as persons who filed retaliation complaints with the Commission. Additionally, we reviewed the documents and statistics provided to us by those agencies and interviewees.

Discussion

1. Whistleblower Retaliation Complaints before the Ethics Commission

Based on interviews with Ethics Commission staff and a review of the Commission's written regulations,²² we summarize the Commission's complaint-handling process as follows.


Preliminary Review. Complaints are received formally and informally, either via a form on the Commission's website or by other written or oral means. Investigators will listen to any complaint, and if it is within the Commission's jurisdiction they will look into it. That inquiry may include reviewing documents, communicating with the complainant, communicating with the person accused of wrongdoing, and other inquiries to determine whether a full investigation is warranted.

Referral to District Attorney, City Attorney. If, after preliminary review, the Commission's staff finds that there is "reason to believe that a violation of law may have occurred,"²³ they refer the matter to the District Attorney and the City Attorney for possible action. If those offices decline to act, the Commission may initiate a formal investigation.

Formal Investigation. During a formal investigation Commission staff researches the matter in depth, gathers evidence, and may take sworn statements from the accused or others. If staff concludes that there is "probable cause to believe that a violation occurred" they report this to the Commission.²⁴ In this context "probable cause" means "there is reason to believe that the respondent" - meaning the accused - "committed a violation of law."²⁵


Further Proceedings. The Commission will then consider the matter in closed session, and determine whether there is “a reasonable ground to suspect that the respondent has committed the violation” in question.²⁶ If so, it may issue a public Accusation and conduct a public hearing on the merits.²⁷ No whistleblower retaliation complaint has ever reached this stage. Indeed, Commission records show that since its inception in 2000, only two such complaints have ever survived preliminary review to become the subject of a formal investigation. Both were dismissed without resulting in a formal Accusation or any public action against the alleged retaliator.²⁸

The Commission’s staff confirmed this in interviews and through statistics they compiled at the Jury’s request. They state that from January 1, 2004 through November 18, 2014, the Commission received 20 complaints that alleged either the type of whistleblowing or the type of retaliatory action that falls within the coverage of the WPO. Of those 20, eighteen were dismissed by the Executive Director after staff conducted a preliminary review, and two were dismissed by the Ethics Commission after staff initiated a formal complaint and conducted a formal investigation.



The Jury also asked Commission staff to provide statistics on the total number of retaliation complaints received by the commission, and whether or not the allegations satisfied the requirements of the WPO. Due to record-keeping constraints, staff was able to only provide this information for complaints received since January 1, 2011. From that date through November 18, 2014 the Commission received, and the Executive Director dismissed, a total of 34 whistleblower retaliation complaints, 15 of which alleged neither the type of whistleblowing nor the type of retaliatory action that is covered under the WPO. Thus, 44% of whistleblower retaliation complaints received during the last four years fell outside the scope of the WPO.

Retaliation Complaints, 2011-2014: Why Did They Fail?



Commission staff members receive a substantial number of complaints that seem quite serious, from whistleblowers who have apparently suffered acts of retaliation, that must still be dismissed – either because the type of whistleblowing, or the type of retaliation that took place falls outside the parameters of the ordinance. This is the chief reason why retaliation complaints have fared so poorly before the Commission.

The WPO protects only those who make disclosures “in house.” As already noted, the whistleblower must make his or her report of government wrongdoing only to certain agencies within City government, in certain approved ways, or the WPO does not apply. Approved recipients are the Ethics Commission, the Controller, the District Attorney, the City Attorney, and the whistleblower’s own department. Reports to the four named agencies must be in the form of a “complaint”; those to the whistleblower’s department must be “in writing.”²⁹

The WPO does not protect disclosures that are made by other means, or to persons or entities that are not listed in the ordinance: for example, to news media, to outside law enforcement agencies, or to elected officials outside City government. Thus, a City employee who discloses government wrongdoing or corruption to the *San Francisco Chronicle*, or to the California Attorney General, or to the F.B.I., or to Congress, is not a “whistleblower” entitled to protection under the WPO. If retaliation ensues and the employee complains to the Commission, his/her complaint will be dismissed.

The whistleblower’s disclosure must also concern an enumerated subject. It must show that a City officer or employee violated a local ordinance governing political practices or government ethics; misused City resources so seriously that a crime was committed; endangered public health or safety; or took official action that advanced a private interest.³⁰ Disclosures of waste, fraud or abuse in general are not protected; nor are those concerning violations of general law.

The scope of the WPO is also limited, in that it forbids only certain types of retaliatory action and leaves untouched a wide variety of other coercive actions and reprisals that are nonetheless serious, and potentially costly to an injured party. Under the WPO, City officers or employees may not “terminate, demote, suspend or take other similar adverse employment action” against those who make a disclosure covered under the WPO. There is no explicit coverage for threats, intimidation, lesser forms of discipline, or for other job actions such as transfer, detail, reassignment, change in duties, adverse performance evaluations or failure to promote.³¹

Ethics Commission staff told us that in evaluating whistleblower retaliation complaints they liberally construe the phrase “similar adverse employment action” to include most other serious job actions, including non-disciplinary ones. The language of the WPO does not support such an interpretation. Termination, demotion and suspension — the only actions specified in the ordinance — are disciplinary actions that result in loss of job status and/or pay. If an employee is not selected for promotion or receives a performance evaluation of “above average” instead of “outstanding” there has been neither discipline nor loss of job status or pay. Such actions are not “similar” to termination, demotion or suspension in that respect, as they must be to qualify as “retaliation” under the WPO. That Ethics Commission staff is willing to treat them as such is further evidence that the definition needs to be broadened in order to fulfill the purpose of the ordinance.

Finally, some complainants are excluded from WPO protection because of their job status. As noted by our predecessor Civil Grand Jury,³² the ordinance covers only City officers and employees. It does not cover applicants for City employment, or employees or applicants for employment with City contractors – even those who work side-by-side with City employees.³³ Statistics compiled by Commission staff show that since 2011, three retaliation complaints have been submitted by contractor employees, and one by an applicant for City employment. They comprised more than 10% of retaliation complaints received during that period, and all were dismissed because such employees are not covered by the WPO.

2. The “Burden of Proof” in Whistleblower Retaliation Complaints

Whistleblower retaliation complaints face an additional hurdle before the Commission. The WPO imposes the “burden of proof” on the whistleblower in such cases, something that does not apply to any other type of complaint to the Commission.

The “burden of proof” means the obligation to prove something.³⁴ In a legal proceeding, one of the participants -- known as the “parties” -- must prove the case or lose it. In a civil lawsuit, the plaintiff bears this burden of proof. In a criminal trial, the prosecution bears the burden.

Complaints before the Ethics Commission are analogous to criminal proceedings. When a complaint is filed with the Commission, its staff investigates. If staff finds reason to believe that a violation of law has occurred, the Executive Director prosecutes the matter before the full Commission, which sits as a quasi-court. Like a criminal prosecutor, the Executive Director bears the burden of proof in the matter. Like a witness who reports a crime to the police, the complainant who reports a violation to the Commission is not a party to the proceeding, and normally bears no burden of proof. Rather, the parties are the Executive Director and the person accused of violating the law. This procedure is established in the City Charter³⁵ and applies to all cases before the Ethics Commission, including those concerning retaliation for whistleblowing.³⁶

In whistleblower retaliation cases, however, the WPO imposes an additional burden of proof on the whistleblower to show by a “preponderance of the evidence” that retaliation occurred. Subsection 4.115(b)(iii) of the WPO states, “In order to establish retaliation under this Section, a complainant must demonstrate by a preponderance of the evidence that the complainant’s engagement in activity protected under Subsection (a) was a substantial motivating factor for the adverse employment action.”

The Commission applies this additional burden during its investigatory process. Although not a party to the proceeding, the WPO complainant must show by a “preponderance of the evidence” that retaliation occurred or the complaint will not go forward. The Commission’s investigators require the complainant to meet this burden during preliminary review of retaliation complaints and also during formal investigation. If the complainant fails to do so, the complaint is dismissed without a public hearing.

A “preponderance of the evidence” means sufficient evidence to show that a factual claim is more likely true than false.³⁷ This is the same burden that falls on the plaintiff in civil court, to win a lawsuit. Thus, a whistleblower who complains of retaliation must “win” the case in the eyes of the Commission’s staff, before they will agree to prosecute the matter.

This can be difficult, because complaints to the Commission are investigated in secret. Investigators are not required to share information with complainants, who lack the Commission’s investigative resources, and may have no idea what evidence has been presented other than their own. Requiring them to prove their claims without fully participating in the procedure places a special burden on WPO complainants, that contributes to their lack of success before the Commission.

3. Remedies for Reprisal Under the WPO

Another deterrent against filing a complaint for retaliation under the WPO is that while the Commission can prosecute the person who retaliates it cannot provide

relief to the victim. Almost all complainants in whistleblower reprisal cases come to the Commission expecting to get their jobs back, or obtain some other form of relief, and are shocked to find that such relief is not available. Even if a job is lost due to retaliation, the Commission will not order reinstatement for the complainant or provide back pay or restoration of leave accruals, retirement credit, or other job benefits lost due to retaliation. All it can do is punish the retaliator.

The WPO does allow an injured party to file a civil complaint against the retaliator in state court, but limits her or his recovery to \$5,000 — an amount that is unlikely to pay even for attorney's fees and other costs of suit, much less the actual financial damages that typically result from a serious job action such as termination. Indeed, this amount is even more inadequate today than it was in 1989, when it first appeared in the Improper Government Activities Ordinance. Based on the Consumer Price Index,³⁸ this recovery amount is worth in 2015 about half of what it was worth in 1989, the year in which the Improper Government Activities Ordinance was enacted.

4. So Where Do They Go?

California state law provides alternative protection to City and county employees who disclose government wrongdoing or mismanagement. The relevant statutes are cited and explained in Appendix B to this report.

The most pertinent one is California Labor Code Section 1102.5, which prohibits retaliation against employees who disclose violations of law, rule or regulation, or workplace safety or health issues.³⁹ Covered disclosures need not be in writing, and may be made to management, other government or law enforcement agencies, or others in authority. A wide variety of retaliatory job actions are prohibited, from discharge to minor changes in the terms of employment. An injured party may seek administrative relief and may also file a civil action in court. If successful, he or she may obtain reinstatement; reimbursement for lost wages and work benefits, damages, attorney fees, and a civil penalty of up to \$10,000 per violation.⁴⁰

At the Jury's request, the Office of the City Attorney compiled data concerning lawsuits and grievances filed against the City over the last 10 years, which raised claims of retaliation for whistleblowing under any law. This data is significant, because at least some of these cases might have been resolved before the Ethics Commission, had it been willing and able to provide relief to the injured party.

In the last ten years there have been eight lawsuits against the City that raised claims of retaliation for whistleblowing. As of January 2015 three of these cases were still pending, and the other five had been resolved by settlement. One settled for \$750,000, the others for more modest amounts: \$115,000; \$75,000; \$70,000; \$57,000; and \$5,000. The City Attorney defends most grievances filed by unions

against the City on behalf of City officers and employees,⁴¹ and after a diligent search, they can find no grievance that raised a claim of reprisal for whistleblowing.

Thus, City officers and employees have successfully litigated complaints of whistleblower retaliation in state court, though none has had a public hearing before the Ethics Commission. This points to the ineffectiveness of the WPO as currently written.

5. The Charter Mandate: Protection for Whistleblowers

Since 2003, the City Charter has required protection for whistleblowers. This so-called "Charter mandate," passed by the voters as part of Proposition C, states: "The Board of Supervisors shall enact and maintain an ordinance... protecting City officers and employees from retaliation for filing a complaint with, or providing information to, the Controller, Ethics Commission, District Attorney, City Attorney or a City department or commission about improper government activity by City officers and employees."⁴²

"To protect" can be defined as "to keep (someone or something) from being harmed, lost, etc."⁴³ If the WPO is to "protect" whistleblowers, as mandated by the Charter, then it must keep them safe from harm. This may be accomplished either by preventing retaliation, or by remedying its effects.

By way of prevention, the WPO requires each City department to post a notice of whistleblower protections prepared by the Controller.⁴⁴ A copy of the current notice is attached as Appendix D. It is addressed to the potential victim of retaliation, rather than the retaliator, and consists of a rather technical explanation of the victim's right to file a complaint of retaliation. It largely repeats the language of the ordinance, and by way of warning, does little more than state that retaliation is prohibited. Neither penalties nor remedies are discussed. Similar language is included in employee outreach sessions and public postings by the Controller on its web site and elsewhere, that encourage employees to "blow the whistle" on government wrongdoing. The notice language is technical, retaliation is a secondary issue, and there is scant mention of punishment for those who retaliate.

Enforcement actions under the WPO if well publicized could have a deterrent effect against retaliation; however, this is not the case. By law, the Ethics Commission must conduct its investigations in secret, until it issues a public Accusation charging a violation of law.⁴⁵ No complaint of retaliation for whistleblowing has ever reached this stage before the Commission. All such investigations have been conducted in secret. There have been no public Accusations, no public hearings, and no public convictions of violating the WPO.

The WPO also fails to "protect" whistleblowers, in that it provides no meaningful remedy for the effects of retaliation. Though state law provides other means of

relief, this was true as well in 2003, when the voters enacted Proposition C.⁴⁶ The Board of Supervisors presumably knew this when it proposed the measure, with its mandate that the Board “enact and maintain an ordinance... protecting City officers and employees from retaliation... .”⁴⁷ We therefore infer that this mandate contemplates a meaningful set of protections at the City level, in addition to those provided in state law.

On a practical level, providing employees with relief inside City government makes good sense. Employment lawsuits are expensive. They are seldom undertaken unless the amount of money at stake is sufficient to justify the cost. They are also risky: if a case is lost, so are the costs of suit. A whistleblower may feel strongly that his suspension was retaliatory, but if it lasted only a few days and cost only a few hundred dollars in lost pay, there may be insufficient damages to warrant the risk of suit. Finally, employment lawsuits can take a great deal of time to make their way through the courts. Even if successful, the monetary relief they provide may be “too little, too late” for one who has not worked for years. A well-designed ordinance could be a useful addition to state law, if it provided a relatively quick and easy local remedy, as an alternative to lengthy, expensive court proceedings. Yet the WPO does no such thing.

6. The Charter Mandate: Definition of “Whistleblowing”

The Charter mandate defines whistleblowing as “filing a complaint with, *or providing information to*, the Controller, Ethics Commission, District Attorney, City Attorney *or a City department or commission....*”⁴⁸ (Emphasis added.) Thus, any disclosure of improper government activities, to any City commission or department whatever, should be protected by local ordinance.

The WPO defines whistleblowing more narrowly. Included are complaints filed with the Controller, Ethics Commission, District Attorney, City Attorney; complaints to the complainant's department, but only if they are made in writing; and information provided during an investigation by the Ethics Commission or the Controller.⁴⁹ Excluded are oral complaints to the complainant's department, and complaints to other City departments or commissions. Also excluded is “providing information” in general, outside of a formal complaint or investigation.

The Charter mandate imposes no such restrictions. It requires protection “for filing a complaint with, or providing information to” any of the listed recipients – including any City department or commission – without regard to how such information is provided.

7. Comparable Laws Protecting Government Employees In Other Jurisdictions

For purposes of comparison, the Jury surveyed whistleblower protections that are available to government employees at the state and federal level, and also in comparable communities around the state.

The federal government and the state of California afford their employees strong protection. Whistleblowers are covered whether their disclosures are made “in house” or outside of government, to those in authority or the public at large. Protected disclosures may concern nearly any kind of government wrongdoing, including violations of law, mismanagement, safety hazards, waste of funds, or abuse of authority. The definition of retaliation is just as broad, covering nearly every type of job action from termination to routine decisions concerning work assignments, pay, leave, and other benefits. These protections extend not only to federal and state employees, but to applicants for government employment as well. If retaliation occurs the whistleblower can obtain full relief, up to and including restoration to a lost position, back pay and related benefits, money damages, attorney’s fees and costs.⁵⁰ Further analysis of these laws may be found in Appendix B to this report.

By contrast to federal and state law, the other large cities and counties that we surveyed provide relatively weak protection for local government employees who “blow the whistle.” We surveyed the whistleblower laws of Los Angeles, San Diego, San Jose and Oakland, and the counties of Santa Clara, Alameda and Los Angeles.⁵¹ Appendix C catalogues these provisions, briefly described as follows.

The definition of “whistleblowing” varies from place to place. Some jurisdictions protect only disclosures that are made “in house,” to one of their own agencies (Oakland, San Diego, Santa Clara County, Los Angeles County); while others protect those made inside and outside government (Alameda County, San Jose, Los Angeles). Some protect only disclosures that involve specific violations of law (Santa Clara County, Los Angeles, San Diego), while others protect those that concern a wide range of improper activities (Alameda County, Oakland, Los Angeles County, San Jose).

In general, retaliation is broadly defined. Most of the cities and counties we surveyed prohibit almost any retaliatory job action (Alameda County, Oakland, San Jose, San Diego); while others forbid “retaliation” or “reprisal” in general, without defining the term (Santa Clara County, Los Angeles County, Los Angeles).

Remedies, however, are scarce. Most provide no relief for the victim of retaliation (Alameda County, Santa Clara County, San Jose, Los Angeles County, San Diego); while just two allow the injured party to file a civil action in court, seeking a small monetary award (Oakland, Los Angeles). Thus, while the coverage of these laws varies, none provides effective relief to the victim of retaliation.

Be that as it may, the standard for San Francisco is set not by other cities or counties, but by its own Charter, which mandates an ordinance protecting its officers and employees from retaliation for whistleblowing. Such protections exist in federal and state government, and there is no reason why they could not exist in San Francisco as well.

8. Role of the Ethics Commission and the Board Of Supervisors

Under the Charter, the Ethics Commission has a duty to make recommendations to the mayor and the Board of Supervisors, concerning revisions to City ordinances related to governmental ethics.⁵² Such revisions may be adopted by the Board of Supervisors, or submitted by the Commission directly to the voters at the next general election.⁵³

The WPO is one of the governmental ethics laws to which these provisions apply.⁵⁴ If, as we have found, the ordinance needs to be strengthened, then the Commission has a duty to consider revising the law, either by recommending changes to the Board of Supervisors or by submitting them to the voters. By the same token, the Board of Supervisors has its own duty to consider changing the law to comply with the City Charter.

Such revisions should include expanding the definition of whistleblowing under the WPO to cover oral complaints to the complainant's department; disclosures to a City department or commission other than the complainant's own; and "providing information" to any of the listed recipients, outside of the formal complaint or investigation process. The Charter mandate specifically requires an ordinance protecting these disclosures, but they are not yet covered.

In our view, "protection" for whistleblowers is illusory unless it includes a meaningful remedy for the effects of retaliation. For that reason the Commission and the Board should consider authorizing the Ethics Commission to order cancellation of a retaliatory job action,⁵⁵ and increasing the limit of the civil penalty available under the WPO to an amount adequate to repay the whistleblower the financial losses that result from such an action.

Finally, the Commission and the Board should consider amending Subsection 4.115(b)(iii) of the WPO to clarify that the burden of proof set forth therein does not apply during preliminary review and investigation of administrative complaints to the Commission.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the discussion above we have come to the following conclusions and make

the following recommendations.

Finding 1:

The WPO does not fully “protect” City officers and employees from retaliation for filing a complaint as required by the Charter mandate of Proposition C, because it covers only a limited range of complaints, it provides no effective remedy for the victim, and its secrecy provisions limit its deterrent effect.

Recommendation 1.1:

That the Ethics Commission recommend to the Board of Supervisors an amendment to the WPO that provides real protection for whistleblowers, in conformity with the Charter mandate of Proposition C.

Recommendation 1.2:

If the Ethics Commission fails to act, that the Board of Supervisors on its own amend the WPO to provide real protection to whistleblowers, in conformity with the Charter mandate of Proposition C.

Recommendation 1.3:

If the Ethics Commission requests that the Board amend the WPO and the Board fails to act, that the Commission consider submitting such an amendment directly to the voters.

Recommendation 1.4:

If the Ethics Commission and the Board fail to act, that the Mayor introduce legislation to the Board of Supervisors that would amend the WPO to provide real protection to whistleblowers, in conformity with the Charter mandate of Proposition C.

Finding 2:

The WPO also fails to fulfill the Charter mandate, in that it does not cover all whistleblower disclosures specified in the Charter.

Recommendation 2.1:

That amendments to the WPO expand the definition of whistleblowing to cover oral complaints to the complainant’s department; disclosures to a City department or commission other than the complainant’s own; and providing information to any of the recipients listed in the Charter mandate (hereafter “listed recipients”), outside of the formal complaint or investigation process.

Recommendation 2.2:

That these amendments further expand the scope of covered disclosures to include “providing information” to any of the listed recipients regarding improper government activities, whether or not such information is set forth in a formal complaint, or provided during an official investigation.

Finding 3.1:

While other large California cities and counties have relatively weak laws protecting their employees from retaliation for whistleblowing, this does not relieve the Board of its responsibility under the Charter mandate, to enact an ordinance that genuinely protects whistleblowers.

Finding 3.2:

Whistleblower protection laws that cover government employees at the state and Federal level can serve as a useful model for improving the WPO.

Recommendation 3:

That amendments to the WPO provide a meaningful remedy for the effects of retaliation, by authorizing the Ethics Commission to order cancellation of a retaliatory job action, and increasing the limit of the civil penalty available under the WPO to an amount adequate to repay the financial losses that can result from such an action.

Finding 4:

The WPO creates an unwarranted obstacle to administrative complaints of retaliation filed with the Ethics Commission, by imposing a burden of proof on the complainant during preliminary review and investigation of such complaints.

Recommendation 4:

That amendments to the WPO include a revision of Subsection 4.115(b)(iii) providing that the burden of proof set forth therein does not apply during preliminary review and investigation of administrative complaints to the Commission.

Request for Responses

Pursuant to Penal Code Sec. 933.05, the civil grand jury requests responses as follows:

From the following individuals:

- Ethics Commission Executive Director: All findings, and Recommendations 1.1, 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 3, 4

From the following governing bodies:

- Ethics Commission: All Findings, and Recommendations 1.1, 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 3, 4.
- Board of Supervisors: All Findings, and Recommendations 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 3, 4.
- Mayor: All Findings, and Recommendations 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 3, 4

<i>Findings</i>	<i>Recommendations</i>	<i>Responses Required</i>
	<p><u>Recommendation 1.3:</u></p> <p>If the Ethics Commission requests that the Board amend the WPO and the Board fails to act within a reasonable time, that the Commission consider submitting such an amendment directly to the voters.</p> <p><u>Recommendation 1.4:</u></p> <p>If the Ethics Commission and the Board fail to act within a reasonable time, that the Mayor introduce legislation to the Board of Supervisors that would amend the WPO to provide real protection to whistleblowers, in conformity with the Charter mandate of Proposition C.</p>	<p>Ethics Commission Executive Director, Ethics Commission</p> <p>Mayor</p>
<p><u>Finding 2:</u></p> <p>The WPO also fails to fulfill the Charter mandate, in that it does not cover all whistleblower disclosures specified in the Charter.</p>	<p><u>Recommendation 2.1:</u></p> <p>That amendments to the WPO expand the definition of whistleblowing to cover oral complaints to the complainant's department; disclosures to a City department or commission other than the complainant's own; and providing information to any of the recipients listed in the Charter mandate (hereafter "listed</p>	<p>Ethics Commission Executive Director, Ethics Commission, Board of Supervisors, Mayor</p>

<i>Findings</i>	<i>Recommendations</i>	<i>Responses Required</i>
	<p>recipients”), outside of the formal complaint or investigation process.</p> <p><u>Recommendation 2.2:</u></p> <p>That these amendments further expand the scope of covered disclosures to include “providing information” to any of the listed recipients regarding improper government activities, whether or not such information is set forth in a formal complaint, or provided during an official investigation.</p>	
<p><u>Finding 3.1:</u></p> <p>While other large California cities and counties have relatively weak laws protecting their employees from retaliation for whistleblowing, this does not relieve the Board of its responsibility under the Charter mandate, to enact an ordinance that genuinely protects whistleblowers.</p> <p><u>Finding 3.2:</u></p> <p>Whistleblower protection laws that cover government employees at the state and Federal level can serve as a useful model for improving the WPO.</p>	<p><u>Recommendation 3:</u></p> <p>That amendments to the WPO provide a meaningful remedy for the effects of retaliation, by authorizing the Ethics Commission to order cancellation of a retaliatory job action, and increasing the limit of the civil penalty available under the WPO to an amount adequate to repay the financial losses that can result from such an action.</p>	<p>Ethics Commission Executive Director, Ethics Commission, Board of Supervisors, Mayor</p>

<i>Findings</i>	<i>Recommendations</i>	<i>Responses Required</i>
<p><u>Finding 4:</u></p> <p>The WPO creates an unwarranted obstacle to administrative complaints of retaliation filed with the Ethics Commission, by imposing a burden of proof on the complainant during preliminary review and investigation of such complaints.</p>	<p><u>Recommendation 4:</u></p> <p>That amendments to the WPO include a revision of Subsection 4.115(b)(iii) providing that the burden of proof set forth therein does not apply during preliminary review and investigation of administrative complaints to the Commission.</p>	<p>Ethics Commission Executive Director, Ethics Commission, Board of Supervisors, Mayor</p>

APPENDIX A: Full Text of SF Campaign & Gov't Conduct Code, Article IV, Chapter 1, Section 4.115 ("Protection for Whistleblowers")

(a) **RETALIATION PROHIBITED.** No City officer or employee may terminate, demote, suspend or take other similar adverse employment action against any City officer or employee because the officer or employee has in good faith (i) filed a complaint with the Ethics Commission, Controller, District Attorney or City Attorney, or a written complaint with the complainant's department, alleging that a City officer or employee engaged in improper government activity by: violating local campaign finance, lobbying, conflicts of interest or governmental ethics laws, regulations or rules; violating the California Penal Code by misusing City resources; creating a specified and substantial danger to public health or safety by failing to perform duties required by the officer or employee's City position; or abusing his or her City position to advance a private interest, (ii) filed a complaint with the Controller's Whistleblower Program, or (iii) provided any information or otherwise cooperated with any investigation conducted under this Chapter.

(b) **COMPLAINTS OF RETALIATION FOR HAVING FILED A COMPLAINT ALLEGING IMPROPER GOVERNMENT ACTIVITY.**

(i) **Administrative Complaints.** Any city officer or employee, or former city officer or employee, who believes he or she has been the subject of retaliation in violation of Subsection (a) of this Section may file a complaint with the Ethics Commission. The complaint must be filed no later than two years after the date of the alleged retaliation.

The Ethics Commission shall investigate complaints of violations of Subsection (a) of this Section pursuant to the procedures specified in San Francisco Charter Section C3.699-13 and the regulations adopted thereunder.

The Ethics Commission shall investigate complaints of violations of Subsection (a) of this Section pursuant to the procedures specified in San Francisco Charter Section C3.699-13 and the regulations adopted thereunder. The Ethics Commission may decline to investigate complaints alleging violations of Subsection (a) if it determines that the same or similar allegations are pending with or have been finally resolved by another administrative or judicial body. Nothing in this Subsection shall preclude the Ethics Commission from referring any matter to any other City department, commission, board, officer or employee, or to other government agencies for investigation and possible disciplinary or enforcement action. The Ethics Commission may refer matters to the Department of Human Resources with a recommendation. The Ethics Commission may require that any

City department, commission, board, officer or employee report to the Ethics Commission on the referred matter.

(ii) Civil Complaints. Any City officer or employee who believes he or she has been the subject of retaliation in violation of Subsection (a) of this Section may bring a civil action against the City officer or employee who committed the violation. Such action must be filed no later than two years after the date of the retaliation.

(iii) Burden of Establishing Retaliation. In order to establish retaliation under this Section, a complainant must demonstrate by a preponderance of the evidence that the complainant's engagement in activity protected under Subsection (a) was a substantial motivating factor for the adverse employment action. The employer may rebut this claim if it demonstrates by a preponderance of the evidence that it would have taken the same employment action irrespective of the complainant's participation in protected activity.

(c) PENALTIES.

(i) Charter Penalties. Any City officer or employee who violates Subsection (a) of this Section may be subject to administrative penalties pursuant to Charter Section C3.699-13.

(ii) Discipline by Appointing Authority. Any City officer or employee who violates Subsection (a) of this Section shall be subject to disciplinary action up to and including dismissal by his or her appointing authority. If no disciplinary action is taken by the appointing authority, the Ethics Commission may refer the matter to the Civil Service Commission for action pursuant to Charter Section A8.341.

(iii) Civil Penalties. Any City officer or employee who violates Subsection (a) of this Section may be personally liable in a civil action authorized under Subsection (b)(ii) of this Section for a civil penalty not to exceed \$5,000.

(d) RESERVATION OF AUTHORITY.

(i) Civil Service Commission. Nothing in this Section shall interfere with the powers granted to the Civil Service Commission by the San Francisco Charter.

(ii) Appointing Authority. Nothing in this Section shall interfere with the power of an appointing officer, manager, or supervisor to take action with respect to any City officer or employee, provided that the appointing officer, manager, or supervisor reasonably believes that such action is justified on facts separate and apart from the fact that the officer or employee filed a complaint with, or cooperated with, an Ethics Commission investigation of such complaint; or filed a complaint with or provided information to the Controller, District Attorney, City Attorney or the complainant's department.

(e) NOTICE OF WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTIONS. The Controller shall prepare, and each City department shall post a notice of whistleblower protections. The notice shall be posted in a location that is conspicuous and accessible to all employees.

APPENDIX B: The WPO Compared With Whistleblower Protection Laws Applicable To Federal, State, And Local Government Employees

The following is a comparison of whistleblower protection laws applicable to federal employees, California state employees, California local agency employees, and California employees in general, with the WPO applicable to employees of the City and county of San Francisco.

A. Who is Covered?

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES: Federal law covers both federal employees and applicants for federal employment. See 5 U.S.C. § 2302(b)(8).

CALIFORNIA STATE EMPLOYEES: California law covers both state employees and applicants for state employment. See Cal. Gov. Code § 8547.8

CALIFORNIA LOCAL AGENCY EMPLOYEES: California law also covers both employees and applicants for “local agency” employment; where a “local agency” means “any county, city, city and county, including any charter county, city, or city and county, and any district, school district, community college district, municipal or public corporation, political subdivision, or public agency of the state, or any instrumentality of any one or more of these agencies.” Cal. Gov. Code § 53296; and see Cal. Gov. Code Article 4.5 (“Disclosure of Information: Local Government”)

CALIFORNIA EMPLOYEES IN GENERAL: California law further covers employees in general, including “individuals employed by... any county, city, city and county, including any charter city or county, and any school district, community college district...” See Cal. Labor Code § 1102.5(a) (“employees” protected), and § 1106 (“employee” defined). Applicants for employment are also covered. See Cal. Labor Code § 98.6(c)(1).

SAN FRANCISCO CITY AND COUNTY EMPLOYEES: The WPO covers “[a]ny City officer or employee, or former City officer or employee,” but does not cover applicants for employment. See WPO, Subsection 4.115(b).

B. Must Covered Disclosures Be Made in a Particular Way?

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES: In the context of federal employment the law covers, without limitation, “any disclosure... if such disclosure is not specifically prohibited by law and if such information is not specifically required by Executive order to be kept secret in the interest of national defense or the conduct of foreign affairs...” 5 U.S.C. § 2302(b)(8)(A). It also separately protects “any disclosure to the Special

Counsel, or to the Inspector General of an agency or another employee designated by the head of the agency to receive such disclosures... ." 5 U.S.C. § 2302(b)(8)(B).

CALIFORNIA STATE EMPLOYEES: In the context of state employment, the law covers any "good faith communication" without limitation as to its recipient. See Cal. Gov. Code § 8547.2(e).

CALIFORNIA LOCAL AGENCY EMPLOYEES: In the context of local agency employment, the law covers only complaints made in writing to the local agency itself, within 60 days of the date of the act or event which is the subject of the complaint. See Cal. Gov. Code § 53297(a).

CALIFORNIA EMPLOYEES IN GENERAL: In the context of employment in general, state law covers disclosures to a government or law enforcement agency, a person with authority over the employee, or to another employee with authority to investigate, discover, or correct the violation or noncompliance in question. The disclosure may also be made to a public body conducting an investigation, hearing or inquiry. See Cal. Labor Code § 1102.5(a).

SAN FRANCISCO CITY AND COUNTY EMPLOYEES: The WPO covers only disclosures that are made in particular ways. One is by "fil[ing] a complaint with the Ethics Commission, Controller, District Attorney or City Attorney, or a written complaint with the complainant's department..."; another, by "filing a complaint with the Controller's Whistleblower Program... ." WPO, Subsection 4.115(a). Also protected are disclosures made while "provid[ing] any information or otherwise cooperat[ing] with an investigation" of such complaints. *Id.* There is no protection for disclosures made by other means, or to other persons or entities; for example, to the news media, or to law enforcement agencies, or to elected officials.

C. What Type of Information Constitutes a Covered Disclosure?

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES: In the context of Federal employment, a covered disclosure is one that the disclosing party "reasonably believes evidences— (i) any violation of any law, rule, or regulation, or (ii) gross mismanagement, a gross waste of funds, an abuse of authority, or a substantial and specific danger to public health or safety... ." 5 U.S.C. § 2302(b)(8)(A).

CALIFORNIA STATE EMPLOYEES: In the context of state employment, a covered disclosure is one that "discloses or demonstrates an intention to disclose information that may evidence (1) an improper governmental activity, or (2) a condition that may significantly threaten the health or safety of employees or the public if the disclosure or intention to disclose was made for the purpose of remedying that condition." Cal. Gov. Code § 8547.2(e). In this context, "improper government activity" means "an activity by a state agency or by an employee that is undertaken in the performance of the employee's duties, undertaken inside a state office, or, if undertaken outside a state office by the employee, directly relates to

state government, whether or not that activity is within the scope of his or her employment, and that (1) is in violation of any state or federal law or regulation, including, but not limited to, corruption, malfeasance, bribery, theft of government property, fraudulent claims, fraud, coercion, conversion, malicious prosecution, misuse of government property, or willful omission to perform duty, (2) is in violation of an Executive order of the Governor, a California Rule of Court, or any policy or procedure mandated by the State Administrative Manual or State Contracting Manual, or (3) is economically wasteful, involves gross misconduct, incompetency, or inefficiency.” Cal. Gov. Code § 8547.2(c).

CALIFORNIA LOCAL AGENCY EMPLOYEES: In the context of local agency employment, the law covers “the written provision of evidence regarding gross mismanagement or a significant waste of funds, an abuse of authority, or a substantial and specific danger to public health or safety.” See Cal. Gov. Code § 53296(c), (d).

CALIFORNIA EMPLOYEES IN GENERAL: Under California law applicable to employees in general, a covered disclosure is one that the employee has “reasonable cause to believe discloses a violation of state or federal statute, or a violation of or noncompliance with a local, state, or federal rule or regulation, regardless of whether disclosing the information is part of the employee’s job duties.” Cal. Labor Code § 1102.5(a). Also protected are disclosures concerning employee safety or health, unsafe working conditions or work practices in the employee’s employment or place of employment. See Cal. Labor Code § 6310.

SAN FRANCISCO CITY AND COUNTY EMPLOYEES: Under the WPO, a covered disclosure is one “alleging that a City officer or employee engaged in improper government activity by: violating local campaign finance, lobbying, conflicts of interest or governmental ethics laws, regulations or rules; violating the California Penal Code by misusing City resources; creating a specified and substantial danger to public health or safety by failing to perform duties required by the officer or employee’s City position; or abusing his or her City position to advance a private interest...” WPO, Subsection 4.115(a). If made through the Controller’s Whistleblower Hotline, the definition of a protected disclosure is somewhat broader: it includes, “the misuse of City funds, improper activities by City officers and employees, deficiencies in the quality and delivery of government services, and wasteful and inefficient City government practices.” WPO, Subsection 4.107(a).

D. What Type of Retaliatory Actions are Prohibited?

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES: Federal agencies are prohibited from “taking, failing to take, or threatening to take or fail to take” any of the following personnel actions as a result of a covered disclosure: “(i) an appointment; (ii) a promotion; (iii) an action under chapter 75 of this title or other disciplinary or corrective action; (iv) a detail, transfer, or reassignment; (v) a reinstatement; (vi) a restoration; (vii) a reemployment; (viii) a performance evaluation under chapter 43 of this title; (ix) a

decision concerning pay, benefits, or awards, or concerning education or training if the education or training may reasonably be expected to lead to an appointment, promotion, performance evaluation, or other action described in this subparagraph; (x) a decision to order psychiatric testing or examination; (xi) the implementation or enforcement of any nondisclosure policy, form, or agreement; and (xii) any other significant change in duties, responsibilities, or working conditions... ." 5 U.S.C. § 2302(a)(2)(A).

CALIFORNIA STATE EMPLOYEES: California state employees are prohibited from taking any of the following actions as a result of a covered disclosure: "promising to confer, or conferring, any benefit; effecting, or threatening to effect, any reprisal; or taking, or directing others to take, or recommending, processing, or approving, any personnel action, including, but not limited to, appointment, promotion, transfer, assignment, performance evaluation, suspension, or other disciplinary action." Cal. Gov. C. § 8547.3(b).

CALIFORNIA LOCAL AGENCY EMPLOYEES: California law prohibits local agency officers, managers or supervisors from taking the following actions as a result of a covered disclosure: "any act of intimidation, restraint, coercion, discrimination, or disciplinary action"; where "disciplinary action means any direct form of discipline" including but not limited to "the firing of an employee." See Cal. Gov. Code § 53296(b), (j).

CALIFORNIA EMPLOYEES IN GENERAL: California employers in general are prohibited from taking any of the following actions as a result of a covered disclosure: discharge, threat of discharge, demotion, suspension, retaliation, adverse action, or any other type of discrimination in the terms and conditions of employment. See Cal. Labor Code §§ 98.6(b)(1), 1102.5.

SAN FRANCISCO CITY AND COUNTY EMPLOYEES: City officers or employees may not "terminate, demote, suspend or take other similar adverse employment action" against those who file a covered complaint. See WPO, Subsection 4.115(a). Threats and intimidation are not covered; nor are lesser forms of discipline, or other job actions such as transfer, detail, reassignment, change in duties, adverse performance evaluations or failure to promote.

E. What Enforcement Procedures are Provided?

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES: An injured party has a right to seek administrative relief by filing a complaint with the U.S. Office of Special Counsel, *see* 5 U.S.C. § 1214; and may also file an action before an independent adjudicator known as the U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board. See 5 U.S.C. §§ 1214(a)(3), 1221.

CALIFORNIA STATE EMPLOYEES: An injured party has a right to seek administrative relief by filing a written complaint with the State Personnel Board,

see Cal Gov. Code § 19683(a); and may also file a civil action in court. See Cal. Gov. Code § 8547.3(c).

CALIFORNIA LOCAL AGENCY EMPLOYEES: An injured party has no right to seek administrative relief. He or she may file a civil action in court against the alleged retaliator, if and when the latter has been convicted in court of criminal retaliation "with malicious intent..." See Cal. Gov. Code § 53298.5(b).

CALIFORNIA EMPLOYEES IN GENERAL: An injured party has a right to seek administrative relief by filing a complaint with the Labor Commissioner, see Cal. Labor Code §§ 98.7, 1102.5; and may also file a civil action in court, regardless of whether he or she first seeks relief from the Labor Commissioner. See Cal. Labor Code §§ 1102.5; 98.7(f), (g); 244(a).

SAN FRANCISCO CITY AND COUNTY EMPLOYEES: An injured party has a right to file an administrative complaint of retaliation with the Ethics Commission, and may also file a civil action in court against the alleged retaliator. See WPO, Subsection 4.115(b), (c); Charter, Sec. C3.699-13.

F. What Remedy is Provided?

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES: The injured party may obtain an order requiring that he or she be placed, as nearly as possible, in the position that he or she would have occupied had the retaliation not occurred; plus back pay and related benefits, medical costs incurred, travel expenses, any other reasonable and foreseeable consequential damages, compensatory damages (including interest, reasonable expert witness fees, and costs), and attorney's fees and costs. See 5 U.S.C. §§ 1214(g), 1221(g)(1).

CALIFORNIA STATE EMPLOYEES: Before the State Personnel Board, the injured party may obtain "appropriate relief, including, but not limited to, reinstatement, backpay, restoration of lost service credit, if appropriate, compensatory damages, and the expungement of any adverse records of the state employee or applicant for state employment who was the subject of the alleged acts of misconduct..." Cal Gov. Code § 19683(c). In court, the injured party may recover money damages, including punitive damages "where the acts of the offending party are proven to be malicious," as well as "reasonable attorney's fees..." Cal. Gov. Code § 8547.8(c).

CALIFORNIA LOCAL AGENCY EMPLOYEES: In court, the injured party may recover money damages, including punitive damages, as well as "reasonable attorney's fees as provided by law." Cal. Gov. Code § 53298.5(b).

CALIFORNIA EMPLOYEES IN GENERAL: Either before the Labor Commissioner or in court, the injured party may obtain "reinstatement and reimbursement for lost wages and work benefits caused by" the employer's retaliatory actions. See Cal. Labor Code §§ 98.6(b), (c); *id.*, § 1102.5. In addition, the employer may be liable for a civil penalty up to \$10,000 per employee for each violation. *Id.* § 98.6(b)(3). The

injured party may also recover attorney fees pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

SAN FRANCISCO CITY AND COUNTY EMPLOYEES: The WPO does not provide any direct relief to the injured party, and makes no provision for attorney fees. If the injured party files a civil action, it limits his or her recovery to “a civil penalty not to exceed \$5,000.” WPO, Subsection 4.115(c)(3). No other money damages may be recovered, either from the person who took the reprisal in question, or from the City and County. See *id.*, Sec. 4.135.

APPENDIX C: Comparison of Selected City And County Whistleblower Protection Ordinances and Policies

The following is a comparison of local whistleblower protection laws currently in effect in selected major cities and counties elsewhere in California.

A. Who is covered?

ALAMEDA COUNTY. Both county employees and applicants for county employment are covered. See Alameda County Admin. Code, Chapter 32 (“Protection of Employees Disciplined For Disclosing Information”), Sec. 3.52.030

OAKLAND: Only city officers or employees are covered. See Oakland Muni. Code 2.38.020

SANTA CLARA COUNTY: “Any person” is covered, without regard to employment status. See Santa Clara County Code, Sec. A25-751, A25-753

SAN JOSE: The policy covers “applicants, officers, officials, employees, or contractors” who work for the city. See City of San Jose Non-Retaliation Policy, City Administrative Policy Manual, Sec. 1.1.4 (hereafter “SJ Policy”)

LOS ANGELES COUNTY: Any “person” is covered. County officers and employees are also expressly covered. See Los Angeles County Code Sections 5.02.060A, 5.02.060B

LOS ANGELES CITY: Any “person” is covered, without regard to employment status. See Los Angeles Municipal Code, Chapter IV, Article 9.5 (“Municipal Ethics and Conflicts of Interest”), Sec. 49.5.4 (“Protection Against Retaliation”)

SAN DIEGO CITY: “[A]ny person” is covered, without regard to employment status. See San Diego Muni. Code, Article 6, Division 4 (“Ethics Commission”), Sec. 26.0415.

B. Must covered disclosures be made in a particular way?

ALAMEDA COUNTY: The ordinance covers “any written document containing a disclosure” of protected information, regardless of its recipient. See Alameda County Admin. Code, Sec. 3.52.020

OAKLAND: The ordinance covers any type of communication that “reports or otherwise brings to the attention of the City Auditor” any protected information. See Oakland Muni. Code 2.38.020

SANTA CLARA COUNTY: The ordinance covers only reports to the Office of the County Counsel, unless a report concerns activities within that Office, in which case

it should be made with the Office of the County Executive. See Santa Clara County Code, Sec. A25-751, A25-753

SAN JOSE: The policy covers "1. Making or filing an internal complaint with the City ... 2. Providing informal notice to the City... 3. Participation in investigations and in court/administrative hearings... 4. Filing a complaint with a Federal or State enforcement or administrative agency 5. Disclosing information to a government or law enforcement agency ... 6. Participating in or cooperating with a Federal or State enforcement agency that is conducting an investigation of the City ... 7. Reporting... 8. Calling an internal or outside governmental agency's 'Whistleblower hotline' 9. Associating with another employee who is engaged in any of the protected activities enumerated here" SJ Policy, "Definitions", I. ("Protected activity" defined).

LOS ANGELES COUNTY: The ordinance covers any type of communication that "reports or otherwise brings to the attention of the auditor-controller or other appropriate agency, office or department of the county of Los Angeles" certain covered information. See Los Angeles County Code Sections 5.02.060A, 5.02.060B

LOS ANGELES CITY. The ordinance covers any type of communication that "reports" covered information "to the Ethics Commission or another governmental entity." See Los Angeles Municipal Code Sec. 49.5.4B.

SAN DIEGO CITY: The ordinance covers "mak[ing] a complaint or provid[ing] information to the [Ethics] Commission." See San Diego Muni. Code Sec. 26.0415.

C. What type of information constitutes a covered disclosure?

ALAMEDA COUNTY: The ordinance covers disclosures "regarding gross mismanagement or a significant waste of funds, an abuse of authority, or a substantial and specific danger to public health or safety." Alameda County Admin. Code, Sec. 3.52.020

OAKLAND: The ordinance covers disclosures of "information which, if true, would constitute one of the following: a work-related violation by a City officer or employee of any law or regulation; fraud, waste or mismanagement of City assets or resources; gross abuse of authority; a specific and substantial danger to public health or safety due to an act or omission of a City official or employee; or use of a City office, position or resources for personal gain." Oakland Muni. Code 2.38.020

SANTA CLARA COUNTY: The ordinance covers disclosure of "information that a County officer or employee has engaged in improper governmental activity in violation of state or federal law, County ordinance or administrative memoranda. Examples of such improper conduct include but are not limited to: violating local campaign finance laws, conflict of interest laws, or governmental ethics; misusing County resources; or using a County position to advance a private interest." Santa Clara County Code, Sec. A25-751

SAN JOSE: The policy covers disclosures “regarding alleged violations of City policy, local, State or Federal law... violation of State or Federal statute, or a violation or noncompliance with a State or Federal rule or regulation... unlawful activity... conflicts of interest, dishonesty or unethical conduct...” San Jose Policy, “Definitions”, I. (“Protected activity” defined).

LOS ANGELES COUNTY: The ordinance covers disclosure of “information which, if true, would constitute: a work-related violation by a county officer or employee of any law or regulation; gross waste of county funds; gross abuse of authority; a specific and substantial danger to public health or safety due to an act or omission of a county official or employee; use of a county office or position or of county resources for personal gain; or a conflict of interest of a county officer or employee.” LA County Code Sec. 5.02.060A

LOS ANGELES CITY. The ordinance covers disclosures of “a possible violation of law...” Los Angeles Municipal Code Sec. 49.5.4B.

SAN DIEGO CITY: The anti-retaliation provision applies to “complainants and witnesses” who “make a complaint or provide information to the Commission.” San Diego Muni. Code Sec. 26.0415. The ordinance defines a “complainant” is one who “makes a complaint alleging violations of governmental ethics laws”; meaning, “local laws governing campaign contribution limits, campaign contribution disclosure, campaign expenditure disclosure, statements of economic interests, receipt and disclosure of gifts, conflicts of interest, lobbying registration and disclosure...” *Id.*, Sec. 26.402.

D. What type of retaliatory actions are prohibited?

ALAMEDA COUNTY: The ordinance prohibits county officers, managers or supervisors from taking “any disciplinary action or disciplinary transfer against any employee, or any other act of intimidation, restraint, coercion or discrimination against any employee or applicant for employment in retaliation for a disclosure of information by the employee.” See Alameda County Admin. Code Sec. 3.52.020, 3.52.040(A)

OAKLAND: The ordinance prohibits retaliation by taking or threatening “any adverse employment action, including discharge, discipline or demotion”; where “adverse employment action” is further defined as one that “had a detrimental and substantial effect on the terms, conditions, or privilege of a complainant’s employment or required the complainant to work in a discriminatorily hostile or abusive work environment. A change that is merely contrary to a complainant’s interests or liking is insufficient.” See Oakland Muni. Code Sec. 2.38.040, 2.38.060, 2.38.070

SANTA CLARA COUNTY: The ordinance prohibits “[A]ny retaliation or reprisal by any County officer or employee against any complainant or informant” without limitation as to the type of action prohibited. See Santa Clara County Code, Sec. A25-753.

SAN JOSE: The policy prohibits the use, or attempted use of official authority “for the purpose of intimidating, threatening, coercing, directing or influencing any person with the intent of interfering with that person’s duty” to disclose official wrongdoing. It further prohibits retaliation by “adverse employment action” which “may include, but is not limited to, any of the following: 1. Real or implied threats of intimidation to attempt or prevent an individual from reporting alleged wrongdoing or because of protected activity 2. Denying promotion to an individual because of protected activity 3. Taking any form of disciplinary action because of protected activity 4. Extending a probationary period because of protected activity 5. Altering work schedules or work assignments because of protected activity”. SJ Policy, “Policy”, “Definitions” (“Adverse Employment Action” defined).

LOS ANGELES COUNTY: The ordinance prohibits county officers or employees from using or threatening to use their official authority or influence either “to restrain or prevent any other person” from making a protected disclosure, or to take “any action as a reprisal against a county officer or employee...”. LA County Code Sections 5.02.060A, 5.02.060B

LOS ANGELES CITY. The ordinance prohibits threatening or effecting “any action as a reprisal...”. Los Angeles Municipal Code Sec. 49.5.4B.

SAN DIEGO CITY: The ordinance prohibits the use or threatened use of “any official authority, including discipline or termination, to discourage, restrain or interfere” with a complainant or witness before the Ethics Commission. San Diego Muni. Code Sec. 26.0415.

E. What enforcement procedures are provided?

ALAMEDA COUNTY: An injured party has a right to file an administrative claim of reprisal, which is investigated by the county administrator and the appropriate appointing authority, and ultimately referred to the Board of Supervisors for determination. See Alameda County Admin. Code Sec. 3.52.030.

OAKLAND: An injured party has a right to file an administrative complaint of retaliation with the City Auditor, and may also file a civil action in court against the alleged retaliator. See Oakland Muni. Code 2.38.050, 2.38.110.

SANTA CLARA COUNTY: The ordinance provides no right to file a complaint of retaliation, either administratively or in court. See Santa Clara County Code, Sec. A25.

SAN JOSE: An injured party “should immediately report the conduct to the applicable Department Director or to the City Manager’s Office of Employee Relations.” SJ Policy, “Complaint Procedures”

LOS ANGELES COUNTY: An injured party “may file a complaint with the director of personnel” who “shall investigate the complaint and thereafter prepare a report thereon which shall be forwarded to the board of supervisors.” LA County Code Sec. 5.02.060C

LOS ANGELES CITY. An injured party has a right to file an administrative complaint of retaliation with the Ethics Commission. A civil action may also be filed in court against the alleged retaliator, either by the injured party – provided he or she is a resident of the City – or by the City Attorney or the Ethics Commission. See Los Angeles Municipal Code Sec. 49.5.4B, 49.5.16B.

SAN DIEGO CITY: The ordinance does not provide any procedure for enforcing its anti-retaliation provision. San Diego Muni. Code Sec. 26.0415.

F. What remedy is provided?

ALAMEDA COUNTY: The ordinance provides no remedy to the injured party, but merely restates the relief available to local agency complainants under state law; i.e., the right to file an action for money damages in court, if and when the accused has been convicted of criminal retaliation. See Alameda County Admin. Code Sec. 3.52.050; Cal. Gov. C. Sect. 53298.5(b).

OAKLAND: The ordinance provides no direct relief to the injured party, and makes no provision for attorney fees. If an injured party files an action in court, it limits his or her recovery to a civil penalty not to exceed \$5,000. See Oakland Muni. Code 2.38.050, 2.38.110.

SANTA CLARA COUNTY: The ordinance provides no relief to the injured party. See Santa Clara County Code, Sec. A25.

SAN JOSE: The policy provides no relief to the injured party. See San Jose Policy.

LOS ANGELES COUNTY: The ordinance provides no relief to the injured party. See Los Angeles County Code Sec. 5.02.060

LOS ANGELES CITY. The ordinance provides no administrative relief to the injured party. If an injured party who is a resident of the City files an action in court, or if the City Attorney or Ethics Commission does so on the injured party’s behalf, the injured party’s recovery is limited to 50 percent of “an amount not more than... \$5,000 per violation...”; the remaining 50 percent to be paid to the City. The court may also order injunctive relief. An injured party who prevails in court may also be awarded “that party’s costs of litigation, including reasonable attorney fees.” See Los Angeles Municipal Code Sec. 49.5.16B.

SAN DIEGO CITY: The ordinance does not provide any remedy for retaliation against complainants or witnesses. San Diego Muni. Code Sec. 26.0415.

APPENDIX D: Controller's Notice Of Whistleblower Protections



CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER

Ben Rosenfield
Controller

Monique Zmuda
Deputy Controller

Whistleblower Program - Protection from Retaliation

PROTECTION OF WHISTLEBLOWERS – RETALIATION PROHIBITED

Who is protected from retaliation?

Any current or former City officer or employee who believes s/he has been the subject of retaliation in violation of Article IV of the San Francisco Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code (Code) may file a complaint with the Ethics Commission, which shall investigate or refer the complaint.

What is "retaliation" under the Code?

The Code defines retaliation as the "termination, demotion, suspension, or other similar adverse employment action" taken against any city officer or employee for having participated in good faith in any of the following protected activities:

- Filing a complaint with the Ethics Commission, Controller, District Attorney, or City Attorney, or filing a written complaint with the complainant's department, alleging that a city officer or employee engaged in *improper governmental activity*.
- Filing a complaint with the Controller's Whistleblower Program.
- Cooperating with an investigation of a complaint conducted under the Code.

"Improper government activity" includes the following:

- Violating local campaign finance, lobbying, conflict of interests, or governmental ethics laws, regulations, or rules.
- Violating the California Penal Code by misusing city resources.
- Creating a specified and substantial danger to public health or safety by failing to perform duties required by the officer or employee's city position.
- Abusing his or her city position to advance a private interest.

What protections are provided to a whistleblower?

You are protected from adverse employment action if you filed a complaint as defined above or cooperated with an investigation of a complaint under the Code.

What should I do if I believe I have been subject to retaliation?

If you believe you have suffered an adverse employment action because of a complaint you filed as listed in Code Section 4.115(a) or because of your cooperation with an investigation under the Code, you must file a complaint with the Ethics Commission within two years after the date of the alleged retaliation. (Code Section 4.115(b)(1))

How do I report that I have been retaliated against?

It is strongly recommended that you speak with an Ethics Commission investigator to determine whether the matter about which you are complaining is within the Ethics Commission's jurisdiction. If it is not within the Ethics Commission's jurisdiction, staff will refer you to the most appropriate agency.

To speak with an investigator, please call the Ethics Commission at (415) 252-3100.

More information regarding filing a complaint with the Ethics Commission may be found at:
<http://www.sfethics.org/ethics/2009/05/complaints.html#j>

Endnotes

¹ 2013-14 San Francisco Civil Grand Jury, *Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense* (July 2014), p. 13.

² San Francisco Campaign & Gov't Conduct Code, Article IV, Chapter 1, Sec. 4.100, *et seq* (rev. 2008) (hereafter "Whistleblower Protection Ordinance" or "WPO").

³ *Id.*, Subsection 4.115(a).

⁴ San Francisco Administrative Code (hereafter "Admin. Code") §§ 16.400 through 16.404. See Ordinance 124-89, Approved 4/26/1989.

⁵ Admin. Code §§ 16.400, 16.401.

⁶ The Improper Government Activities Ordinance forbade City officers or employees to retaliate by "promising to confer or not to confer, or conferring or not conferring, any benefit; effecting, or threatening to effect, any reprisal; or taking, or directing others to take, or recommending, or approving any personnel action, including, but not limited to, appointment, promotion, transfer, assignment, performance evaluation, suspension, or other disciplinary action...." *Id.*, Subsection 16.402(b).

⁷ *Id.*, Sec. 16.402.

⁸ San Francisco Charter (hereafter "Charter"), Appendix C, Sec. C3.699-11, item 7.

⁹ See Ordinance 71-00, Approved 4/28/2000, at p. 151ff.

¹⁰ See WPO, Sec. 4.105 (2000).

¹¹ Under the new law, City officers or employees were forbidden to intimidate, threaten, coerce, or interfere with any individual because that individual had filed such a complaint, or cooperated in its investigation. They were also forbidden to discipline or otherwise retaliate against any City officer, employee or applicant for City employment for the same reason. See *id.*, Subsection 4.115(a) (2000).

¹² *Id.*, Sec. 4.105 (2000).

¹³ See Ordinance 29-02, Approved 3/15/2002.

¹⁴ See WPO, Subsection 4.115(a) (rev. 2002).

¹⁵ To qualify for protection, a disclosure had to charge a City officer or employee with violating local laws regulating campaign finance, lobbying, conflicts of interest or governmental ethics, violating the California Penal Code by misusing City resources; creating a specified and substantial danger to public health or safety by failing to perform duties required by the officer or employee's City position; or abusing his or her City position to advance a private interest. Whistleblowers were also protected if they cooperated in the investigation of such a complaint. *Id.*

¹⁶ Specifically, it granted the Controller "authority to receive individual complaints concerning the quality and delivery of government services, wasteful and inefficient City government practices, misuse of City government funds, and improper activities by City government officers and employees." Charter, Appendix F, Subsection F1.107(a).

¹⁷ *Id.*, Subsection F1.107(c).

¹⁸ In 2008 the Board of Supervisors passed an ordinance expanding the list of complaints covered under the anti-retaliation provision to include those filed with the Controller's Whistleblower Program. Otherwise, it made no substantive changes to the anti-retaliation provisions. See Ordinance No. 205-08, approved 9/19/08; WPO, Subsection 4.115(b) (2008).

¹⁹ *Id.*, Sec. 4.107.

²⁰ See *Whistling in the Dark: The San Francisco Whistleblower Program, 2010-2011 San Francisco Civil Grand Jury*.

²¹ See *id.*, Subsection 4.115(b); Charter, Section C3.699-13.

²² See "Ethics Commission Regulations For Investigations And Enforcement Proceedings" effective July 5, 1997; as amended through March 29, 2013.

²³ *Id.*, Sec. IV.C

²⁴ *Id.*, Sec. VII. If Commission staff concludes that probable cause does not exist they must notify the Commission of that fact, and the Commission remains free to consider the matter on the motion of any one of its members. *Id.*, Sec. VI.A.

-
- ²⁵ *Id.*, Sec. II.L.
- ²⁶ *Id.*, Sec. VIII.A.4.
- ²⁷ *Id.*, Sec. IX.
- ²⁸ See the Commission's "Enforcement Summaries" at <http://www.sfethics.org/ethics/2009/05/enforcement.html>, (complaints resolved 11/14/2011 and 7/23/2012).
- ²⁹ See WPO, Subsection 4.115(a). Also protected are disclosures made while providing any information or otherwise cooperating with an investigation of such complaints. *Id.*
- ³⁰ *Id.*, Subsection 4.115(a). If disclosures are made through the Controller's Whistleblower Hotline, the definition of a protected disclosure is somewhat more inclusive. It covers disclosures concerning "misuse of City funds, improper activities by City officers and employees, deficiencies in the quality and delivery of government services, and wasteful and inefficient City government practices." *Id.*, Subsection 4.107(a).
- ³¹ See *id.*, Subsection 4.115(a).
- ³² 2013-14 San Francisco Civil Grand Jury, *Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense* (July 2014), p. 13.
- ³³ See WPO, Subsection 4.115(b).
- ³⁴ See Cal. Evid. Code Sec. 115; Witkin, *California Evidence* (5th Ed., 2012), at 175.
- ³⁵ Charter, Sec. C3.699-13.
- ³⁶ See WPO, Subsection 4.115(b)(i).
- ³⁷ See Witkin, *California Evidence* (5th Ed., 2012) at 207-08.
- ³⁸ See "CPI Inflation Calculator," published by United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, on its web site at http://www.bls.gov/data/inflation_calculator.htm
- ³⁹ Cal. Labor Code § 1102.5 and sections that follow.
- ⁴⁰ See Cal. Labor Code §§ 98.6(b)(1), 1102.5. See also Cal. Government Code § 53296 (additional protections, applicable only to local agency employees).
- ⁴¹ Under some labor contracts minor grievances are handled at the departmental level. These were not included in the search.
- ⁴² See Charter, Appendix F, Subsection F1.107(c).
- ⁴³ See Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/protect>
- ⁴⁴ See WPO, Subsection 4.115(e).
- ⁴⁵ See Charter, Appendix C, Subsection C3.699-13(a).
- ⁴⁶ California Government Code § 53296 was enacted in 1986, and last amended in 1994. California Labor Code § 1102.5 was enacted in 1937, and while additional protections were added in 2014, its former provisions were substantially as described above.
- ⁴⁷ Charter, Sec. F1.107(c)
- ⁴⁸ Charter, Appendix F, Sec. F1.107(c)
- ⁴⁹ See WPO, Subsection 4.115(a)
- ⁵⁰ See 5 U.S.C. §§ 1214, 1221, 2302; Cal. Gov. C. §§ 8547.2, 8547.3, 8547.8, 19683(a)
- ⁵¹ See Los Angeles Municipal Code Sec. 49.5.4, 49.5.16B; San Diego Muni. Code Sec. 26.402, 26.0415, 26.0421, 26.0439; San Jose City Policy Manual, Sec. 1.1.4; Oakland Muni. Code Sec. 2.38.020 - 2.38.020, 2.38.110; Santa Clara County Code Sec. A25-751, A25-753; Alameda County Admin. Code Sec. 3.52.020 - 3.52.050; Los Angeles County Code Sec. 5.02.060 Neither Sacramento nor Fresno has an ethics commission or its equivalent, or any whistleblower protection ordinance or policy that the Jury could discern.
- ⁵² See Charter, Sec. C3.699-11, item 6.
- ⁵³ See *id.*, Sec. 15.102.
- ⁵⁴ See "Ethics Commission Regulations For Investigations And Enforcement Proceedings", at p. 2 ("violation of law" defined).
- ⁵⁵ We suggest a two-step process. If, after a public hearing, the Commission finds that retaliation has occurred, it would issue a "cease and desist" order requiring the agency or department that took the action to retroactively cancel it, expunge personnel records related to the action, and restore any

back pay, service credit or other benefits that were lost as a consequence. Such orders are authorized under Charter Section C3.699(c)(i). At the same time, the Commission would provide the employing agency with an opportunity to nullify this order, by showing that the acting official reasonably believed that the action was justified, based on facts separate and apart from the complainant's whistleblowing. This would respect the "reservation of authority" set forth at Subsection 4.115(d)(ii) of the WPO.

Introduction Form

By a Member of the Board of Supervisors or the Mayor

Time stamp
or meeting date

I hereby submit the following item for introduction (select only one):

- 1. For reference to Committee. (An Ordinance, Resolution, Motion, or Charter Amendment)
- 2. Request for next printed agenda Without Reference to Committee.
- 3. Request for hearing on a subject matter at Committee.
- 4. Request for letter beginning "Supervisor [] inquires"
- 5. City Attorney request.
- 6. Call File No. [] from Committee.
- 7. Budget Analyst request (attach written motion).
- 8. Substitute Legislation File No. []
- 9. Reactivate File No. []
- 10. Question(s) submitted for Mayoral Appearance before the BOS on []

Please check the appropriate boxes. The proposed legislation should be forwarded to the following:

- Small Business Commission Youth Commission Ethics Commission
- Planning Commission Building Inspection Commission

Note: For the Imperative Agenda (a resolution not on the printed agenda), use a Imperative Form.

Sponsor(s):


Clerk of the Board

Subject:

Board Response - Civil Grand Jury - San Francisco's Whistleblower Protection Ordinance is in Need of Change

The text is listed below or attached:

Resolution responding to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court on the findings and recommendations contained in the 2014-2015 Civil Grand Jury Report entitled, "San Francisco's Whistleblower Protection Ordinance is in Need of Change;" and urging the Mayor to cause the implementation of accepted findings and recommendations through his/her department heads and through the development of the annual budget.

Signature of Sponsoring Supervisor: 

For Clerk's Use Only: