

From: [Anonymous](#)
To: [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: A Slate of SOTF Recommendations
Date: Wednesday, January 20, 2021 5:32:10 AM
Attachments: [signature.asc](#)

Obviously, I am a pro-transparency advocate, so I'll give my pro-transparency recommendations for your consideration after now having a chance to do research on the candidates. The following analysis assumes that recently recommended Seat 4 Padmanaban will be successfully approved by the Board.

At the moment, the 4 non-expired SOTF seats have:

- 3 women and 1 man, and
- 3 new members (Dean Schmidt - attorney, Jennifer Wong - technologist, Jaya Padmanaban - journalist) and 1 member with experience (Lila LaHood - journalist/publisher).

If gender parity and an expertise/freshness balance is a goal, you can recommend 4 men and 2 women, and 3 continuing and 3 new members.

This would give 5 men, 5 women, 4 experienced, and 6 new members, in total. (Seat 3 remains unfilled)

You can also add both a City employee and a member of the public who has requested records before - each may be risky on their own, but together add a diverse perspective.

On that basis, I recommend:

1. Appointing new members:
 - Laurie **Jones Neighbors** (re: helping bridge the digital divide and bring public access to underserved communities)
 - ADA Ryan **Khojasteh** (City employee perspective, young person, and attorney)
 - Kai **Forsley** (records requesters' perspective, Civil grand jury investigative experience, librarian)
2. Reappointing Chris **Hyland**, Bruce **Wolfe**, and Matt **Yankee**. They have a deep understanding of the policy and technology issues from their own work and past cases, and all have years of public service. Furthermore, at least one appointee (Wolfe) must have a disability. (Disclosure: all 3 have obviously voted for and against various cases I have brought before them)
3. Seeking legal advice about the effect, if any, of appointing Khojasteh.

Finally, I did not initially understand the vocal (and written) outcry at the first hearing against Mr. Pilpel (I wasn't around back before 2016). I have since researched his prior actions not only on this Task Force but also at other City public bodies. **SOTF members must not be permitted to both be a third-party neutral in a public hearing at SOTF and also be an advocate defending a party on the same issue before a different tribunal like the Ethics Commission when their position loses at SOTF.** For example, would members of your Board vote on a CEQA appeals hearing, and then, if the member is in the minority losing position, now go to Court and be a party's advocate? If a three-judge Federal appeals panel hears a case and a judge loses in a 2-to-1 vote does the judge in the minority now go the Supreme Court to advocate against their peers? Of course not. SOTF rulings are enforceable

at Superior Court, but actions like Pilpel's create the appearance of impropriety and conflict of interest that may invalidate those rulings.

As I've previously described, apart from Mr. Pilpel's prior inappropriate prior actions as a City official, his policy positions would create lawsuits against the City. Contrary to Mr. Pilpel's beliefs, the City can neither discriminate against anonymous meeting attendees/requesters nor subjectively determine which requests or meetings are more important vs less important. Around 5-6 anonymous voices (including me) are present at SOTF, and all of us would have to sue the City instead - that means the City would owe attorneys fees and court costs if we win. At least for me, I have a track record of winning public records cases, and as long as they go through SOTF without requiring Court intervention, the City owes me no money.

=====

NOTE: 1. If you are a public official: I intend that these communications all be disclosable public records, and I will not hold in confidence any of your messages, notwithstanding any notices to the contrary. 2. Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. 3. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. 4. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

From: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Fwd: In Support of the Reappointment of Bruce Wolfe to the Sunshine Task Force
Date: Thursday, January 21, 2021 5:04:56 PM

For public record. Thanks. — Connie

Connie Chan
District 1 Supervisor
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

From: Kim-Shree Maufas <kimshreesf@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 21, 2021 4:37:59 PM
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>
Cc: Bruce Wolfe <brucewolfe.sf@gmail.com>
Subject: In Support of the Reappointment of Bruce Wolfe to the Sunshine Task Force

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

Dearest Chair Peskin and Supervisors Mandelman & Chan.
(Happy New Year and 2021 Happy Inauguration Day! Hoping that my message finds you & your families healthy and safe.)

My name is Kim-Shree Maufas and I'm a former School Board Member and longtime SF Resident. I'm also a strong and ardent supporter of the San Francisco Sunshine Task Force. I've recently come to discover that Mr. Bruce Wolfe is up for reappointment to the Task Force this year and I'm extending my wholehearted support of his reappointment.

If you're even remotely privy to the Task Force's history in our fair City, you'll know that it isn't any fairy tale to say the least. Over the years, since the Task Forces' inception, there have been so many efforts by so many different actors who have tried to either 1) shut it down, 2) deny its mandated efforts to "sunshine" information to the public, 3) remove vocal members, 4) have forthright members censured, 5) randomly cancel its meetings, and in so many other ways **STOP** the Task Force from doing the "will of the people" here in San Francisco - which is essentially to **sunshine** and "protect the public's interest in open government and to carry out the duties enumerated in **Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code**" (preamble at <https://sfgov.org/sunshine/>).

Mr. Wolfe embodies the noble qualities needed to be a member of this trusted committee in volunteering to ensure that everyday San Francisco Citizens' interests in open and transparent government are sought out and met, no matter how many trials

and tribulations must be overcome. He is knowledgeable in the 67th Chapter's administrative code, patient with people, and wise in his considerations. And honestly, I'm just so, so grateful that Bruce wants to continue to do this work on our behalf (*thank you, sir*). Especially, when I know that he, himself, has experienced some of the aforementioned examples of member suppression and retaliation.

Please do not hesitate to reappoint Mr. Bruce Wolfe to another term on San Francisco's Sunshine Task Force for the good of all who reside in the City and County of San Francisco, California, including myself.

Sincerely,
Kim-Shree Maufas
District 9 Resident
Lover of San Francisco (*my family's home town*)

"The world is a dangerous place to live; not because of the people who are evil, but because of the people who don't do anything about it." ~Albert Einstein

Confidentiality Notice:

This e-mail and any attachments may contain confidential information intended solely for the use of the addressee. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, any distribution, copying, or use of this e-mail or its attachments is prohibited. If you received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately by e-mail and delete this message and any copies. Thank you