

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Department Required to Respond	2014 Responses (implementation)	2014 Response Text
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R1: The Jury recommends a contract with the Fair Political Practices Commission for at least a two-year pilot basis to enforce both state and related San Francisco law violations.	Ethics Commission	Will not be implemented	The Ethics Commission sees no need for this and it is possible that the Charter would prohibit such a contract. Currently, the FPPC is not allowed to do this under state law (a pilot program exists between the FPPC and the County of San Bernardino, but this is the only jurisdiction allowed under existing statute.)
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R1: The Jury recommends a contract with the Fair Political Practices Commission for at least a two-year pilot basis to enforce both state and related San Francisco law violations.	Board of Supervisors	will not be implemented	While the Board of Supervisors does not have the authority to implement this recommendation, the Board broadly agrees that such an arrangement would likely improve enforcement, and encourages the Ethics Commission and other elected officials to pursue it.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R1: The Jury recommends a contract with the Fair Political Practices Commission for at least a two-year pilot basis to enforce both state and related San Francisco law violations.	City Attorney	City Attorney has no authority to implement	The City's Attorney Office does not have the authority to implement R1. If requested, the City's Attorney's Office will assist the Ethics Commission with implementing this recommendation, though his recommendation may first require an amendment to state law, See Cal. Govt. Code Section 83123.5
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R1: The Jury recommends a contract with the Fair Political Practices Commission for at least a two-year pilot basis to enforce both state and related San Francisco law violations.	District Attorney	The Recommendation will not be implemented	Will not be implemented by the District Attorney. The District Attorney has no role in contracting on behalf of the City. Additionally, the enforcement authority of the Ethics Commission is governed by the San Francisco Charter (See Section 3.699-12)
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R2: The Board of Supervisors should request an independent audit by the City Attorney to determine whether prohibited contributions were forfeited to the City as required by law.	Board of Supervisors	will not be implemented	While the Board supports this recommendation, implementing it will require an individual Supervisor to propose an audit, which should be conducted by the Controller's City Auditor Division with assistance from the City Attorney. While any Supervisor can undertake such an effort, collectively the Board cannot preemptively guarantee one of its members will choose to do so.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R2: The Board of Supervisors should request an independent audit by the City Attorney to determine whether prohibited contributions were forfeited to the City as required by law.	City Attorney	Policy matter for the BOS	R1 is a policy matter for the Board of Supervisors(BOS). If requested, the City Attorney's Office will assist the BOS with implementing this recommendation (assuming sufficient budget authorization is provided to the City Attorney's Office to cover the cost of review.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Recommendation 3: The Jury recommends that the Ethics Commission and the Board of Supervisors act to enhance the Citizen's Right of Action to enforce all of the City's ethics laws, with an award of attorney fees and a share of any penalties going to the City for a successful filer, as was provided by Proposition J.	Ethics Commission	Will be implemented	The Ethics Commission will investigate to determine whether an enhancement to a Citizens Right of Action would accomplish the further assurance to the public that the laws would enforce.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R3: The Jury recommends that the Ethics Commission and the Board of Supervisors act to enhance the Citizen's Right of Action to enforce all of the City's ethics laws, with an award of attorney fees and a share of any penalties going to the City for a successful filer, as was provided by Proposition J.	City Attorney	Policy mater for the Ethics Commission, BOS and Mayor	R3 is a policy matter for the Ethics Commission, The BOS and the Mayor. If requested, the City Attorney's Office will assist the Ethics Commission, the BOS and the Mayor with implementing this recommendation.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R3: The Jury recommends that the Ethics Commission and the Board of Supervisors act to enhance the Citizen's Right of Action to enforce all of the City's ethics laws, with an award of attorney fees and a share of any penalties going to the City for a successful filer, as was provided by Proposition J.	Board of Supervisors	will not be implemented	The Board of Supervisors is not convinced that the existing private right of action needs to be broadened.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R4: That contract approval forms be converted to a format which allows searches by the name of the official, by the name of the contractor, the value of contracts and the date the contract was signed. Behested payments information should be filed electronically in a format that allows for searches and data aggregation. Form 700s should be formatted to allow data to be searched on income sources, outside employment, gift sources and travel.	Ethics Commission	Partially implemented/partially will not be implemented.	Converting each type of form into such a format requires expensive development of software platforms. This particular recommendation would be extremely expensive. Over time, the Commission plans to develop such platforms for most if not all filings it administers. Lack of funding for development means that the addition of the various forms will be done as recourses are made available. It should be noted, for example, that 2014 is the first time ever that all Form 700 financial disclosure filed with the Ethics Commission had to be submitted electronically. This was an important, but technically difficult step. Since there is no specified state electronic schema for these forms, creating a searchable database would be risky as it might not conform to state standards when they are eventually promulgated. But it is a desirable goal and will be accomplished eventually. Absent the proper software, data would have to be entered manually. This is unrealistic as the cost would be higher in terms of staff time and attendant issues would arise such as transfer error. The Commission has already made great progress in moving its many filings into electronic databases, and there should be no doubt that this will continue. SF is ahead of the majority of jurisdictions in this areas. For example, The New York Times recently noted that the Federal Elections Commission takes weeks and in some cases more than a month to process campaign finance filings of federal candidates, whereas in SF this information is processed in matter of minutes. (Note: this recommendation includes Behested Payment Forms, which are not filed with the Ethics Commission.)
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R4: That contract approval forms be converted to a format which allows searches by the name of the official, by the name of the contractor, the value of contracts and the date the contract was signed. Behested payments information should be filed electronically in a format that allows for searches and data aggregation. Form 700s should be formatted to allow data to be searched on income sources, outside employment, gift sources and travel.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Will be implemented partially	Converting each type of form into such a format requires expensive development of software platforms. This particular recommendation would be extremely expensive. Over time, the Commission plans to develop such platforms for most if not all filings it administers. Lack of funding for development means that the addition of various forms will be done as resources are made available. It should be noted, for example, that 2014 is the first time ever that all Form 700 financial disclosures field with the Ethics Commission had to be submitted electronically. This was an important, bit technically difficult step. Since there is no specified state electronic schema for these forms, creating a searchable database would be risky as it might not confirm to state standers wen they are eventually promulgated. But it is a desirable goal and will be accomplished eventually. Absent the proper software, data would have to be entered manually. This is unrealistic as the cost would be higher in terms of staff time and attendant issues. The Commission has already made great progress un moving its many filings into electronic database, as there should be no doubt that this will continue. SF is ahead of the majority of jurisdictions in this area. For example, the New York Times recently noted that the Federal Elections Commission takes weeks and in some cases more than a month to process campaign finance filings of federal candidates, whereas in SF this information is processes in a matter of minutes. (Note: Behested payment forms are not filed with the Ethics Commission)

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Department Required to Respond	2014 Responses (implementation)	2014 Response Text
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R4: That contract approval forms be converted to a format which allows searches by the name of the official, by the name of the contractor, the value of contracts and the date the contract was signed. Behested payments information should be filed electronically in a format that allows for searches and data aggregation. Form 700s should be formatted to allow data to be searched on income sources, outside employment, gift sources and travel.	Chief Data Officer	Recommendation partially implemented(recommendation will not be implemented for behested payments which are not filed with the Ethics Commission)	The Ethics Commission notes that they plan on implementing this recommendation over time as recourses become available. Converting each type of form into a searchable format requires the development of software platforms. Absent the proper software, data would have to be entered manually. Manual entry is an unattractive option for the Ethics Commission due o the cost of staff time and the potential for transfer error. It should be noted that 2014 is the first time that all Form 700 financial disclosures filed with the Ethics Commission had to be submitted electronically. Since there is no specified state electronic schema for these forms, creating a searchable database would be risky as it might not conform to state standards when they are eventually promulgated. SF is aged of the majority of jurisdiction in this area and processes filings in a matter of minutes. The Federal Election Commission takes weeks and in some cases more than a month to process campaign finance filings of federal candidates.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R5: The Ethics Commission work to develop a common format database for data posted to DataSF, initially aiming to combine campaign, lobbying and Form 700 data.	Ethics Commission	Partially implemented/partially awaiting state action.	The Commission notes that the campaign and lobbyist data are already available in a common database format on DataSF. Form 700 is not on DataSF because a state data schema has yet to be defined by the Fair Political Practices Commission and the Commission will revisit this issue by February 2015.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R5: The Ethics Commission work to develop a common format database for data posted to DataSF, initially aiming to combine campaign, lobbying and Form 700 data.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Partially implemented/partially awaiting state action.	The Commission notes that the campaign and lobbyist data are already available in a common database format on DataSF. Form 700 is not on DataSF because a state data schema has yet to be defined by the Fair Political Practices Commission and the Commission will revisit this issue by February 2015.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R5: The Ethics Commission work to develop a common format database for data posted to DataSF, initially aiming to combine campaign, lobbying and Form 700 data.	Chief Data Officer	Recommendation partially implemented-awaiting state action.	The Ethics Commission and its Executive Director note in their response that campaign and lobbyist data are already available in a common database format on DataSF. For 700 data is not on DataSF because the state data schema has yet to be defined by the Fair Political Practices Commission.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R6a: The Ethics Commission should proactively look at ways to track back 501(c) (3) &(4) money to real donors before the start of campaigns where this kind of money will be important; its true source should be identified.	Ethics Commission	Newly implemented	Effective July 1, 2014, a new state law requires "Multipurpose Organizations" including nonprofits and federal and out-of-state PACs spending on state and local elections to report as political committees and disclose those donors who are the sources of funds used for political purposes. However, absent qualifying as a campaign committee under state law, nonprofit organizations appear to be generally entitled to keep their donors confidential (ref. 26 USC 6103/6104/7431; NAACP vs Alabama, 357 US 449 [1958])
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R6b: The Ethics Commission should propose ordinance amendments to require disclaimers in mailings, ads, door hangers and other voter outreach materials funded by committees whose individual donors are not identified to the satisfaction of a reasonable person which state "this is paid for by (insert organization name) funded by anonymous donors in this campaign cycle,"	Ethics Commission	Requires further analysis	The Ethics Commission requires further analysis of this recommendation and will include a discussion of the merits as part of its upcoming consideration of a package of proposals for changes in the Campaign Finance Reform Ordinance (CFRO) anticipated later this year.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R7: The Ethics Commission should make guides and educational materials available in the major languages as is done in other City Departments.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Will be implemented	The Commission will make guides in education materials as is done in other departments.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R8: The lobbyist ordinance should be reviewed and amended to provide clearer public disclosure of contacts with City officials regarding the interests of clients, and who should be required to register and make disclosures.	Ethics Commission	Currently under implementation	The new definitions and provisions have been drafted into regulations by the Ethics Commission staff and will be reviewed by the Commission at its regular July 2014 nettings. These new provisions and regulations should be in effect by the end of the calendar year.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R8: The lobbyist ordinance should be reviewed and amended to provide clearer public disclosure of contacts with City officials regarding the interests of clients, and who should be required to register and make disclosures.	Board of Supervisors	has been implemented	The Board of Supervisors this year approved Ordinance No. 98-14, which significantly strengthened lobbyist disclosure requirements.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R9: The requirement for disclosure of all expenditures aimed at influencing City Hall decisions should be reinstated in the law with full public disclosure.	Ethics Commission	Will be implemented should the BOS adopt a measure	The Commission will ensure that any such measure is enforced. Within the next 12 months the Ethics Commission will consider re-examining whether or not there is a need to make further changes to the lobbying ordinance to enhance public disclosure of expenditures aimed at influencing City Hall decisions.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R9: The requirement for disclosure of all expenditures aimed at influencing City Hall decisions should be reinstated in the law with full public disclosure.	Board of Supervisors	will not be implemented	The lobbyist ordinance was recently strengthened by the Board of Supervisors, and the expenditure lobbyist definition was not reinstated, in part because of the history of this provision, as outlined by the Ethics Commission response
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R10: Work of "strategic advisors" that provide guidance on winning approvals from City officials and/or the public should be reviewed by the Ethics Commission for possible inclusion in the lobbyist registration and/or campaign consultant law.	Ethics Commission	Will not be implemented	Regulating activity that is not lobbying and that is not campaign consulting would appear to be outside of the Ethics Commission's jurisdiction since it would not involve government contacts or campaign activity.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R11: The Ethics Commission in conjunction with the City Attorney should develop a policy to ensure preservation of e-mails and text messages consistent with preservation of other public records. The policy, along with policies on preservation of public records, should be made available for public comment. Once it is completed and published it should be made available on City Attorney and Ethics Commission web pages that lists each Department, its policy, and how to obtain documents.	City Attorney	Policy matter for the Ethics Commission	R11 is a policy matter for the Ethics Commission and other appropriate City agencies, such as the BOS and the Mayor. If requested, the City Attorney's Office will assist the Ethics Commission and other appropriate City Agencies with the implementation of their recommendation, likely through legislation that would establish a Citywide protocol regarding preservation of public records.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R11: The Ethics Commission in conjunction with the City Attorney should develop a policy to ensure preservation of e-mails and text messages consistent with preservation of other public records. The policy, along with policies on preservation of public records, should be made available for public comment. Once it is completed and published it should be made available on City Attorney and Ethics Commission web pages that lists each Department, its policy, and how to obtain documents.	Ethics Commission	Requires further analysis	Needs further analysis subject to an upcoming Supreme Court ruling. The City's document retention policy does not appear hazy. The Administrative Code requires each department to have its own policy and schedule regarding retention. The concept regarding the regulation of text messages is understandable, but compares to the regulation of telephone calls. The process for overseeing these activities seems untenable and would likely require increasingly resources, although it should be the subject of continued discussion. The questions and issues in the area of private texts and private e-mails are currently under debate in the California court system; the most current ruling states that these items are not in the public domain. However, the issue is now to be heard by the California Supreme Court; the subsequent ruling should dictate the City's course of action.

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Department Required to Respond	2014 Responses (implementation)	2014 Response Text
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R11: The Ethics Commission in conjunction with the City Attorney should develop a policy to ensure preservation of e-mails and text messages consistent with preservation of other public records. The policy, along with policies on preservation of public records, should be made available for public comment. Once it is completed and published it should be made available on City Attorney and Ethics Commission web pages that lists each Department, its policy, and how to obtain documents.	Sunshine Ordinance Task Force	Requires further analysis	The SOTF in conjunction with the City Attorneys Office and Ethics Commission, should develop policies to ensure the preservation of emails and text messages consistent with preservation of other public records. Before adoption, these policies would be made available for public comment. The finalized policies would then be sent to all City agencies, boards, commissions, and departments and made available on the SOTFs website. Each City agency, board, commission, and department website should include, in a similar section, the applicable Record Retention Policy and Schedule and information about how to request public records, including contact information and forms, if applicable. The SOTF, through the Compliance and Amendments Committee and the Education, Outreach and Training Committee, intends to review these issues in he next 6 months. In addition, it should be noted that the California Government Code Section 34090 states that the destruction of records less than two years old is not authorized. Section 8.3 of SF Admin Code, however, authorizes destruction of records less than two years if this would not be detrimental to the City and County or defeat any public purpose. This section of the Admin Code should be amended to comply with California Government Code Section 34090.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R11: The Ethics Commission in conjunction with the City Attorney should develop a policy to ensure preservation of e-mails and text messages consistent with preservation of other public records. The policy, along with policies on preservation of public records, should be made available for public comment. Once it is completed and published it should be made available on City Attorney and Ethics Commission web pages that lists each Department, its policy, and how to obtain documents.	Board of Supervisors	will not be implemented	by nature, such policy changes would be beyond the jurisdiction of the Board of Supervisors. The Board looks forward to upcoming work on this issue by the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, the Ethics Commission and the City Attorney.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R12: The Jury recommends that the Ethics Commission and the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force review departmental web sites for compliance and notify non-compliant departments to immediately post their sources of outside funding, or face a show-cause before the Ethics Commission on why the information has not been posted.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Will be partially implemented	The Commission Director will direct staff to notify all departments to remind officials and employees to follow this requirement and ensure that such postings are easy to locate on departmental website.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R12: The Jury recommends that the Ethics Commission and the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force review departmental web sites for compliance and notify non-compliant departments to immediately post their sources of outside funding, or face a show-cause before the Ethics Commission on why the information has not been posted.	Sunshine Ordinance Task Force	Requires further analysis	The SOFT, through its Compliance and Amendments Committee and/or its Education, Outreach, and Training Committee, shall review the websites of each City agency, board, commission, and department for compliance and shall develop a model for content required by Sunshine Ordinance Section 67.29-6. This said, the SOTF is mindful of its limited resources to regularly review and motor each departmental website for compliance with this provision alone and to notify non-compliant departments. The SOYF is also skeptical that the Ethics Commission has the power to order a show-cause hearing in the manner that the Jury recommends.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R13: All violations of departmental Statements of Incompatible Activities should be disclosed to the Ethics Commission and posted on the Commission's web site.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Will not be implemented	The Commission's position is that this cannot be implemented when it violates employee privacy rights. Additionally, only a narrow range of five types of employee misconduct is disclosable, and even then ONLY when such matters are "confirmed". The "Good Government Guide" indicates that the process for determining if such matters are confirmed is "unclear". Further, the Guide states that "The privacy issues pertaining to these types of personnel records can be complex, and other consideration in addition to privacy, such as the need to maintain effective investigations, may be relevant". The categories not exempt from disclosures are: 1.) personal dishonesty, 2.) misappropriation of public funds, resources or benefits, 3.) unlawful discrimination against another on the basis of status, 4.) abuse of authority, and 5.) violence. The disclosable categories are not necessarily addressed in each departmental SIA. Therefore, in order to carry out this recommendation, the Ethics Commission would have to take each reported case of employee misconduct, analyze whether it meets the disclosable threshold under local law, and then compare it with the requirements of the individual departmental SIA. There are at least 53 different departments SIAs in existence; administering this proposal would be both difficult and incredibly time consuming and possibly incite a legal challenge.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R13: All violations of departmental Statements of Incompatible Activities should be disclosed to the Ethics Commission and posted on the Commission's web site.	Ethics Commission	Will not be implemented	The Commission's position is that this cannot be implemented when it violates employee privacy rights. Additionally, only a narrow range of five types of employee misconduct is disclosable, and even then ONLY when such matters are "confirmed". The "Good Government Guide" indicates that the process for determining if such matters are confirmed is "unclear". Further, the Guide states that "The privacy issues pertaining to these types of personnel records can be complex, and other consideration in addition to privacy, such as the need to maintain effective investigations, may be relevant". The categories not exempt from disclosures are: 1.) personal dishonesty, 2.) misappropriation of public funds, resources or benefits, 3.) unlawful discrimination against another on the basis of status, 4.) abuse of authority, and 5.) violence. The disclosable categories are not necessarily addressed in each departmental SIA. Therefore, in order to carry out this recommendation, the Ethics Commission would have to take each reported case of employee misconduct, analyze whether it meets the disclosable threshold under local law, and then compare it with the requirements of the individual departmental SIA. There are at least 53 different departments SIAs in existence; administering this proposal would be both difficult and incredibly time consuming and possibly incite a legal challenge.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R14a: The Ethics Commission should continue to routinely notify all non-filers of their obligation within 30 days of the state filing deadline.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Implemented	The Commission already does this.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R14a: The Ethics Commission should continue to routinely notify all non-filers of their obligation within 30 days of the state filing deadline.	Ethics Commission	Implemented	The Commission already does this.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R14b: The Ethics Commission should recommend dismissal for any officer or employee who fails to file by the 90 day deadline for referral to the Fair Political Practices Commission	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Will be implemented in amended form	If someone has failed to file within 90 days, the Ethics Commission will recommend to the appointing authority suspension of that person until they have filed.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R14b: The Ethics Commission should recommend dismissal for any officer or employee who fails to file by the 90 day deadline for referral to the Fair Political Practices Commission	Ethics Commission	Will be implemented in amended form	If someone has failed to file within 90 days, the Ethics Commission will recommend to the appointing authority suspension of that person until they have filed.

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Department Required to Respond	2014 Responses (implementation)	2014 Response Text
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R14c: The Ethics Commission should recommend dismissal for any officer or employee who files a Statement of Economic Interest that is inaccurate and relevant to the position they hold.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Will be implemented in amended form	If someone has failed to file within 90 days, the Ethics Commission will recommend to the appointing authority suspension of that person until they have filed.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R14c: The Ethics Commission should recommend dismissal for any officer or employee who files a Statement of Economic Interest that is inaccurate and relevant to the position they hold.	Ethics Commission	Will be implemented in amended form	If someone has failed to file within 90 days, the Ethics Commission will recommend to the appointing authority suspension of that person until they have filed.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R14d: Now that all Form 700 filers file electronically, the Ethics Commission should propose that they be filed with them as well as with the Department filing officer.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Will be implemented in the future	The Ethics Commission has already discussed doing this and it is an eventual goal. 2014 is the first year that Forms 700 filed with the Commission have been filed exclusively electronically. The Director notes that while this process was successful and resulted in only five non-filers as of this writing, it was also difficult to convert the many filers to a new process. The Commission needs a few years to settle into the new process but would like to introduce a change wherein all Form 700 filers in the City file directly with the Ethics Commission electronically. We envision doing this in the foreseeable future; a set timeframe is not possible because it will largely be determined by available funding.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R14d: Now that all Form 700 filers file electronically, the Ethics Commission should propose that they be filed with them as well as with the Department filing officer.	Ethics Commission	Will be implemented in the future	The Ethics Commission has already discussed doing this and it is an eventual goal. 2014 is the first year that Forms 700 filed with the Commission have been filed exclusively electronically. The Director notes that while this process was successful and resulted in only five non-filers as of this writing, it was also difficult to convert the many filers to a new process. The Commission needs a few years to settle into the new process but would like to introduce a change wherein all Form 700 filers in the City file directly with the Ethics Commission electronically. We envision doing this in the foreseeable future; a set timeframe is not possible because it will largely be determined by available funding.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R15: The Ethics Commission should audit and act on violations disclosed through Form 700 filings of local prohibitions such as compensated advocacy and incompatible activities, and enforce these violations with strong action.	Ethics Commission	Implemented	The Ethics Commission already does this. The Director notes that while we do not have the staffing resources to audit all Form 700 filings, we do review a portion of them based on investigative criteria, complaints filed and other information that is brought to our attention.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R15: The Ethics Commission should audit and act on violations disclosed through Form 700 filings of local prohibitions such as compensated advocacy and incompatible activities, and enforce these violations with strong action.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Implemented	The Ethics Commission already does this. The Director notes that while we do not have the staffing resources to audit all Form 700 filings, we do review a portion of them based on investigative criteria, complaints filed and other information that is brought to our attention.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R16: The Ethics Commission should require full disclosure of contributions or payments for official travel of City officials, including the actual amount contributed and the names of the original donors. The official should also disclose what official business was conducted, including meetings, who participated in the meetings, topics, speeches given, ceremonies attended and other information.	Ethics Commission	Requires further analysis	The Ethics Commission will conduct more analysis on this item in its upcoming plans for proposed changes to the Governmental Ethics Ordinance (GEO) anticipated next year. The BOS will need to concur.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R16: The Ethics Commission should require full disclosure of contributions or payments for official travel of City officials, including the actual amount contributed and the names of the original donors. The official should also disclose what official business was conducted, including meetings, who participated in the meetings, topics, speeches given, ceremonies attended and other information.	Board of Supervisors	will not be implemented	By nature, such policy changes would be beyond the jurisdiction of the Board of Supervisors. The Board looks forward to the additional analysis and recommendation of the Ethics Commission.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R17a: The Ethics Commission staff should collect the official calendars prepared under the Sunshine Ordinance monthly, convert them to electronic form and post them online.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Will not be implemented	The Ethics Commission does not have the staffing resources to do this; other priorities are wanting already. The Ethics Commission recommends that departments should collect the official calendars prepared under the Sunshine Ordinance monthly, convert them to electronic form and post them online.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R17a: The Ethics Commission staff should collect the official calendars prepared under the Sunshine Ordinance monthly, convert them to electronic form and post them online.	Ethics Commission	Will not be implemented	The Ethics Commission does not have the staffing resources to do this; other priorities are wanting already. The Ethics Commission recommends that departments should collect the official calendars prepared under the Sunshine Ordinance monthly, convert them to electronic form and post them online.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R17a: The Ethics Commission staff should collect the official calendars prepared under the Sunshine Ordinance monthly, convert them to electronic form and post them online.	Sunshine Ordinance Task Force	Recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable	Having official calendars available at one central place or website-e.g., via the Ethics Commissions collection of official calendars, or on a central open data API- would facilitate the publics ability to locate those official calendars. This recommendation would shift responsibility from Department Heads to the Ethics Commission. However, there is no reason why various departments should not be responsible for making calendars on their own websites as well. Additionally, barring possible technology and resource barriers that are presently unknown to the SOTF, the SOTF can provide static links on its own website to the public calendars of all city departments and agencies. The SOTF, through its Compliance and Amendments Committee and/or its Education Outreach and Training Committee, intends in the next 6 months to review departments' and agencies' compliance and urge department heads to maintain their calendars permanently and post them on their websites no later than "three business days subsequent to the calendar entry date." The Task Force will also incorporate the Sunshine Ordinance's public calendar requirements into its education and outreach materials.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R17a: The Ethics Commission staff should collect the official calendars prepared under the Sunshine Ordinance monthly, convert them to electronic form and post them online.	City Attorney	Policy matter for Ethics Commission	R17a is a policy matter for the Ethics Commission. If requested, the City Attorney's Office will assist the Ethics Commission with the implementation of this recommendation.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R17b: The City Attorney and the Ethics Commission ensure that those officials subject to the calendar requirement, and their administrative staff, be trained on the law's requirements.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Will be implemented	The Director will work with the City Attorney's office to include this item in future annual Sunshine Trainings (although it does not apply to the vast majority of those who receive the training.)

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Department Required to Respond	2014 Responses (implementation)	2014 Response Text
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R17b: The City Attorney and the Ethics Commission ensure that those officials subject to the calendar requirement, and their administrative staff, be trained on the law's requirements.	Ethics Commission	Will be implemented	The Director will work with the City Attorney's office to include this item in future annual Sunshine Trainings (although it does not apply to the vast majority of those who receive the training.)
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R17b: The City Attorney and the Ethics Commission ensure that those officials subject to the calendar requirement, and their administrative staff, be trained on the law's requirements.	Sunshine Ordinance Task Force	Requires further analysis	The SOTF, through its Education, Outreach, and Training Committee assists with the annual training provided by the City Attorney under the Sunshine Ordinance. As noted above, the task Force's Compliance and Amendments Committee and/or the Education, Outreach, and Training Committee intends in the next 6 months to review compliance with the Sunshine Ordinances calendar requirements and to conduct a larger review of all existing Sunshine Ordinance training materials and programs, with the intent of better tailoring these training materials and programs to the audience (Elected Officials, Members of Board and Commissions, Commission Secretaries, Department Heads, Department Head Secretaries, Public Information Officers, etc.) Efforts by the City Attorney and the Ethics Commission with respect to this recommendation should be coordinated with the SOTF. Keeping with the best practices of open government, the SOTF also urges that the BOS adhere to the public calendar requirements of other city departments and agencies.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R17b: The City Attorney and the Ethics Commission ensure that those officials subject to the calendar requirement, and their administrative staff, be trained on the law's requirements.	City Attorney	Will be implemented	In cooperation with the Ethics Commission, the City Attorney's Office will implement this recommendation by including a discussion of the Sunshine Ordinance's calendar requirements in it bi-annual ethics and sunshine training.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R18: The Board of Supervisors should adopt a rule subjecting themselves to the public calendar requirement of the Sunshine Ordinance.	Board of Supervisors	will not be implemented	As evidenced by the Civil Grand Jury report, Supervisors already willingly disclose their calendars
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R19: The Commission should grant or deny post-public employment restriction waiver applications by resolutions that indicate specifically how the decision meets the conditions of the ordinance.	Ethics Commission	Will be implemented	The Commission approves of this idea and will issue written resolution for future decisions when waivers are granted.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R20a: The Mayor's Office should establish a blue-ribbon committee of experts and stakeholders in open government, sunshine and transparency, including former Sunshine Task Force members. The Committee of Experts should review and update the Sunshine Ordinance as necessary and should report to both entities and the Board of Supervisors recommendations that would result in coordination and respect for the functions of each entity.	Sunshine Ordinance Task Force	Requires further analysis	The SOTF strongly encourages efforts by any officer or entity to further the aims of transparent and open government. Nonetheless, whether a blue ribbon committee is created or not, the SOTF has the power and duty to "propose to the BOS amendments to the Sunshine Ordinance" pursuant to SF Admin Code Section 67.30(c). The SOTF, through its Compliance and Amendments Committee, intends in the next 6 months to initiate a new review of the Sunshine Ordinance to, in part: 1) identify sections of the Sunshine Ordinance which overlap and/or conflict with the rules governing the city's Ethics Commission, and 2) identify areas of the Sunshine Ordinance that should be update to reflect new technologies implemented since its passing. Such a review should consider the views of City agencies, boards, commissions, and departments as both policy goals and practical implementation issues; the views of "experts and stakeholders in open government, sunshine, and transparency, including former Sunshine Ordinance Task Force members; " and the views of the City Attorney and the Ethics Commission in order to foster greater harmony among those entities involved.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R20a: The Mayor's Office should establish a blue-ribbon committee of experts and stakeholders in open government, sunshine and transparency, including former Sunshine Task Force members. The Committee of Experts should review and update the Sunshine Ordinance as necessary and should report to both entities and the Board of Supervisors recommendations that would result in coordination and respect for the functions of each entity.	Mayor	Recommendation will not be implemented, not warranted	The establishment of a new committee is not necessary to revise San Francisco campaign and ethics laws. The Ethics Commission can submit legislation directly to the Board of Supervisors. Additionally, proposed revisions to the Sunshine Ordinance can be offered by experts and stakeholders outside of the committee process. Most recently, Supervisor David Chiu proposed changes to the lobbying ordinance that were eventually approved by the Board of Supervisors.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R20a: The Mayor's Office should establish a blue-ribbon committee of experts and stakeholders in open government, sunshine and transparency, including former Sunshine Task Force members. The Committee of Experts should review and update the Sunshine Ordinance as necessary and should report to both entities and the Board of Supervisors recommendations that would result in coordination and respect for the functions of each entity.	Board of Supervisors	will not be implemented	This recommendation is not directed to the Board of Supervisors. Any individual Supervisors could propose the creation of a task force legislatively.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R20a: The Mayor's Office should establish a blue-ribbon committee of experts and stakeholders in open government, sunshine and transparency, including former Sunshine Task Force members. The Committee of Experts should review and update the Sunshine Ordinance as necessary and should report to both entities and the Board of Supervisors recommendations that would result in coordination and respect for the functions of each entity.	Ethics Commission		The Ethics Commissions defers to the Mayor's office.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R20b: For now, arrangements should be made jointly by the Ethics Commission and the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force to have complaints heard by an independent hearing officer who would develop a consistent legally sufficient record of the case for the decision of each body. This would allow the meetings of the Task Force and the Commission to focus on broader policy issues.	Sunshine Ordinance Task Force	Requires further analysis	The SOTF would be interested in fully vetting a proposal to have particularly complex cases heard by an independent hearing officer in order to develop complete and legally sufficient records. Regarding whether this recommendation is warranted at this time: The SOTF is keenly aware of the backlog in its caseload and concerted efforts are already underway to address it. In particular, the SOTF has scheduled an additional full SOTF meeting each month through the end of this year and has reinstated a complaint procedure to focus and narrow the issues in dispute. Further, the SOTF intends in the next 6 months to review and updates its bylaws and complaint procedures, review due process regarding SOTF complaints and referrals and review SOTF and Ethics Commission procedures regarding referrals. The SOTF will seek public comment on any proposed changes tot he bylaws and complaint procedures. Regarding whether the recommendation is feasible: SOTF members have raised several concerns, including how this hearing officer would be selected in order to ensure expertise and impartiality, how this hearing officer would be compensated, and how his or her independence would be assured.

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Department Required to Respond	2014 Responses (implementation)	2014 Response Text
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R20b: For now, arrangements should be made jointly by the Ethics Commission and the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force to have complaints heard by an independent hearing officer who would develop a consistent legally sufficient record of the case for the decision of each body. This would allow the meetings of the Task Force and the Commission to focus on broader policy issues.	Mayor	Recommendation will not be implemented.	There is no procedure in the voter adopted Sunshine Ordinance to allow for adjudication of complaints by an independent hearing officer. The Ethics Commission is the officially appointed body that investigates referrals and complaints from the Sunshine Reform Task Force.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R20b: For now, arrangements should be made jointly by the Ethics Commission and the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force to have complaints heard by an independent hearing officer who would develop a consistent legally sufficient record of the case for the decision of each body. This would allow the meetings of the Task Force and the Commission to focus on broader policy issues.	Board of Supervisors	will not be implemented	This recommendation relates to the operation of the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force and the Ethics Commission, and is not directed at the Board of Supervisors;
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R20b: For now, arrangements should be made jointly by the Ethics Commission and the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force to have complaints heard by an independent hearing officer who would develop a consistent legally sufficient record of the case for the decision of each body. This would allow the meetings of the Task Force and the Commission to focus on broader policy issues.	Ethics Commission	Will not be implemented	The Ethics Commission does not agree with this recommendation and believes it is in the public's best interest to have the Commission continue to investigate and hear Sunshine Referrals and complaints. Further, there is no mechanism in the Sunshine Ordinance to do this.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R21: The Board of Supervisors should provide the Commissioners an Executive Secretary separate from the existing Commission's employee base who will, among other duties, prepare the Commission's agendas, maintain minutes, lists of complaints, serve as a liaison for public input and interested persons meetings and assist a Commission member to be the parliamentarian.	Board of Supervisors	will not be implemented	The Board of Supervisors agrees that an additional staff member could improve the effectiveness of the Ethics Commission. The Board will consider this recommendation as part of the Ethics Commission's next budget. Unfortunately, the constraints imposed by the Civil Grand Jury response process do not allow the Board to officially say that this recommendation will be considered at a later date.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R21: The Board of Supervisors should provide the Commissioners an Executive Secretary separate from the existing Commission's employee base who will, among other duties, prepare the Commission's agendas, maintain minutes, lists of complaints, serve as a liaison for public input and interested persons meetings and assist a Commission member to be the parliamentarian.	Ethics Commission	Will not be implemented in the foreseeable future	The Ethics Commission's staffing priorities are for more investigators and auditors. The Commission notes that, while in an ideal world a Commission Secretary is desirable, for a commission this small it is not an urgent need.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R21: The Board of Supervisors should provide the Commissioners an Executive Secretary separate from the existing Commission's employee base who will, among other duties, prepare the Commission's agendas, maintain minutes, lists of complaints, serve as a liaison for public input and interested persons meetings and assist a Commission member to be the parliamentarian.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Will not be implemented in the foreseeable future.	The Ethics Commission's staffing priorities are for more investigators and auditors. The Commission notes that, while in an ideal world a Commission Secretary is desirable, for a commission this small it is not an urgent need.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R22: The Commissioners should use their committee structure to focus on Ethics Commission issues. In the weeks between monthly meetings, each commissioner could take the lead on issues of concern to the Ethics Commission, such as developing policies on emerging campaign finance issues, transparency matters, complaint processing and training. This structure would allow for more interaction with the public and the regulated community.	Ethics Commission	May be implemented	The Commission will consider using committees on an as-needed basis. The committee system was designed for larger bodies. A commission of only five members using a committee system would likely entail a larger number of meetings unwieldy for such a small body and would result in redundant sessions. Commissioners are volunteers donating a great deal of their time and wisdom to the city and have managed to conduct business appropriately. As needed, special meetings have been conducted to move more sizable or difficult issues before the Commission. Even Roberts Rules of Order states that the formality necessary in a large assembly would hinder the business of a small board.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R23: That the Ethics Commission apply to the City Attorney for permission to engage outside counsel for advice and recommendations	Ethics Commission	Requires further analysis	This Ethics Commission is willing to discuss the merits of this with the City Attorney, but has concerns about continuity and costs. Under the Charter, it is ultimately not the Commission's decision to make.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R23: That the Ethics Commission apply to the City Attorney for permission to engage outside counsel for advice and recommendations	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Requires further analysis	This Ethics Commission is willing to discuss the merits of this with the City Attorney, but has concerns about continuity and costs. Under the Charter, it is ultimately not the Commission's decision to make.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R23: That the Ethics Commission apply to the City Attorney for permission to engage outside counsel for advice and recommendations	City Attorney	NO IMPLEMENTATION COMMENT WROTE "PARTIALLY AGREE"	The Ethics Commission has rarely requested or relied on outside counsel to step into the shoes of the City Attorney's Office for particular matters. As this history reflects, there is no need for the Ethics Commission to apply to the City Attorney for permission to engage outside counsel, except in extremely rare circumstance. Notably, the Ethics Commission cannot freely engage its own outside counsel. Charter section 15.102 mandates that the City Attorney serve as "the legal advisor of the Commission". The Charter also sets out a specific procedure by which any elected official, department head, board or commission may request outside counsel. The Ethics Commission may employ this process, but only if it has reason to believe that the City Attorney has " a prohibited financial conflict of interest under California law or a prohibited ethical conflict of interest under CA Ruled of Professional Conduct". See SF Charter section 6.102(1). Since the voters adopted section 6.102 in 2001, the Ethics Commission has not invoked this procedure.

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Department Required to Respond	2014 Responses (implementation)	2014 Response Text
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R24: The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors should request an annual written report from the Ethics Commission that meets the standards set out in the Charter for annual reviews of the effectiveness of the City's laws. This report should be posted on the Ethics Commission web site.	Board of Supervisors	has been implemented	In its response to the Civil Grand Jury Report, the Ethics Commission indicated that it will provide such a report
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R24: The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors should request an annual written report from the Ethics Commission that meets the standards set out in the Charter for annual reviews of the effectiveness of the City's laws. This report should be posted on the Ethics Commission web site.	Mayor	Recommendation will not be implemented, not warranted	This recommendation appears unnecessary. The City Charter mandates an annual review of law effectiveness, not a written review. The Ethics Commission and the Executive Director communicate to the Mayor and the Board through memos, oral testimony and in-person meetings and the Annual Report.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R24: The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors should request an annual written report from the Ethics Commission that meets the standards set out in the Charter for annual reviews of the effectiveness of the City's laws. This report should be posted on the Ethics Commission web site.	Ethics Commission	Will be implemented	The Commission will provide a report.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R25: The Ethics Commission should begin to focus Staff resources on monitoring and auditing other items within the Ethics Commission jurisdiction unrelated to campaigns such as the following ordinances: Conflict of Interest, Governmental Ethics, The Lobbyist Ordinance, Campaign Consultant Ordinance and the Sunshine Ordinance.	Ethics Commission	Partially implemented	Provided with sufficient resources, more work in the area will be accomplished. The Commission staff does much more of this work than the finding indicates , but lacks the staff and resources to do this work on a comprehensive basis. As it is, the staff can only audit a few non-publically financed campaigns each year due to resource limitations. The Commission notes that additional auditors are needed just for campaign finance; extending the audit reach is a desirable notion, but like many of these recommendations, this one comes with costs but no suggestions on how to meet them. Note: recent changes in the lobbyist ordinance will require audits of lobbyist in the future.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R25: The Ethics Commission should begin to focus Staff resources on monitoring and auditing other items within the Ethics Commission jurisdiction unrelated to campaigns such as the following ordinances: Conflict of Interest, Governmental Ethics, The Lobbyist Ordinance, Campaign Consultant Ordinance and the Sunshine Ordinance.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Partially implemented	Provided with sufficient resources, more work in the area will be accomplished. The Commission staff does much more of this work than the finding indicates , but lacks the staff and resources to do this work on a comprehensive basis. As it is, the staff can only audit a few non-publically financed campaigns each year due to resource limitations. The Commission notes that additional auditors are needed just for campaign finance; extending the audit reach is a desirable notion, but like many of these recommendations, this one comes with costs but no suggestions on how to meet them. Note: recent changes in the lobbyist ordinance will require audits of lobbyist in the future.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R25: The Ethics Commission should begin to focus Staff resources on monitoring and auditing other items within the Ethics Commission jurisdiction unrelated to campaigns such as the following ordinances: Conflict of Interest, Governmental Ethics, The Lobbyist Ordinance, Campaign Consultant Ordinance and the Sunshine Ordinance.	Board of Supervisors	will not be implemented	This recommendation is within the jurisdiction of the Ethics Commission; however, the Board of Supervisors should consider providing additional resources in the next budget process
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R26: The Ethics Commission should determine information reported elsewhere that is relevant for supplemental understanding of information currently reported locally, and provide links to it on the Ethics Commission web site, if it cannot be imported and posted.	Ethics Commission	Already implemented	The Commission already provides links to the Secretary of State's CAL-Access database and material on the Fair Political Practices Commission website. The Ethics Commission Staff will continue to link to other relevant websites where appropriate. The Commission adds that this should be noted ha the Commissions website is already considered among the best and most comprehensive sites in the country.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R26: The Ethics Commission should determine information reported elsewhere that is relevant for supplemental understanding of information currently reported locally, and provide links to it on the Ethics Commission web site, if it cannot be imported and posted.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Already implemented	The Commission already provides links to the Secretary of State's CAL-Access database and material on the Fair Political Practices Commission website. The Ethics Commission Staff will continue to link to other relevant websites where appropriate. The Commission adds that this should be noted ha the Commissions website is already considered among the best and most comprehensive sites in the country.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R26: The Ethics Commission should determine information reported elsewhere that is relevant for supplemental understanding of information currently reported locally, and provide links to it on the Ethics Commission web site, if it cannot be imported and posted.	Chief Data Officer	Recommendation already implemented.	The Commission's website is already considered among the best and most comprehensive sites in the county. Links to the Secretary of States CAL-Access database and material on the Fair Political Practices Commission web sites are easy to access. The website will continue to link to other relevant websites where appropriate.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R27: When a bill is proposed or passed to amend campaign finance and ethics laws, it should specify how it "furthers the purposes of this Chapter".	Ethics Commission	Already implemented	All proposed changes to existing ordinances are accompanied by comprehensive staff memoranda explaining the details and purposes of the proposed changes.

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Department Required to Respond	2014 Responses (implementation)	2014 Response Text
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R27: When a bill is proposed or passed to amend campaign finance and ethics laws, it should specify how it "furthers the purposes of this Chapter".	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Already implemented	All proposed changes to existing ordinances are accompanied by comprehensive staff memoranda explaining the details and purposes of the proposed changes.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R27: When a bill is proposed or passed to amend campaign finance and ethics laws, it should specify how it "furthers the purposes of this Chapter".	Board of Supervisors	will be implemented immediately	The Board of Supervisors believes that individual Supervisors will ask the City Attorney to include such findings in future legislation.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R27: When a bill is proposed or passed to amend campaign finance and ethics laws, it should specify how it "furthers the purposes of this Chapter".	City Attorney	Policy matter for Ethics Commission & BOS	R27 is a policy matter for the Ethics Commission and the Board of Supervisors. If requested, the City Attorney's Office will assist the Ethics Commission and the Board of Supervisors with the implementation of this recommendation.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R28: That the Commission hold hearings, whether through their committees or in the full Commission, to ask the public to report matters that appear improper, then call the responsible officials before the Commission to account for and defend their actions.	Ethics Commission	Will not be implemented	Allowing anyone to force public officials to appear before the Ethics Commission to defend themselves against charges invites anyone with personal agendas to create punitive actions against public officials -at will whether there is a basis or not for such accusations. This proposal does not regard actual law-breaking, but merely the appearance of impropriety and calls Constitutional issues directly into consideration.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R29: That the Ethics Commission hold a hearing on "Proposition J Revisited" to consider how some of its concepts apply today and whether the "public benefit" definition includes elements that should be incorporated into sections of the C&GCC, and specifically consider offering amendments to C&GCC which re-incorporate its Findings and Declarations into current San Francisco law, and to consider placing these amendments on the ballot.	Ethics Commission	Requires further analysis	City laws prevent all City officials and employees from accepting anything of value for they duties they perform. In addition, local ordinance identifies a number of "restricted sources" who may not make donations to candidate and office holders. Note: The language in Prop J was determined to be unconstitutional by the LA Superior Court in 2002. That ruling still stands and there is no reason to believe that it would fare different in SF, indicating that a measure to readopt Prop J, as written would be fruitless. The Commission intends to include this use as part of a larger discussion of the conflict of interest and campaign finance rules.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	R29: That the Ethics Commission hold a hearing on "Proposition J Revisited" to consider how some of its concepts apply today and whether the "public benefit" definition includes elements that should be incorporated into sections of the C&GCC, and specifically consider offering amendments to C&GCC which re-incorporate its Findings and Declarations into current San Francisco law, and to consider placing these amendments on the ballot.	Board of Supervisors	will not be implemented	This recommendation is directed at the Ethics Commission, though individual Supervisors could also call a hearing on the matter. The Board recognizes the legislative history outlined by the Ethics Commission.

CGJ Year	Report Title	Findings	Response Required	2014 Responses (agree or disagree)	2014 Response Text
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 1a: The Ethics Commission lacks resources to handle major enforcement cases. These include, for example, cases alleging misconduct, conflict of interest, violating campaign finance and lobbying laws, and violating post-employment restrictions.	Ethics Commission	Agree	The Ethics Commission acknowledges that, like many agencies, it does not have the full resources it could use in carrying out its mission, it is productive in resolving its enforcement cases.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 1a: The Ethics Commission lacks resources to handle major enforcement cases. These include, for example, cases alleging misconduct, conflict of interest, violating campaign finance and lobbying laws, and violating post-employment restrictions.	Board of Supervisors	Agree	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 1a: The Ethics Commission lacks resources to handle major enforcement cases. These include, for example, cases alleging misconduct, conflict of interest, violating campaign finance and lobbying laws, and violating post-employment restrictions.	City Attorney	Partially disagree	The City Attorney's Office defers to the Ethic Commission's agreement with this finding, but this Office is not aware of any specific major enforcement case that the Ethics Commission, due to lack of resources has declined to bring where there was otherwise sufficient evidence of a violation. Regardless, the Ethics Commission would benefit from additional resources to increase its ability to handle major enforcement matters without impacting the Commissions ability to handle its other duties and responsibilities.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 1a: The Ethics Commission lacks resources to handle major enforcement cases. These include, for example, cases alleging misconduct, conflict of interest, violating campaign finance and lobbying laws, and violating post-employment restrictions.	District Attorney		The District Attorney defers to the Ethics Commissions response to this finding
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 1b: The Ethics Commission has only two investigators.	Ethics Commission	Agree	The Ethics Commission currently has two investigators; a third position exists but remains vacant because it is unfunded.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 1b: The Ethics Commission has only two investigators.	Board of Supervisors	Agree	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 1b: The Ethics Commission has only two investigators.	City Attorney	Agree	NO ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PROVIDED.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 1b: The Ethics Commission has only two investigators.	District Attorney	Agree	NO ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PROVIDED.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 1c: The confidentiality required of Ethics Commission investigations runs counter to the Commission's other duties to make information more public and to increase the transparency of government.	Ethics Commission	Disagree	There is nothing inconsistent with the confidentiality requirements relating to enforcement actions and the Ethics Commission's role in making information public and promoting transparency of government. The confidentiality of investigations is required by the Charter; it has no impact on the other duties of the Commission not related to investigations/enforcement.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 1c: The confidentiality required of Ethics Commission investigations runs counter to the Commission's other duties to make information more public and to increase the transparency of government.	Board of Supervisors	Disagree	The Board of Supervisors supports the greatest possible transparency at the Ethics Commission, including in its investigations and enforcement actions, but recognizes the Charter provisions cited by the City Attorney.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 1c: The confidentiality required of Ethics Commission investigations runs counter to the Commission's other duties to make information more public and to increase the transparency of government.	City Attorney	Disagree	The San Francisco Charter requires the Ethics Commission to conduct its investigations "in a confidential manner" and provides that certain records relating to investigations must be kept confidential to the extend permitted by state law. Charter C3.699-13(a). Despite this Charter restriction on how it must conduct its investigations, the Ethics Commission must still comply with the same public meeting and records laws that apply to all City agencies, including providing advance public notice of its meetings and taking its actions publically.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 1c: The confidentiality required of Ethics Commission investigations runs counter to the Commission's other duties to make information more public and to increase the transparency of government.	District Attorney	Disagree	The Commission is in the same position with respect to the timing of any public disclosure of violations whether the investigation is conducted by the Commission, The City Attorney, the District Attorney or the Fair Political Practices Commission. In order to insure that the investigation of an ethics complaint is not compromised, public disclosure typically must wait until the investigation is complete.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 1d: The District Attorney, City Attorney and the Fair Political Practices Commission have more substantial investigative staffs.	Ethics Commission	Agree	Other, larger law enforcement entities do have more investigative staff's; they also generally have a larger workload that their resources can easily accommodate.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 1d: The District Attorney, City Attorney and the Fair Political Practices Commission have more substantial investigative staffs.	Board of Supervisors	Agree	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 1d: The District Attorney, City Attorney and the Fair Political Practices Commission have more substantial investigative staffs.	City Attorney	Agree	NO ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PROVIDED.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 1d: The District Attorney, City Attorney and the Fair Political Practices Commission have more substantial investigative staffs.	District Attorney	Agree	NO ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PROVIDED.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 1e: The Fair Political Practices Commission has been very active in bringing enforcement actions, and handles enforcement for some local units of California government.	Ethics Commission	Partially Agree	While the FPPC handles enforcement maters for the County of San Bernardino, and otherwise initiates some enforcement actions in local jurisdictions, they generally do not enforce local laws.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 1e: The Fair Political Practices Commission has been very active in bringing enforcement actions, and handles enforcement for some local units of California government.	Board of Supervisors	Agree	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 1e: The Fair Political Practices Commission has been very active in bringing enforcement actions, and handles enforcement for some local units of California government.	City Attorney	Agree	NO ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PROVIDED.

CGJ Year	Report Title	Findings	Response Required	2014 Responses (agree or disagree)	2014 Response Text
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 1e: The Fair Political Practices Commission has been very active in bringing enforcement actions, and handles enforcement for some local units of California government.	District Attorney	The District Attorney has insufficient information to agree or disagree with this finding	The District Attorney has insufficient information to agree or disagree with this finding
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 1f: Enforcement is best handled outside of the environment of political partisanship and preferences.	Ethics Commission	Agree	However, the budget process is the primary attachment of the Ethics Commission to the City; the Commission has not experienced undue influence as a result of this relationship.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 1f: Enforcement is best handled outside of the environment of political partisanship and preferences.	Board of Supervisors	Agree	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 1f: Enforcement is best handled outside of the environment of political partisanship and preferences.	City Attorney	Agree	NO ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PROVIDED.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 1f: Enforcement is best handled outside of the environment of political partisanship and preferences.	District Attorney	Agree and disagree	The District Attorney agrees that enforcement of ethics violations should be free from political partisanship and preferences. The District Attorney does not agree with this finding to the extent it implies this cannot be accomplished when enforcement is handled by local agencies.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 2: In some instances, improper campaign contributions were returned to the contributor rather than forfeited to the City as required by City law. The Jury found no record of the Commission acting to waive or reduce the forfeiture.	Board of Supervisors	Disagree	The Board of Supervisors has not formally received information about specific instances but believes the Ethics Commission should follow up on specific allegations; further, the Board of Supervisors notes that candidates are subject to regular auditing as part of their election campaigns
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 2: In some instances, improper campaign contributions were returned to the contributor rather than forfeited to the City as required by City law. The Jury found no record of the Commission acting to waive or reduce the forfeiture.	City Attorney	Disagree	The Civil Grand Jury has not provided any specific facts about improper contributions that the Ethics Commission allegedly mishandled. In the absence of more specific allegations, the City Attorneys Offices has no basis for concluding that the Ethics Commission has inappropriately returned contributions and must presume that that Ethics Commission has appropriately followed City law.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 3: A broader citizen's right of action to enforce ethics laws will provide assurance to the public that the laws will be enforced.	Ethics Commission	Agree	NO ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PROVIDED.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 3: A broader citizen's right of action to enforce ethics laws will provide assurance to the public that the laws will be enforced.	City Attorney	Partially disagree	The City Attorneys Office partially disagrees with Finding 3 because the Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code currently provides a qualified private right of action to SF residents that may already provide sufficient assurance to the public. Section 3.242(c) states: "any resident may bring a civil action on behalf of the people of San Francisco to enjoin violations of or compel compliance with a conflict of interest or governmental ethics law", after notifying the City Attorney of the residents intent to file and providing an opportunity for the City Attorney to pursue the same matter.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 3: A broader citizen's right of action to enforce ethics laws will provide assurance to the public that the laws will be enforced.	Board of Supervisors	partially disagree	The Board of Supervisors understands how a broader right of private action could lead to greater enforcement of the City's ethics laws, but believes that the existing qualified right of private action could be employed more frequently.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 4: Some information currently reported and posted is not put into the standard searchable electronic format. The Jury specifically finds that contract approval forms, Form 700 forms, behested payments forms, and Lobbyists On Behalf Of The City forms can be converted to a searchable format before they are posted.	Ethics Commission	Partially Agree	There is some information filed with the Ethics Commission not currently in searchable electronic format.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 4: Some information currently reported and posted is not put into the standard searchable electronic format. The Jury specifically finds that contract approval forms, Form 700 forms, behested payments forms, and Lobbyists On Behalf Of The City forms can be converted to a searchable format before they are posted.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Partially Agree	There is some information filed with the Ethics Commission not currently in searchable electronic format.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 4: Some information currently reported and posted is not put into the standard searchable electronic format. The Jury specifically finds that contract approval forms, Form 700 forms, behested payments forms, and Lobbyists On Behalf Of The City forms can be converted to a searchable format before they are posted.	Chief Data Officer	Agree	Some of the information filed with the Ethics Commission is not currently in a searchable electronic format.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 5: Required filings are treated independently and cannot easily be cross searched electronically using common data reference fields like name and organization to access and aggregate information types, such as dollar amounts, that cross between filings.	Ethics Commission	Disagree partially	This assertion is not completely accurate. The Commission compiles all campaign and lobbyist filings on DataSF so that the information may be searched and aggregated. In fact, the Commission uses the campaign and lobbyist data on DataSF to aggregate and visualize the data on the Commissions web dashboards. A recent report by the Mayor's Office describes "how the SF Ethics Commission uses DataSF to increase transparency by summarizing and creating visualizations related to ethics data and reports." Further, the report states "Our top referred is the Ethics Commission, see Figure 12, which has made extensive use of DataSF not only as a publishing platform but as a means to create dashboard and visualizations on it's own site. See Figure 13 on the next page for a screenshot showing how the Ethics Commission creates visualization using the DataSF platform and them embeds the visualization into a web page. This makes them the top embedders, i.e. the top data visualizations that have been viewed within and external website" Further, according to "Governing" magazine, the US Open Data Census in March o this year rates SF as the "best city for open data" in the country. The study involved gives both our lobbyist reporting system and our campaign finance system perfect scores.

CGJ Year	Report Title	Findings	Response Required	2014 Responses (agree or disagree)	2014 Response Text
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 5: Required filings are treated independently and cannot easily be cross searched electronically using common data reference fields like name and organization to access and aggregate information types, such as dollar amounts, that cross between filings.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Disagree partially	This assertion is not completely accurate. The Commission compiles all campaign and lobbyist filings on DataSF so that the information may be searched and aggregated. In fact, the Commission uses the campaign and lobbyist data on DataSF to aggregate and visualize the data on the Commissions web dashboards. A recent report by the Mayor's Office describes "how the SF Ethics Commission uses DataSF to increase transparency by summarizing and creating visualizations related to ethics data and reports." Further, the report states "Our top referred is the Ethics Commission, see Figure 12, which has made extensive use of DataSF not only as a publishing platform but as a means to create dashboard and visualizations on it's own site. See Figure 13 on the next page for a screenshot showing how the Ethics Commission creates visualization using the DataSF platform and then embeds the visualization into a web page. This makes them the top embedders, i.e. the top data visualizations that have been viewed within and external website" Further, according to "Governing" magazine, the US Open Data Census in March of this year rates SF as the "best city for open data" in the country. The study involved gives both our lobbyist reporting system and our campaign finance system perfect scores.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 5: Required filings are treated independently and cannot easily be cross searched electronically using common data reference fields like name and organization to access and aggregate information types, such as dollar amounts, that cross between filings.	Chief Data Officer	Disagree in part	Required filings are treated independently. However, campaign and lobbyist filings are compiled on DataSF and the information can be searched, aggregated, and visualized for effect.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 6a: City officials, both those in elective office and political appointees, also may create separate committees to raise funds and campaign for political party office such as the Party Central Committees. There are no limits on contributions to these committees.	Ethics Commission	Agree	There is no disagreement with these statements.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 6b: If candidates seek election to local political party committees during the same election cycle while also seeking election to an official City position, including supervisor, candidate committee rules do not apply. Thus while being limited to a \$500 cap in a City contest (or even an outright prohibition on contributions), donors may contribute additional funds through the back door of a political party contest.	Ethics Commission	Agree	There is no disagreement with these statements.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 6c: The rise of major donors, and the potential for further influence following the recent U.S. Supreme Court decision, may well influence elections far beyond what political party affiliation has historically done.	Ethics Commission	Agree	However there is no evidence provided in the report that proves this to be true locally (the trend in San Francisco in recent years has been a reduction in the number of Major Donors)
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 6d: Corporations may not contribute directly to a candidate for City office but may instead contribute to a business association that contributes to a candidate, or to a nonprofit that spends on behalf of a candidate, or to another committee controlled by the candidate or officeholder, or through an independent expenditure committee.	Ethics Commission	Agree	NO ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PROVIDED.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 6e: Corporate money is being funneled into local campaigns through a web of nonprofit organizations. The Jury cannot determine whether the main effect is to hide the true source of contributions or if this shields illegal contributions from disclosure. The Ethics Commission has not discussed a disclosure strategy to make this information public.	Ethics Commission	Not enough information is provided in the report to agree	Not enough information is provided in the report to agree
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 7: The Ethics Commission provides written information only in English although San Francisco has strong political participation from communities and officials whose first language is not English and who require guides and educational materials relevant to their needs.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Agree	This is correct for the time being.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 8: The current definition of "lobbyist" and "contacts" does not provide the public with sufficient information to understand who and how City Hall decisions are influenced despite the intent of the law.	Ethics Commission	Partially Agree	The ordinance was recently amended and updated at the Board of Supervisors (changes not in effect at time Finding was written)
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 8: The current definition of "lobbyist" and "contacts" does not provide the public with sufficient information to understand who and how City Hall decisions are influenced despite the intent of the law.	Board of Supervisors	partially disagree	The ordinance was recently amended by an ordinance sponsored by Board of Supervisors' President David Chiu in partnership with City Attorney Dennis Herrera. The amendments should improve the public's understanding of lobbying activity.

CGJ Year	Report Title	Findings	Response Required	2014 Responses (agree or disagree)	2014 Response Text
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 9: The effort to influence City Hall decisions is not limited to contacts with City officials but also includes outreach to community, political and nonprofit organizations as well as to the general public through television ads, mailers, robocalls, polling and other strategies. In 2010 the Ethics Commission proposal was approved by the Board to eliminate reporting on these expenditures	Ethics Commission	Agree	Under the change, which was part of a successful simplification of the lobbyist registration process, Expenditure Lobbyist would still have to register paid lobbyist the expenditures made to influence public opinion were no longer captured when the changes went into effect. Prior to the change, only five organizations had ever reported expenditure lobbying: In 2007, the California Urban Issues Project reported expenditures of \$46,400 and the Small Property Owners of SF reported spending \$1000. In 2009, the California Urban Issues Project reported \$1702, the SF Common Sense Coalition reported \$58110 and the SF Firefighters Local 798 reported \$367350. Because the actual number of such reported expenditures were so few, it is not a controversial decision to drop this requirement due to the limited benefit provided; at the time, no public objection was made.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 9: The effort to influence City Hall decisions is not limited to contacts with City officials but also includes outreach to community, political and nonprofit organizations as well as to the general public through television ads, mailers, robocalls, polling and other strategies. In 2010 the Ethics Commission proposal was approved by the Board to eliminate reporting on these expenditures	Board of Supervisors	Agree	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 10: People holding themselves out as "strategic advisors" provide advice on ways to influence City decision-making.	Ethics Commission	Unable to agree	This finding is not adequately explained in the report making it difficult to respond.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 11: The role of e-mail and text messages in governmental decision-making has not been fully discussed and explored. Rules on preservation of e-mails in public records are very hazy and some departmental officials told the Jury they routinely delete e-mail. Guidance from the City Attorney on preservation of e-mail is non-specific. There is no guidance regarding text messages. There is no policy that applies to private e-mails and text messages that further public decision-making.	City Attorney	Disagree	The City Attorney's Office has provided guidance on the issues addressed in this finding. The Office's Good Government Guide has provided guidance on these issues for several years. The most recently released update of the Guide, published online on August 18, 2014 provides guidance regarding record retention requirements and email (on page 116): "E-mail and other electronic records are subject to the records retention laws. As with paper records, some electronic records fit the definition of "records" in the retention context. But most do not. The vast majority of public records in the City's possession do not fall under the definition of "records" within the meaning of records retention law. Therefore, the City may destroy these records at any time. For example, as a general rule, employees may immediately dispose of phone message slips, notes of meetings, research notes prepared for the personal use of the employee creating them, and the large majority of e-mail communications .." The Good Government Guide also provides the following guidance regarding text messages and emails, including those on personal electronic devices (on pages 88-89): The first element of the definition of public record-that it is a "writing"-is immensely expansive. It encompasses any handwriting, typewriting, printing, photostating, photographing, photocopying, transmission by e-mail or fax, and every other means of recording on any tangible thing any form of communication or representation, including letters, words, pictures, sounds, or symbols. Cal. Govt. Code § 6252(g). This concept of a writing goes beyond the traditional written form. It may consist of communications in any medium that contains encoded information, such as a computer tape, video recording, cassette recording, voicemail, text message, photograph, or movie. E-mails including attachments are writings within the meaning of the Public Records Act. Yet, while it is clear that electronic records are "writings" under the Act, many principles developed under the Act preceded the current era of electronic communications, and those principles and others are in some respects still evolving to catch up with this sweeping technological change. * * * The third element of the definition-that a public record is "prepared, owned, used, or retained by a state or local agency"-is expansive, too. In particular, there may be instances where the City does not own a record that is nonetheless considered a public record. For example, while courts have not definitively resolved the issue, City officials and employees, in an abundance of caution, should assume that work they perform for the City on personal computers or other personal communications devices may be subject to disclosure under the public records laws. Such a record meets the first two elements of the definition of public record; the remaining question is whether, under the circumstances, the law would consider the record prepared or used by the City. Lastly, the Good Government Guide also provides the following additional guidance on text messages (on page 141): Neither the Brown Act nor Sunshine Ordinance addresses text messaging during meetings, and there is no definitive case law on the subject. The City Attorney's Office strongly discourages the practice. Text messaging or use of other personal electronic communications devices during meetings is especially problematic when the policy body is holding an adjudicative hearing, such as a hearing to grant or suspend a permit, that will affect individual private interests. Text messaging during such a hearing could enable a member to surreptitiously communicate with one of the parties, or receive evidence or direction as to how to vote, from an outside party, that other members of the body and the parties do not see. These circumstances may undermine the integrity of the proceeding and raise due process concerns. Even outside the adjudicative context, text messaging or use of other personal electronic communications devices during any meeting of a policy body presents serious problems. The Brown Act and Sunshine Ordinance presume that public input
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 11: The role of e-mail and text messages in governmental decision-making has not been fully discussed and explored. Rules on preservation of e-mails in public records are very hazy and some departmental officials told the Jury they routinely delete e-mail. Guidance from the City Attorney on preservation of e-mail is non-specific. There is no guidance regarding text messages. There is no policy that applies to private e-mails and text messages that further public decision-making.	Ethics Commission	Partially agree	The City document retention policy does not require retention of correspondence for any specific period of time; this would include e-mails. Departments are free to create more restrictive rules as they find necessary.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 11: The role of e-mail and text messages in governmental decision-making has not been fully discussed and explored. Rules on preservation of e-mails in public records are very hazy and some departmental officials told the Jury they routinely delete e-mail. Guidance from the City Attorney on preservation of e-mail is non-specific. There is no guidance regarding text messages. There is no policy that applies to private e-mails and text messages that further public decision-making.	Sunshine Ordinance Task Force	Disagree partially	Email messages related to City business that are retrieved or sent by City officers and employees are public records and should be retained under a Departments record retention policy and schedule approved pursuant to SF Admin Code Section 8.3, which provides inter alia "Current records and storage records less than five years old may be destroyed or otherwise disposed of if their destruction or other disposition within a shorter length of time will not be detrimental to the City and County or defeat any public purpose". The SOTF is mindful that public business may increasingly be conducted via mixed private/public email accounts, and that this simultaneously raises privacy and ethical concerns as well as challenges for enforcing public records regulations as to these quasi public accounts. Text messages may or may not be public "records; a court case (City of San Jose v. Santa Clara County Superior Court [Smith], S218066) is now considering that issue. There are no uniform retention requirement for email communications, let alone text messages. Department heads are permitted to destroy records, provided that "the retention period applicable to them is set forth in a schedule for the system enatic retention and destruction of records that tis prepared by the department head, approved by the Mayor or Mayor's designee, or the board or commission concerned" A noted by the Grand Jury, guidance from the City Attorney as to both email and text messages could be more clear. The SOTF may issue its own guidance to the City departments as to email and text message retention and production under its power to "provide information to other City departments on appropriate ways to implement the Sunshine Ordinance"

CGJ Year	Report Title	Findings	Response Required	2014 Responses (agree or disagree)	2014 Response Text
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 11: The role of e-mail and text messages in governmental decision-making has not been fully discussed and explored. Rules on preservation of e-mails in public records are very hazy and some departmental officials told the Jury they routinely delete e-mail. Guidance from the City Attorney on preservation of e-mail is non-specific. There is no guidance regarding text messages. There is no policy that applies to private e-mails and text messages that further public decision-making.	Board of Supervisors	partially disagree	The Board of Supervisors agrees that emerging technologies create new challenges for public records laws, but the Board also believes that the City Attorney provides a significant amount of advice in this area, including an updated section on Public Records Laws in the newly revised Good Government Guide.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 12: Many departments have failed to post their sources of outside funding as required by the Sunshine Ordinance.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Cannot agree/disagree due to lack of information	The Commission does not have enough information to respond to this finding so it cannot yet agree.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 12: Many departments have failed to post their sources of outside funding as required by the Sunshine Ordinance.	Sunshine Ordinance Task Force	Agree	Sunshine Ordinance Section 67.29-6 plainly states "No official or employee or agent of the city shall accept, allow to be collected, or direct or influence the spending of, any money, or any goods or services worth more than one hundred dollars in aggregate, for the purpose of carrying out or assisting any City function unless the amount and source of all such funds is disclosed as public record and made available on the website for the department to which the funds are directed"
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 13: When violations of the standards in a departmental Statements of Incompatible Activities are enforced departmentally as a disciplinary matter, the Ethics Commission is not notified and the discipline is not disclosed to the public.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Agree	Normally, departments are required to keep employee disciplinary measures confidential. In accordance with the Civil Service Commission's "Citywide Employee Personnel Records Guidelines" all employee personnel records-including records of completed/resolved/sustained disciplinary actions-must be maintained only in the employee's Official Employee Personnel File ("OEPF"). How long a disciplinary action remains in the OEPF and what is removed from an OEPF will vary depending on departmental policy and the applicable collective bargaining agreement. Employees' OEPFs are maintained in their departments; The Ethics Commission does not have access to those files. Thus, only the department head would have information regarding disciplinary matters. Moreover, even if the Ethics Commission did have that information, the right of privacy in the California Constitution protects employees from unwarranted disclosure of confidential information. CA Constitution, Article I, Section 1. Accordingly, as information regarding disciplinary actions taken against an employee is considered a confidential personnel matter/confidential personnel information is not normally disclosable. In addition, there are a number of other state laws protecting employee privacy not mentioned here.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 13: When violations of the standards in a departmental Statements of Incompatible Activities are enforced departmentally as a disciplinary matter, the Ethics Commission is not notified and the discipline is not disclosed to the public.	Ethics Commission	Agree	Normally, departments are required to keep employee disciplinary measures confidential. In accordance with the Civil Service Commission's "Citywide Employee Personnel Records Guidelines" all employee personnel records-including records of completed/resolved/sustained disciplinary actions-must be maintained only in the employee's Official Employee Personnel File ("OEPF"). How long a disciplinary action remains in the OEPF and what is removed from an OEPF will vary depending on departmental policy and the applicable collective bargaining agreement. Employees' OEPFs are maintained in their departments; The Ethics Commission does not have access to those files. Thus, only the department head would have information regarding disciplinary matters. Moreover, even if the Ethics Commission did have that information, the right of privacy in the California Constitution protects employees from unwarranted disclosure of confidential information. CA Constitution, Article I, Section 1. Accordingly, as information regarding disciplinary actions taken against an employee is considered a confidential personnel matter/confidential personnel information is not normally disclosable. In addition, there are a number of other state laws protecting employee privacy not mentioned here.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 14: The Ethics Commission has increased compliance by notifying any employee who fails to file Form 700 within 30 days after the deadline that he or she must file or face potential penalties.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Agree	NO ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PROVIDED.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 14: The Ethics Commission has increased compliance by notifying any employee who fails to file Form 700 within 30 days after the deadline that he or she must file or face potential penalties.	Ethics Commission	Agree	NO ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PROVIDED.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 15: The disclosures in Form 700 filings also may reveal violations of San Francisco laws that are enforced locally. This includes compensated advocacy before other commissions and arrangements that violate the locally adopted and enacted Statements of Incompatible Activities for each department.	Ethics Commission	Agree	NO ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PROVIDED.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 15: The disclosures in Form 700 filings also may reveal violations of San Francisco laws that are enforced locally. This includes compensated advocacy before other commissions and arrangements that violate the locally adopted and enacted Statements of Incompatible Activities for each department.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Agree	NO ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PROVIDED.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 16: City officials travel expenses can be covered by gifts made by individuals, lobbyists, business associations, corporations or any other source, including those with financial interests in matters to be decided by the official. The public disclosure is limited to a list of donors or donor organizations contributing \$500 or more, but without specifying the total amount of the gift. Additionally, a significant amount of travel expenses are paid through organizations that do not disclose the names of the original donors.	Ethics Commission	Agree	Gifts of travel are governed by a myriad of state and local rules; additional disclosure may be advisable.

CGJ Year	Report Title	Findings	Response Required	2014 Responses (agree or disagree)	2014 Response Text
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 16: City officials travel expenses can be covered by gifts made by individuals, lobbyists, business associations, corporations or any other source, including those with financial interests in matters to be decided by the official. The public disclosure is limited to a list of donors or donor organizations contributing \$500 or more, but without specifying the total amount of the gift. Additionally, a significant amount of travel expenses are paid through organizations that do not disclose the names of the original donors.	Board of Supervisors	Agree	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 17a: There is useful information in the calendars of City Officials that should be readily available to the public.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Agree	Although there is a lack of explanatory information in the report, the Ethics Commission will not dispute these findings, except to note that the ordinance does not require attendee names.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 17a: There is useful information in the calendars of City Officials that should be readily available to the public.	Ethics Commission	Agree	Although there is a lack of explanatory information in the report, the Ethics Commission will not dispute these findings, except to note that the ordinance does not require attendee names.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 17a: There is useful information in the calendars of City Officials that should be readily available to the public.	Sunshine Ordinance Task Force	Agree	Sunshine Ordinance Section 67.29-5 provides, inter alia "The Mayor, The City Attorney, and every Department Head shall keep or cause to be kept a daily calendar wherein is recorded d the time and place of each meeting or event attended by that official"
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 17a: There is useful information in the calendars of City Officials that should be readily available to the public.	City Attorney	Agree	NO ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PROVIDED.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 17b: The Jury found calendar entries that did not meet the law's requirements, particularly in listing the meeting's subject matter and attendee names. As a result, it is not possible to crosscheck lobbyists' reports on their meetings with City officials with the calendar reports from the City officials.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Agree	Although there is a lack of explanatory information in the report, the Ethics Commission will not dispute these findings, except to note that the ordinance does not require attendee names.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 17b: The Jury found calendar entries that did not meet the law's requirements, particularly in listing the meeting's subject matter and attendee names. As a result, it is not possible to crosscheck lobbyists' reports on their meetings with City officials with the calendar reports from the City officials.	Ethics Commission	Agree	Although there is a lack of explanatory information in the report, the Ethics Commission will not dispute these findings, except to note that the ordinance does not require attendee names.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 17b: The Jury found calendar entries that did not meet the law's requirements, particularly in listing the meeting's subject matter and attendee names. As a result, it is not possible to crosscheck lobbyists' reports on their meetings with City officials with the calendar reports from the City officials.	Sunshine Ordinance Task Force	Agree	The City Attorney and the Ethics Commission ensure that those officials subject to the calendar requirement, and their administrative staff, be trained on the law's requirements.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 17b: The Jury found calendar entries that did not meet the law's requirements, particularly in listing the meeting's subject matter and attendee names. As a result, it is not possible to crosscheck lobbyists' reports on their meetings with City officials with the calendar reports from the City officials.	City Attorney	Partially disagree	The Sunshine Ordinance requires the calendars maintained by the Mayor, the City Attorney, and the department heads to include "the time and place of each meeting or event attended" and " a general statement of issues discusses," but it does not require the listing of attendee names. See Admin. Code 67.29-5. This Office agrees that the lack of attendee names may make it difficult to crosscheck lobbyists disclosure reports with these official calendars. But the Sunshine Ordinance does not require officials subject to the calendar requirement to include this additional information in their calendar entries, although those officials may do so voluntarily.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 17c: The training currently provided on the Sunshine Ordinance contains no materials on the keeping of official calendars as required by the Ordinance.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Agree	Although there is a lack of explanatory information in the report, the Ethics Commission will not dispute these findings, except to note that the ordinance does not require attendee names.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 17c: The training currently provided on the Sunshine Ordinance contains no materials on the keeping of official calendars as required by the Ordinance.	Ethics Commission	Agree	Although there is a lack of explanatory information in the report, the Ethics Commission will not dispute these findings, except to note that the ordinance does not require attendee names.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 17c: The training currently provided on the Sunshine Ordinance contains no materials on the keeping of official calendars as required by the Ordinance.	Sunshine Ordinance Task Force	Agree	NO ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PROVIDED.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 17c: The training currently provided on the Sunshine Ordinance contains no materials on the keeping of official calendars as required by the Ordinance.	City Attorney	Partially disagree	The City Attorney's Office bi-annual Sunshine Ordinance training has not addressed the issue because most of the attendees, such as members of City boards and commissions, are not subject to this calendar requirement. But, for a number of years, the City Attorney's Office's Good Government Guide has provided guidance on Sunshine Ordinance's calendar requirements. (page 114-115 of the Good Government Guide, updated on August 18, 2014)
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 18: The Board of Supervisors is not subject to this calendar requirement. Many members did provide their calendars upon request, and the information in their calendars will be helpful for public understanding of their work.	Board of Supervisors	Agree	While the requirement does not officially apply to the Board of Supervisors, most if not all Supervisors regularly respond to public records requests for their calendars.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 19: The public record will be better served if post-public employment restriction waivers are granted by Commission resolutions that indicate the specific grounds for granting the waiver. In at least one instance, the Ethics Commission inappropriately interpreted the "extreme hardship" standard to grant a post-public employment restriction waiver.	Ethics Commission	Agree with first sentence of finding	While in agreement with the first sentence of this finding, the Ethics Commission did not misinterpret the standard and disagrees with that part of the statement.

CGJ Year	Report Title	Findings	Response Required	2014 Responses (agree or disagree)	2014 Response Text
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 20: Both the Ethics Commission and the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force act in good faith. They are authorized to come to similar ends – transparency in government. However, there are legal and procedural differences between their process and their legal requirements. Therefore, the results of their work are not in harmony with each other.	Sunshine Ordinance Task Force	Disagree partially	The SOTF refers to very few matters to the Ethics Commission for enforcement. Although this reflects in part a view that not all Sunshine Ordinance violations merit referral for enforcement, it has also not fostered a greater agreement or understanding as to the appropriate burden to show or enforce a violation, willful or not. As illustrated by earlier SOTF responses, there remains ample terrain for collaboration and coordination between these separate but overlapping bodies.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 20: Both the Ethics Commission and the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force act in good faith. They are authorized to come to similar ends – transparency in government. However, there are legal and procedural differences between their process and their legal requirements. Therefore, the results of their work are not in harmony with each other.	Mayor	Agree	Unlike The Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, which is an advisory body, the Ethics Commission is a law enforcement agency with the ability to impose monetary and other sanctions and its procedures are more substantial. Often, differences are based more on interpretive actions.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 20: Both the Ethics Commission and the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force act in good faith. They are authorized to come to similar ends – transparency in government. However, there are legal and procedural differences between their process and their legal requirements. Therefore, the results of their work are not in harmony with each other.	Board of Supervisors	Agree	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 20: Both the Ethics Commission and the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force act in good faith. They are authorized to come to similar ends – transparency in government. However, there are legal and procedural differences between their process and their legal requirements. Therefore, the results of their work are not in harmony with each other.	Ethics Commission	Generally agree	Unlike the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, which is an advisory body, the Ethics Commission is a law enforcement agency with the ability to impose monetary and other sanctions and its procedures are more substantial. Often, differences are based more on interpretive actions.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 21a: The policy-making powers of the Ethics Commission are vested in the Commission itself, not in the Executive Director (absent express delegation by the Commission).	Board of Supervisors	Agree	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 21a: The policy-making powers of the Ethics Commission are vested in the Commission itself, not in the Executive Director (absent express delegation by the Commission).	Ethics Commission	Agree	NO ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PROVIDED.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 21a: The policy-making powers of the Ethics Commission are vested in the Commission itself, not in the Executive Director (absent express delegation by the Commission).	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Agree	NO ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PROVIDED.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 21b: The current structure where staff provides much of each Commission meeting's content creates the impression that the Commission is not an independent policy-making body.	Board of Supervisors	Partially disagree	Most Boards and Commissions, whose members receive modest or negligible compensation, rely on significant amounts of staff work.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 21b: The current structure where staff provides much of each Commission meeting's content creates the impression that the Commission is not an independent policy-making body.	Ethics Commission	Disagree	NO ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PROVIDED.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 21b: The current structure where staff provides much of each Commission meeting's content creates the impression that the Commission is not an independent policy-making body.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Disagree	NO ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PROVIDED.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 22: While the Commission's Bylaws authorize committees, no committees have been established or meet. One result is that all matters requiring deliberation by the Commission are heard only once a month, in a process that can extend for many months and sometimes for years. If the Commission acts through its committee structure, issues can be explored and brought to the full commission in a more developed state, thus providing a better basis for the Commission's actions.	Ethics Commission	Partially agree	Some Commission deliberations have extended for months but not for years, notwithstanding one case of extended delay created at the request of and as a courtesy to the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 23: While the Charter mandates the City Attorney represent the Ethics Commission, conflicts have arisen repeatedly, and the Ethics Commission has had to obtain outside counsel. We find these instances of conflict are likely to continue, and that the Commission is best represented by a consistent set of lawyers who are not City employees.	Ethics Commission	Mostly disagree	The Ethics Commission has obtained outside counsel only three times.

CGJ Year	Report Title	Findings	Response Required	2014 Responses (agree or disagree)	2014 Response Text
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 23: While the Charter mandates the City Attorney represent the Ethics Commission, conflicts have arisen repeatedly, and the Ethics Commission has had to obtain outside counsel. We find these instances of conflict are likely to continue, and that the Commission is best represented by a consistent set of lawyers who are not City employees.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Mostly disagree	The Ethics Commission has obtained outside counsel only three times.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 23: While the Charter mandates the City Attorney represent the Ethics Commission, conflicts have arisen repeatedly, and the Ethics Commission has had to obtain outside counsel. We find these instances of conflict are likely to continue, and that the Commission is best represented by a consistent set of lawyers who are not City employees.	City Attorney	Disagree	This Finding does not consider the central role of the City Attorney in advising the City and its constituent agencies. Charter section 6.102 designates the elected City Attorney as the legal representative of the City as a whole. With one City Attorney representing the City, the City speaks with one voice on legal issues and avoids the chaos, as well as tremendous taxpayer expense, that would result if each City department could freely hire its own council to represent its view of the City's interests. The more frequent use of outside counsel could have significant consequences on the consistency and continuity of legal advice provided to City agencies, boards, and commissions. The Ethics Commission has not "repeatedly" obtained outside counsel due to conflicts of interest. In its separate response, the Ethics Commission stated that it has used outside counsel on only three occasions, and at the August 18, 2014 Commission meeting to discuss its response, the Civil Grand Jury's representative did not dispute this figure. Rather, the Civil Grand Jury's representative explained that the Jury used the word "repeatedly" in this Finding because the Jury counted the number of meetings rather than the number of discrete matters where the Commission used outside counsel. So, for example, when the City retained outside counsel for the official misconduct proceedings regarding Sherriff Mirkarimi, the Civil Grand Jury considered this matter as requiring the "repeated" use of outside counsel because the Ethics Commission held a number of meetings on the matter. In fact, the Ethics Commission has rarely used outside counsel for legal advice, nor is there any basis to conclude it is "likely" that the Ethics Commission will need to use outside counsel for future matters. On the limited occasions when the City Attorney's Office has agreed to provide the Ethics Commission with outside counsel, this Office has always relied on its reciprocal relationship with other Bay Area public law offices, such as the Oakland City Attorney's Office and the Santa Clara County Counsel's Office, to obtain such counsel for the Commission. These public law offices have substantial familiarity with the types of legal issues that face the Ethics Commission, and they typically do not require the Commission to expand any of its budget on these additional legal services. But, like the SF City Attorney's Office, their recourses are limited.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 24a: The Jury was unable to locate and the Ethics Commission was unable to provide copies of any reports or notes of oral presentations to the Mayor or to the Board of Supervisors as required in the Charter to report annually on the effectiveness of San Francisco's ethics laws.	Board of Supervisors	Partially disagree	It is unfortunate that the Grand Civil Jury was unable to locate any communications between the Ethics Commission and the Board of Supervisors. Such communications do occur with some regularity, but communication could always be improved and formalized.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 24a: The Jury was unable to locate and the Ethics Commission was unable to provide copies of any reports or notes of oral presentations to the Mayor or to the Board of Supervisors as required in the Charter to report annually on the effectiveness of San Francisco's ethics laws.	Mayor	Disagree in part	The Executive Director of Ethics Commission is in regular contact with both the Legislative and Executive Branch. The Ethics Commission provides comment and analysis of the legislative changes proposed by the Board of Supervisors.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 24a: The Jury was unable to locate and the Ethics Commission was unable to provide copies of any reports or notes of oral presentations to the Mayor or to the Board of Supervisors as required in the Charter to report annually on the effectiveness of San Francisco's ethics laws.	Ethics Commission	Agree	Although the report states the need for constant adaptation of pertinent laws to deal with changing circumstances, it also fails to report that the Ethics Commission has vigorously reviewed the laws under its purview on an ongoing basis for just these reasons.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 24b: The Jury was unable to locate any reports that reviewed changes in laws aimed at transparency and ethical conduct adopted in other jurisdictions that might be relevant to San Francisco. The only references were to changes based on court decisions that resulted in less public disclosure and less protection against the influence of money in politics even when those decisions were not based on San Francisco cases.	Board of Supervisors	Agree	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 24b: The Jury was unable to locate any reports that reviewed changes in laws aimed at transparency and ethical conduct adopted in other jurisdictions that might be relevant to San Francisco. The only references were to changes based on court decisions that resulted in less public disclosure and less protection against the influence of money in politics even when those decisions were not based on San Francisco cases.	Mayor	Disagree in part	The Executive Director of Ethics Commission is in regular contact with both the Legislative and Executive Branch. The Ethics Commission provides comment and analysis of the legislative changes proposed by the Board of Supervisors.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 24b: The Jury was unable to locate any reports that reviewed changes in laws aimed at transparency and ethical conduct adopted in other jurisdictions that might be relevant to San Francisco. The only references were to changes based on court decisions that resulted in less public disclosure and less protection against the influence of money in politics even when those decisions were not based on San Francisco cases.	Ethics Commission	Agree	Although the report states the need for constant adaptation of pertinent laws to deal with changing circumstances, it also fails to report that the Ethics Commission has vigorously reviewed the laws under its purview on an ongoing basis for just these reasons.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 24c: The proper standard to judge the effectiveness of laws is to consider their ability to achieve the purposes set forth when they were enacted.	Board of Supervisors	Agree	

CGJ Year	Report Title	Findings	Response Required	2014 Responses (agree or disagree)	2014 Response Text
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 24c: The proper standard to judge the effectiveness of laws is to consider their ability to achieve the purposes set forth when they were enacted.	Mayor	Agree	NO ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PROVIDED.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 24c: The proper standard to judge the effectiveness of laws is to consider their ability to achieve the purposes set forth when they were enacted.	Ethics Commission	Agree	Although the report states the need for constant adaptation of pertinent laws to deal with changing circumstances, it also fails to report that the Ethics Commission has vigorously reviewed the laws under its purview on an ongoing basis for just these reasons.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 25a: Periodic reviews of filed information are essential to ensure its validity.	Ethics Commission	Agree/Disagree	This finding describes a huge volume of work.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 25a: Periodic reviews of filed information are essential to ensure its validity.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Agree/Disagree	This finding describes a huge volume of work.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 25a: Periodic reviews of filed information are essential to ensure its validity.	Board of Supervisors	Agree	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 25b: The Ethics Commission has undertaken little to no monitoring and auditing of the content of Lobbyists, Campaign Consultants, Conflict of Interest and Governmental Ethics filings beyond fines for late filing of statements; nor have they actively monitored whether former City employees abide by the restrictions on dealing with their former departments.	Ethics Commission	Agree/Disagree	This finding describes a huge volume of work. We disagree with the characterization of "little to no"
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 25b: The Ethics Commission has undertaken little to no monitoring and auditing of the content of Lobbyists, Campaign Consultants, Conflict of Interest and Governmental Ethics filings beyond fines for late filing of statements; nor have they actively monitored whether former City employees abide by the restrictions on dealing with their former departments.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Agree/Disagree	This finding describes a huge volume of work. We disagree with the characterization of "little to no"
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 25b: The Ethics Commission has undertaken little to no monitoring and auditing of the content of Lobbyists, Campaign Consultants, Conflict of Interest and Governmental Ethics filings beyond fines for late filing of statements; nor have they actively monitored whether former City employees abide by the restrictions on dealing with their former departments.	Board of Supervisors	partially disagree	While there is clearly more work to be done, the Board of Supervisors cannot characterize the amount of work done in this area.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 26: The Ethics Commission, though its staff, can catalog information reported elsewhere that is relevant for supplemental understanding of information currently reported locally. Links to this information would be a logical addition to the Ethics Commission web site.	Ethics Commission	Disagree	The concept is too broad to understand appreciably.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 26: The Ethics Commission, though its staff, can catalog information reported elsewhere that is relevant for supplemental understanding of information currently reported locally. Links to this information would be a logical addition to the Ethics Commission web site.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Disagree	The concept is too broad to understand appreciably.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 26: The Ethics Commission, though its staff, can catalog information reported elsewhere that is relevant for supplemental understanding of information currently reported locally. Links to this information would be a logical addition to the Ethics Commission web site.	Chief Data Officer	Agree in part	The Ethics Commission should determine information reported elsewhere that is relevant for supplemental understanding of information currently reported locally, and provide links to it on the Ethics Commission website, if it cannot be imported and posted.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 27: The Charter requires that proposals to amend campaign finance and ethics laws explain how the change will assist in furthering the purpose of the law. The Ethics Commission proposals have not included any statements showing that its proposals will further the purposes of the law.	Ethics Commission	Disagree	There is no basis for this finding.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 27: The Charter requires that proposals to amend campaign finance and ethics laws explain how the change will assist in furthering the purpose of the law. The Ethics Commission proposals have not included any statements showing that its proposals will further the purposes of the law.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Disagree	There is no basis for this finding.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 27: The Charter requires that proposals to amend campaign finance and ethics laws explain how the change will assist in furthering the purpose of the law. The Ethics Commission proposals have not included any statements showing that its proposals will further the purposes of the law.	Board of Supervisors	partially disagree	The Board believes that the Civil Grand Jury is making a technical finding here, not a broader one. The Board also understands the technical response by the City Attorney that such findings are not required, though they would be advisable.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 27: The Charter requires that proposals to amend campaign finance and ethics laws explain how the change will assist in furthering the purpose of the law. The Ethics Commission proposals have not included any statements showing that its proposals will further the purposes of the law.	City Attorney	Partially disagree	The Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code (not the Charter) provides that the Board of Supervisors may amend the Campaign Finance Reform Ordinance or the Government Ethics Ordinance if any such amendment "furthers the purpose" of those laws. See Campaign & Governmental Code section 1.103, 3.204. Neither section requires the proposed amendments to explicitly explain how the amendments would further those purposes.

CGJ Year	Report Title	Findings	Response Required	2014 Responses (agree or disagree)	2014 Response Text
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 28a: The Commission has not taken an active role in questioning the propriety of actions that skirt the edges of legality. This inquiry can feed into reports on the effectiveness of laws, and also remind public officials that they can be called to account for the appearance of impropriety.	Ethics Commission	Disagree	There is no basis for this finding. The Ethics Commission staff frequently discusses the appropriateness of the behavior of public officials and whether such behavior warrants investigation. Such discussion often prompts changes to ordinances, rules and regulations.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 28b: The general public needs an opportunity to talk to the Ethics Commission about their expectations and beliefs on ethical behavior of public officials. This initial discussion may help to highlight matters that appear to be improper.	Ethics Commission	Agree	The public is free to, and very frequently does, communicate to the Commission through public comment and written electronic messages.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 29: The Findings and Declarations of Proposition J (2000) clearly articulate many public concerns with role of money in politics and should be re-adopted, perhaps adapted to be part of the general conflict of interest law - Chapter 2 of Article III of the C&GCC.	Ethics Commission	Disagree	The intents and purposes of Prop J were redrafted, clarified and expanded by Prop E in 2003, in apparent response to concerns that existing law was outdated, inadequate and confusing. The BOS unanimously voted to place the measure on the ballot by vote of 10-0, and all eleven supported the measure (Ammiano, Daly, Dufty, Gonzalez, Hall, Maxwell, McGoldrick, Newsom, Perkin, Sandoval and Ma. Ma was not present for the vote). This measure was also supported by Common Cause. The measure was also supported unanimously at the Ethics Commission by Commissioners Melbostad, Planthold Garcia and McCoy. Prop E was adopted with support from 62% of the voters.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	Finding 29: The Findings and Declarations of Proposition J (2000) clearly articulate many public concerns with role of money in politics and should be re-adopted, perhaps adapted to be part of the general conflict of interest law - Chapter 2 of Article III of the C&GCC.	Board of Supervisors	partially disagree	The Board of Supervisors understands the Civil Grand Jury's finding that some provisions of Prop J should be looked at again, but also recognizes the history outlined by the Ethics Commission response to this finding.